



An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in hospitality industry

Halil Nadiri^{*}, Cem Tanova¹

Faculty of Business and Economics, Eastern Mediterranean University, P.O. Box 95, Gazimağusa, North Cyprus, Mersin 10, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Organizational justice
Job satisfaction
Organizational citizenship behavior
North Cyprus

ABSTRACT

The relationship of organizational justice perceptions of hotel employees in North Cyprus with various work-related variables was investigated. A total of 208 employees and their managers filled out questionnaires. It was found that distributive justice tended to be a stronger predictor of all of the study variables compared to procedural justice. Findings suggest that the fairness of personal outcomes that employees receive may have more impact on turnover intentions, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) than the perceived fairness of a firm's procedures. It was also found that even though improved job satisfaction seems to be related to OCB, organizational justice seems to be the key factor that has a strong effect on both OCB and job satisfaction.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

With increasing globalization and international competition, the importance of recruiting, retaining and managing resources that can help to increase competitiveness of organizations has become a crucial factor in the success of hospitality industry. Among these resources, human resources demand special attention. Human resources play a central role in the services sector. A primary reason for this is that the services are seen as inseparable from their provider. In this context, increasing employees' job satisfaction, commitment to the organization and motivation will not only increase the extra-role behavior of the employees through organizational citizenship behavior, but it will also contribute to the increased competitiveness of hospitality sector organizations and lead to better future performance. Especially in the service industry, evidence suggests a strong linkage between job satisfaction and performance. Researchers found a significant positive relationship between employees' job satisfaction and customer perceptions of service quality performance (Hartline and Keith, 1996; Yoon et al., 2001). It is expected that satisfied employees will engage in better service delivery (Schmit and Allscheid, 1995) and this will positively influence customer confidence and word-of-mouth and as well as contribute to achieve customer loyalty. So, having a loyal base of satisfied customers within such a competitive environment, increases

revenues, decreases costs and builds market share. Organizational justice has been shown to be related to employee outcomes such as job satisfaction (Fields et al., 2000). Thus, the concept of organizational justice and its consequences need to be understood by managers in the services sector. Managers need to have a better understanding of the role of organizational justice and its consequences in the hospitality industry. This concept is especially important for organizations that hope to develop more institutionalized policies and procedures.

As a Mediterranean island, North Cyprus' economy depends on tourism. In North Cyprus tourism is a significant contributor to the GDP. When we consider the scale disadvantage and the isolation that has been imposed on North Cyprus, the importance of the tourism sector can be seen clearly due to the unspoiled natural beauty and cultural heritage of North Cyprus where tourism remains a competitive sector. North Cyprus is considered to be an emerging new market for European tourists. In the wake of increasing competition and the dramatic changes occurring in the tourism industry in North Cyprus, there is a need for hotel managers and international investors to recognize the importance of service improvements in establishing a competitive advantage.

The aim of the current study is to examine the relationship of justice perceptions of hotel employees in North Cyprus with various work-related variables such as employees' organizational citizenship behaviors, their intentions to leave the hotel and seek other employment, and their overall job satisfaction. Previous researchers have shown that overall perceptions of fairness will influence work-related attitudes of employees (James, 1993; Fulford, 2005). The current study looks at the perceptions of distributive, procedural and interactional justice to see if the impact that they have on work-related attitudes differs. The study analyzes whether procedural

^{*} Corresponding author. Tel.: +90 392 630 1343; fax: +90 392 365 1017.

E-mail addresses: halil.nadiri@emu.edu.tr (H. Nadiri), cem.tanova@emu.edu.tr (C. Tanova).

¹ Tel.: +90 392 630 1343; fax: +90 392 365 1017.

justice perceptions (about fairness of rules and procedures) can mainly influence organizational citizenship behaviors of the employees while distributive justice perceptions (about the outcomes that employees receive from the organization) may primarily influence turnover intentions. In addition we analyze how justice perceptions influence the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior.

2. Literature review

2.1. Organizational justice

Justice perceptions have long been considered as explanatory variables in organizational research (Adams, 1965; Deutsch, 1975; Leventhal, 1976). Organizational justice describes the individuals' (or groups') perception of the fairness of treatment received from an organization and their behavioral reaction to such perceptions (James, 1993). In the extant literature, justice has been conceptualized based on three dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the outcomes, procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of the means used to determine those outcomes (Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997), and interactional justice refers to the fairness of interpersonal treatment (Martínez-Tur et al., 2006). Therefore the distributive justice is concerned with "ends", and the procedural justice with "means" (Sweeney and McFarlin, 1997). The expectancy theory of motivation states that motivation is influenced by the belief that effort will lead to higher performance (expectancy) and belief that higher performance will lead to better rewards (instrumentality) that are valued (valence) by the employees (Robbins, 2001, p. 173). Since distributive justice is about the fairness of the outcomes, it has a strong link with instrumentality. Thus, we can see that distributive justice perceptions of employees will have an influence on their motivation. The employees will have certain beliefs and attitudes about the way that the organization will make and implement decisions. In situations where the beliefs of how decisions should be made and how they are actually made are different, the employees may experience cognitive dissonance and as a result the employees will feel uncomfortable that may lead to job dissatisfaction.

Many studies have analyzed the relationship between these two forms of organizational justice and their effects on various work-related variables including turnover intention, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction (Alexander and Ruderman, 1987; Folger and Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992; Sweeney and McFarlin, 1997; Cropanzano and Folger, 1991; Cropanzano and Randall, 1993). For example, Alexander and Ruderman (1987) used six organizational outcome variables including job satisfaction, turnover intentions, tension/stress, trust in management, conflict/harmony, and evaluation of supervisor. Procedural justice had a greater influence on five of the variables compared to distributive justice. Of the six variables, only turnover intentions had a stronger link with distributive justice than with procedural justice.

In the hospitality industry, studies have shown that organizational justice perceptions of hotel employees have an impact on their commitment (Fulford, 2005). Thus, it becomes critical that hotel managers be very sensitive to how their decisions and how the methods they use to reach their decisions will be perceived by their employees.

2.2. Turnover intentions

Turnover continues to be a topic of interest among management researchers. Shaw et al. (1998) report over 1500 studies on the subject. There have been meta-analyses on the determinants of

turnover (Hom and Griffeth, 1995). Several studies have also examined both the magnitude and costs of turnover in the hotel industry (Hom and Griffeth, 1995; Hinkin and Tracey, 2000; Pizam and Thornburg, 2000). High turnover is generally acknowledged as one of the distinguishing features of the hotel and hospitality industry (Carbery et al., 2003). Wood (1997), Woods (1997), and Manley (1996) underline the positive and negative effects of the high turnover rate in the hospitality sector. Some researchers do not see employee turnover to be dysfunctional, however, at the organizational level there is strong evidence that higher turnover has replacement and recruitment costs (Deery and Iverson, 1996; Manley, 1996). One reason that a high rate of voluntary turnover is alarming for many managers is the fear that the employees with better skills and abilities will be those who are able to leave whereas those who remain will be those who cannot find other jobs (Tanova and Holtom, 2008). Additionally, in the hospitality industry one of the most critical intangible costs is the loss of employee morale for the employees who prefer to stay with the organization. As a result, this can affect the level of service provided to the customer.

Mobley (1977) has formulated a withdrawal decision process to explain how people decide to leave their institutions. According to his model, individuals first evaluate their existing jobs and experience satisfaction or dissatisfaction based on their jobs. If dissatisfaction is felt, the thought of quitting arises. Before searching for alternatives, individuals first try to evaluate the cost that will incur from quitting the existing job and the utility that is expected to be received from the search. If the expected utilities are considered to be worthy of quitting, a search for the alternatives begin, followed by an evaluation and comparison of the alternatives with the present situation. Intention to quit is formed if the alternatives are more desired which is followed by actual withdrawal. Cho et al. (2009) argues that in hospitality sector in the US positive employee attitudes such as organizational commitment and perceived organizational support help to reduce the intention to leave.

2.3. Organizational citizenship behavior

Organizational citizenship behaviors are behaviors of a discretionary nature that are not part of employees' formal role requirements, nevertheless these behaviors contribute to the effective functioning of an organization (Organ, 1988; Athanasou and King, 2002; Robbins, 2001, p. 25). OCB are beneficial and desirable from an organizational perspective, but managers have difficulty eliciting their occurrence or punishing their absence through contractual arrangement and formal rewards because the behaviors are voluntary (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). Chiang and Birtch (2008) report that extra-role behaviors in Hong Kong hospitality sector are influenced primarily by non-financial rewards. Organ (1990) described five categories of OCB:

- conscientiousness means that employees carry out in role behaviors well beyond the minimum required levels;
- altruism means that they help others;
- civic virtue suggests that employees responsibly participate in the political life of the organization;
- sportsmanship states that people do not complain but have positive attitudes;
- courtesy indicates that they treat others with respect.

Organization citizenship behaviors will influence customer loyalty. This is due to improved employee–customer interaction and to improve "service climate" (Armario et al., 2004). OCB–customer loyalty relationship may be due to improved service quality in the context of hospitality sector (Suh and Yoon, 2003;

Bell and Menguc, 2002). Bienstock et al. (2003) argue that among employees that have direct contact with the customer, OCB becomes extremely important, since the OCB of this group of employees leads to improved customer evaluation of service quality.

2.4. Job satisfaction

High employee satisfaction is important to managers who believe that “an organization has a responsibility to provide employees with jobs that are challenging and intrinsically rewarding” (Robbins, 2001, p. 82). Oshagbemi (2000) has defined job satisfaction as “individual’s positive emotional reaction to particular job”. Gill (2008) shows that employees with higher degree of trust will have higher levels of job satisfaction in the hospitality industry. Job satisfaction can affect many other variables such as turnover intentions. Price and Mueller (1981) stated that job satisfaction has an indirect influence on turnover through its direct influence on formation of intent to leave.

3. Hypotheses

The relationship of both forms of organizational justice with individual outcomes like job satisfaction and turnover intention has been proposed by various researchers, some suggesting more of those variables would be accounted for distributive justice (Folger and Konovsky, 1989) whereas some proposing the opposite (McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992; Cropanzano and Folger, 1991). For example, previous studies in the United States have revealed that employee perceptions about distributive and procedural justice may predict an employee’s intention to stay, job satisfaction, evaluation of supervisor and organizational commitment (Cropanzano and Randall, 1993; Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Sweeney and McFarlin, 1997). These studies also found that judgment about procedural justice may be more strongly related to evaluation of supervision and organizational commitment while distributive justice may be more strongly related to job satisfaction and intent to stay (McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992).

Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996) proposed that employees’ perceptions of procedural justice are related to different aspects of satisfaction (i.e. pay, promotion, and supervision) and organizational commitment. Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991) suggest that receiving a fair outcome on a specific occasion does not mean that fair outcomes will always be forthcoming. Thus outcome fairness generally predicts only context-specific responses. Job satisfaction is such a context-specific response and therefore should be more related to distributive justice (i.e. outcome fairness) rather than procedural justice (Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Lowe and Vodanovich, 1995; Martin and Bennett, 1996). This is also in line with Sweeney and McFarlin’s (1997) two factor model of justice and with a recent meta-analysis of research in other contexts (Colquitt et al., 2001). Greenberg (1987) has proposed that perceptions of unfairness in the distributive justice will lead individuals to sense injustice therefore be less productive, less satisfied and consequently be more willing to quit their jobs. Thus, employees perceiving injustice in the work place will be less satisfied with their jobs and hence the thought of quitting the work arouses followed by actual turnover.

Fields et al. (2000) have summarized the result of previous studies of the relationship of distributive justice and procedural justice with employee outcomes as: (1) both distributive and procedural justice are related to job satisfaction, intent to stay and evaluation of supervision; (2) the relationship of procedural justice is stronger with evaluation of supervision; (3) the relationship of distributive justice is stronger with job satisfaction and intent to stay; (4) procedural justice moderates the relationship if dis-

tributive justice with evaluation of supervision; and (5) gender moderates the relationships of both distributive justice and procedural justice with job satisfaction and intent to stay. Therefore, the first, second, and third hypotheses are formed accordingly.

H1. Perceptions of distributive and procedural justice will be significantly related to employees’ turnover intention.

H2. Distributive justice perceptions of employees will account for more of the variance on job satisfaction of employees as compared to the variance accounted by procedural justice.

H3. Distributive justice perceptions of employees will account for more of the variance on turnover intention of employees as compared to the variance accounted by procedural justice.

Williams et al. (2002) proposed that when perceptions of fairness treatments are high, employees are more likely to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors. A variety of studies have found a positive relationship between perception of procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviors (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; Moorman, 1991; Moorman et al., 1993, 1998; Organ and Moorman, 1993). Fahr et al. (1990) found that procedural justice account for unique variance with respect to altruism dimension of OCB. In line with these results, Moorman (1991) found that there exists positive relationship between procedural justice and four OCB dimensions. Organ and Moorman (1993) concluded that procedural justice, rather than distributive justice or job satisfaction, provides a better explanation of OCB. Moorman (1991) has also suggested that the decisions to behave as an organizational citizen was more a result of a general positive evaluation of the organizational system, institutions and authorities evoked by procedural justice rather than an evaluation of fairness of outcomes. Robinson and Morrison (2000) have reported that when employees felt that their employer had failed to satisfy employment obligations, they were less likely to engage in civic behavior. Although it would be logical to expect that employees who are more satisfied would be more likely to talk positively, engage in extra-role behavior, assist other employees to perform better, and to go beyond their official job requirements in order to get the work done, however empirical research shows that there is modest overall relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior but satisfaction is not related to organizational citizenship behavior when organizational justice is controlled (Lepine et al., 2002; Konovsky and Organ, 1996; Moorman, 1991).

Therefore hypotheses 4, 5 and 6 are:

H4. Perception of distributive and procedural justice will be significantly related to employees’ organizational citizenship behavior.

H5. Procedural justice perceptions of employees will account for more of the variance in organizational citizenship behavior levels compared to the variance accounted by distributive justice perceptions.

H6. Job satisfaction will not be related to organizational citizenship behavior when distributive procedural and interactional justice are controlled.

4. Methodology

4.1. Sample

The sample for this study was drawn from four 5 star hotels which are the most popular tourist establishments (Nadiri, 2003)

in North Cyprus. All of these establishments were contacted and permissions to carry out the research were obtained. Using non-probabilistic sampling method, 300 questionnaires were distributed to the managers and employees that were willing to participate in the study. Two versions of questionnaires were used; one for employees and the other version for managers. Out of the 300 employee–manager dyads a total of 208 employees and 40 managers filled out the questionnaires. The employees filled out a questionnaire with questions about their job satisfaction, justice perceptions and turnover intentions. The managers filled out questionnaires about each of their employee's organizational citizenship behavior. The anonymity of the employees was ensured. Research assistants distributed the questionnaires to employees and managers separately, and they collected and matched the completed questionnaires. The scales were translated to Turkish from the English language. The Turkish versions were also back translated to English and the two versions were compared by an independent linguist to ensure equivalence. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients were comparable with the original scales.

4.2. Measures

4.2.1. Organizational citizenship behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior was measured with a 19 item, 5-point Likert type scale that was asked to managers. The scales included items adapted from scales used previously by [Organ and Konovsky \(1989\)](#). An example of the item format is “Your employee helps busy colleagues”. The Cronbach alpha was found to be 0.63. The managers filled out the OCB questions for their employees.

4.2.2. Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured with a 4 item, 5-point Likert type scale that was asked to employees. The scales included items adapted from scales used previously by [Lucas et al. \(1990\)](#). An example of the item format is “I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do”. The Cronbach alpha was found to be 0.84. The job satisfaction questions were filled out by the employees.

4.2.3. Distributive, procedural, and interactional justice

The 20 item, 5-point Likert type scale developed by [Niehoff and Moorman \(1993\)](#) was used to measure procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice. The Cronbach alpha for the 20 items was 0.939. The 5 items were related to distributive justice (alpha value 0.907), 6 items to procedural justice (alpha value 0.760) and 9 items for interactional justice (alpha value 0.902). An item scale for distributive justice is “I feel I am being rewarded fairly considering the responsibilities I have”. An item

scale for procedural justice is “My supervisor is neutral in decision making”. An example item from interactional justice measure is “My supervisor provides explanations for the decisions related to my job”. The justice questions were filled out by the employees.

4.2.4. Turnover intentions

A 3 item, 5-point Likert scale developed by [Cammann et al. \(1979\)](#) was used to measure turnover intentions of the employees. Each item asked the respondents to indicate the degree of occurrence of thought of quitting, searching for another job, and actually intending to quit. The Cronbach alpha was calculated to be 0.85. The turnover intention questions were filled out by the employees.

5. Analysis and results

5.1. Descriptive statistics

Among managers 90.4% are male and 9.6% are female. 65.4% are locals whereas 34.6% are from Turkey. Education levels of managers are 9.6% vocational school, 67.3% bachelor degree, and 23.1% graduate degree. The years of service among managers are 54.8% below 5 years, 15.4% 6–10 years, and 30.8% more than 10 years. Among employees 34.6% are female, while 63.5% are male. 82.7% of employees are between 21 and 30 years old. And 82% of employees are locals and 17.3% of the employees are from Turkey. Years of service among employees are 94.5% less than 5 years. Many employees in the hotel industry are seasonal employees due to lower occupancy rates during off peak seasons.

The gender distribution among managers shows that the management ranks are predominantly male dominated. Even among non-managerial employees males constitute more than 60% of the respondents. This reflects the realities of the male dominated character of the hospitality sector in North Cyprus. The level of education of the respondents is also relatively high with more than 90% with university education among managers. This shows the unique nature of the high demand for university education in North Cyprus where there are 6 universities for 300,000 inhabitants. Most secondary school graduates prefer to enter university programs instead of vocational technical schools.

[Table 1](#) presents means, standard deviations, correlations and reliability coefficients for all study variables. Results of the correlation analysis provide support for the discriminant validity of the study. When correlation coefficient matrix between constructs is examined, no correlation coefficient is above 0.90. This means that all the constructs are different/distinct ([Amick and Walberg, 1975](#)). Prior research has also successfully shown that these scales predict different dependent measures and suggest that they are distinct variables representing different constructs ([McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992](#)). The average variance extracted

Table 1
Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and correlations.

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Education level ^a	3.79	1.15								
2. Tenure ^b	1.12	0.38	–0.033							
3. Age ^b	2.13	0.39	–0.065	0.546***						
4. Turnover intentions	2.53	0.82	–0.214**	–0.241***	–0.042					
5. Job satisfaction	3.23	0.81	–0.020	0.324***	0.159*	–0.587***				
6. OCB	3.56	0.31	–0.159*	0.210**	0.033	–0.205**	0.324***			
7. Distributive justice	3.68	0.81	–0.121	0.056	0.012	–0.458***	0.672***	0.513***		
8. Procedural justice	3.69	0.57	–0.210	0.246***	0.074	–0.508***	0.722***	0.376***	0.704***	
9. Interactional justice	3.68	0.62	–0.097	0.291***	0.118	–0.542***	0.720***	0.410***	0.666***	0.776***

^a For education level, 1 = primary school, 2 = secondary school, 3 = lycee, 4 = vocational school, 5 = undergraduate, 6 = postgraduate, 7 = Ph.D.

^b For tenure, 1 = below 5, 2 = 6–10, and 3 = over 10. For age, 1 = below 20, 2 = 21–30, 3 = 31–40, 4 = 41–50, and 5 = over 51.

* $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed).

** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed).

*** $p < 0.001$ (2-tailed).

Table 2

Hierarchical regression results for the influence of control variables and procedural justice followed by distributive justice and interactional justice on turnover intentions and job satisfaction.

Variables	Turnover intentions					Job satisfaction				
	R^2 change	β	<i>t</i> -Statistics	<i>p</i> -Value	VIF	R^2 change	β	<i>t</i> -Statistics	<i>p</i> -Value	VIF
Step 1: controls	0.117			0.000		0.106			0.000	
Education level		−0.155	−3.289	0.001	1.00		−0.007	−0.159	0.874	1.00
Tenure		−0.678	−3.948	0.000	1.43		0.731	4.277	0.000	1.43
Age		0.236	1.439	0.152	1.43		−0.055	−0.335	0.738	1.43
Step 2: Procedural justice	0.265	−0.787	−9.322	0.000	1.12	0.458	1.022	14.589	0.000	1.12
Step 3: Distributive justice	0.023	−0.220	−2.805	0.006	2.05	0.064	0.360	5.870	0.000	2.05
Step 4: Interactional justice	0.021	−0.327	−2.722	0.007	2.87	0.022	0.332	3.579	0.000	2.87
<i>N</i>		208						208		
R^2		0.426					0.649			
Equation <i>F</i> -value		24.83		0.000			62.04		0.000	

(AVE) was also used to examine convergent validity of each construct and the results accounted for more than 50% of the corresponding items (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Additionally, leading researchers have argued that although these are separate constructs, in practice, correlation should be found between them due to convergent validity of the constructs related to employee work-related attitudes (Folger, 1987).

Hierarchical regression and correlation analyzes were employed to test the hypotheses. Three step hierarchical regression analysis was employed for hypotheses 2, 3, and 5. In addition, correlation analysis was conducted for hypotheses 1 and 4. The variables were checked for multicollinearity. The VIF scores reported in the tables show that the VIFs are well below 10 indicating that there is no cause for concern about the multicollinearity.

In Table 2 we regressed the control variables, then procedural justice followed by distributive justice and finally interactional justice on turnover intentions, and job satisfaction. In Table 2, our objective was to see the influence of distributive justice when procedural justice was controlled. And also to see the influence of interactional justice when both distributive and procedural justice were controlled. In Table 3 we regressed the control variables, then distributive justice followed by procedural justice and finally interactional justice on organizational citizenship behavior. In Table 3, our objective was to see the influence of procedural justice after distributive justice was controlled.

In Table 2 at step 1, we entered four control variables: education level, tenure, age, and gender. Staines et al. (1986) argued that these types of variables need to be controlled for, because these kinds of variables have general potential to inflate relations between other variables. As Table 2 indicates, tenure significantly predicted turnover intentions and job satisfaction. Our finding was that people with more years of experience tended to have higher job satisfaction was consistent with earlier findings (Lynch and Verdin, 1987; Oshagbemi, 2000). People with more years of experience tended to have lower turnover intentions. This can be due to increase in organizational commitment where people with more years of service may become more committed to their organizations.

At step 2, procedural justice was entered, at step 3 distributive justice was entered and at step 4 interactional justice was entered. In all the steps the additional justice dimensions contributed significantly to the model.

The first hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between distributive and procedural justice and turnover intention was supported ($r = -0.458$ and $r = -0.508$ respectively, both $p < 0.001$) (see Table 1).

Our second hypothesis that distributive justice perceptions would account for more variance on job satisfaction than procedural justice was supported. This result suggests that job satisfaction will be high when procedural justice is perceived to be high, but when we control for procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice still account for significant variance in job satisfaction.

Our third hypothesis that distributive justice would account for more variance on turnover intentions than procedural justice was supported. Distributive justice tended to be more important predictor of turnover intentions as compared to procedural justice where we entered distributive justice at step 3 resulted in 0.023 change in R^2 ($F(1,202) = 7.865$, $p < 0.006$). This means that when all distributive, procedural and interactional justice is high, turnover intentions will decrease (there is negative relationship with both: $\beta_{DJ} = -0.220$, $\beta_{PJ} = -0.787$, and $\beta_{IJ} = -0.327$).

The fourth hypothesis that distributive and procedural justice will be significantly related to employees' organizational citizenship behavior was supported ($r = 0.513$ and $r = 0.376$ respectively, both $p < 0.001$).

Our fifth hypothesis that procedural justice would account for more variance in organizational citizenship behaviors of employees than distributive justice would was NOT supported. Table 3 shows that procedural justice is entered after distributive justice is

Table 3

Hierarchical regression results for the influence of control variables and distributive justice followed by procedural justice and interactional justice on OCB.

Variables	OCB				
	R^2 change	β	<i>t</i> -Statistics	<i>p</i> -Value	VIF
Step 1: controls	0.079			0.000	
Education level		−0.042	−2.347	0.020	1.004
Tenure		0.223	3.422	0.001	1.425
Age		−0.098	−1.579	0.116	1.430
Step 2: Distributive justice	0.234	0.183	8.332	0.000	1.019
Step 3: Procedural justice	0.003	−0.048	−1.022	0.308	2.253
Step 4: Interactional justice	0.005	0.058	1.189	0.236	2.872
<i>N</i>		208			
R^2		0.321			
Equation <i>F</i> -value		15.863		0.000	

Table 4

Hierarchical regression results for the influence of control variables and job satisfaction followed by distributive justice and procedural justice on OCB.

Job satisfaction followed by justice on OCB						Justice followed by job satisfaction on OCB					
Variables	R ² change	β	t-Statistics	p-Value	VIF	Variables	R ² change	β	t-Statistics	p-Value	VIF
Step 1: controls	0.079			0.001		Step 1: controls	0.079			0.001	
Education level		−0.042	−2.347	0.020	1.004	Education level		−0.042	−2.347	0.020	1.004
Tenure		0.223	3.422	0.001	1.425	Tenure		0.223	3.422	0.001	1.425
Age		−0.098	−1.579	0.116	1.430	Age		−0.098	−1.579	0.116	1.430
Step 2:	0.071			0.000		Step 2:	0.243			0.000	
Job satisfaction		0.106	4.125	0.000	1.118	Distributive justice		0.194	5.935	0.000	2.253
Step 3:	0.181			0.000		Interactional justice		0.058	1.190	0.236	2.872
Distributive justice		0.212	6.198	0.000	2.498	Procedural justice		−0.083	−1.503	0.134	3.173
Procedural justice		−0.056	−0.978	0.329	3.438	Step 3:	0.010			0.089	
Interactional justice		0.079	1.577	0.116	3.055	Job satisfaction		−0.063	−1.707	0.089	2.852
N		208				N		208			
R²		0.33				R²		0.33			
Equation F-value		14.143		0.000		Equation F-value		14.143		0.000	

already in the model [R^2 change = 0.003, $F(1,202) = 1.044$, $p < 0.308$]. Results have indicated that after distributive justice has been accounted for, the additional contribution of procedural justice is not significant on the organizational citizenship behaviors of employees.

The sixth hypothesis was about the influence of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behaviors. From Table 4 we can see that there was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. However, there was no influence of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behaviors when the influence of justice had been controlled.

6. Discussion and managerial implications

The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship of organizational justice with various work-related variables, i.e. organizational citizenship behavior, turnover intention, and job satisfaction. Correlations between employees' organizational justice perceptions were significantly related to organizational citizenship behavior, turnover intentions, and job satisfaction.

6.1. Procedural justice and distributive justice

Organizational justice was conceptualized as three separate dimensions: procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice. Both procedural and distributive justice are important predictors of work outcomes, and organizational researchers should investigate both types of justice (Greenberg, 1987). Most of the researchers had suggested that procedural justice would be more related with organizational outcomes and the attitudes of employees toward the institution (Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Lind and Tyler, 1988), whereas distributive justice would be a more important predictor of individual outcomes like intentions to quit and satisfaction with work (McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992). For example, in the extant literature, it is found that fairness of the procedure was a better explanatory variable for organizational citizenship behavior (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Moorman, 1991).

As opposed to these findings, results of the current study indicated that procedural justice did not tend to be a stronger predictor of turnover intentions and job satisfaction compared to distributive and interactional justice. However, distributive justice tended to be a stronger predictor of organizational citizenship behavior compared to procedural justice. Our findings suggest that the fairness of a firm's procedures may have a lesser impact on organizational citizenship behavior than the fairness of personal outcomes that employees receive. The fairness of firm's procedures has impact on turnover intentions and job satisfaction however,

fairness of personal outcomes that employees receive still explains more of the variance on employees' turnover intentions even after we have considered the part played by the impact of perceived fairness of the firm's procedures. We can state that for the employees in hospitality industry in North Cyprus, the role of perception of fairness in firm's procedures is very important with regard to personal outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intentions. However, the fairness of personal outcomes like fair distribution of pay and other rewards and perceived fairness in the managers' interactions with their employees still impact the employees' job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Furthermore, outcome fairness is more important with regard to organizational outcomes such as OCB as well.

Why would the fairness of a firm's procedures have impact on personal outcomes (i.e. job satisfaction and turnover intentions) while outcome fairness have greater impact on organizational outcome (i.e. OCB), could be explained by using self-interest and group-value theory which have already been discussed in the literature review. The reason why procedural justice impacts job satisfaction is that employees can enhance their outcomes by asking for a wage increase, a promotion or better benefits and working conditions. The logic behind this is that procedural justice must exist within the organization; as such, employees must be able to influence the outcomes by participating in decision making (self-interest theory); hence in such cases, the employee's job satisfaction can be enhanced and influenced by procedural justice. The findings of Alexander and Ruderman (1987) supported the discussion above where they found that procedural fairness was significant factor influencing job satisfaction. Based on that, we may state that in the hospitality industry in North Cyprus, employees may be allowed to take part in decision making, thus they can have the feeling that they control the outcomes in one way or another. This result can also be used in explaining why procedural justice will impact turnover of employees. When the job satisfaction of employees is high, they may become highly committed to their organizations which in turn results in lower turnover rates. However, we also see from our results that even after procedural justice has been considered, there is still further impact of distributive and interactional justice on the turnover intentions and job satisfaction of the employees.

Tyler (1989) stated that, as suggested by group-value theory, several non-control issues, such as neutrality in the decision-making procedure, trust in the decision maker, and evidence about social standing, may have a more powerful (strong, significant, crucial) effect on judgments of procedural justice than control issues. Violation or absence of any one of these non-control issues may result in low fairness perception of procedures. Thus

employees may rely more on outcome than procedural fairness in such conditions.

This can be the reason why distributive justice explained more variance in organizational citizenship behavior than procedural justice in our study.

This can also be attributed to the distinct nature of hospitality industry where employees can easily shift to other firms due to the ease of finding other jobs. The skills of employees in this sector are easily transferred to similar positions in different organizations. It might be much more difficult for an employee in the manufacturing sector, who learns to use one specific machine, to transfer to another organization where the employee would probably have to learn to use different equipment. Based on the nature of the hospitality industry jobs, it is relatively easier for employees to change organizations with a shorter learning curve.

6.2. Organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction

OCB was significantly explained by job satisfaction of employees. This may lead the practicing managers to assume that the way to increase OCB is through increasing job satisfaction which is usually associated with increasing salaries or improving working conditions. However, when we introduced organizational justice variables to the equation, and then looked at the effect of job satisfaction on OCB over and above the effect of organizational justice variables, there was no significant effect which leads us to conclude that organizational justice is a variable that has a strong effect on job satisfaction and OCB. Thus organizational justice results in increased or decreased job satisfaction and OCB at the same time. When we eliminate the role of organizational justice, the remaining effect of job satisfaction is not much on OCB. This means that practicing managers should aim to improve OCB through improved organizational justice; this will not only improve OCB but also lead to increased satisfaction. If managers focus on job satisfaction improvement through means other than increased organizational justice, the effect of this may be minimal on OCB.

6.3. Overall implications

Central role played by employees in services sector should be taken into account seriously. The service quality depends on employee performance. Nadiri and Hussain (2005), in one of their studies, stated that customers visiting North Cyprus hotels have a narrow zone of tolerance which means that customers are not likely to accept heterogeneity in services provided by hotels. Therefore organizational justice perceptions of employees is very crucial in that sense where increased job satisfaction together with effective training will lead to increased service quality which finally results in increased customer satisfaction and loyalty. On the other hand, if employees do not perceive organizational justice they will not demonstrate organizational citizenship behaviors even if management attempts to keep them satisfied. Lack of perceived fairness may also lead to increased turnover of employees. Thus, high turnover may result in decrease in service

quality. Even it may be more important for some services where customers will prefer to contact with the same service provider over the time.

Results of the study were somewhat incongruent with extant literature. Procedural justice was a predictor for turnover intentions and job satisfaction of employees. However, distributive and interactional justice were even stronger predictors for turnover intentions and job satisfaction. This means that employees' decision to leave the hotel that they have been working for is related to how the decisions about the allocation of rewards are made in the hotel. But even if the perceptions of fairness in decision-making procedures could be achieved, the actual rewards they have received will further explain their decisions to leave.

As opposed to other studies, in our study distributive justice was a stronger predictor for organizational citizenship behavior compared to procedural justice. Employees' OCB such as helping fellow workers or doing more than they are required to is more related to the fairness of the rewards they have been allocated. As the most important factor of production and service, employees play a significant role in the effectiveness of organizations. Creating a sense of belonging to the organization with loyal employees and fostering loyalty among employees can be a competitive advantage in today's business world. Therefore, managers in hospitality industry in North Cyprus with stiff domestic and international competition should come to understand that transparency in the fairness of firm's procedures and rewards will allow them to develop more loyal and committed employees. Hotel managers have to become aware of the extent their decisions and their methods of making the decisions influence the performance of their staff, and how this in turn impacts customer satisfaction. Managers should realize that in the hospitality industry employees have a need to see equitable rewards. Our findings show that employees not only look to see fair procedures in place for the distribution of rewards, but the actual fairness of the distributed rewards are also critical in both voluntary turnover decisions and organizational citizenship behaviors. It is not enough for managers to develop human resource management procedures that are fair, but it is also very important that the end results of the procedures are perceived as fair.

7. Limitations and opportunities for future research

The present findings have several implications for future research, some of which are related to the limitations of this study. In this study, only 5 star hotels in North Cyprus were investigated. Thus, the generalizability of our results is somewhat limited and findings could be specific to these types of establishments. Other limitations of this study are small sample size and representativeness of the sample where non-probabilistic sampling method and convenience sampling were used. Future research in this field can investigate how job satisfaction and organizational justice may influence turnover decisions and organizational citizenship behaviors in different cultural and organizational settings.

Appendix A. Items from the questionnaire

	Mean	Std. deviation
Organizational citizenship behavior		
Help busy colleagues	3.90	0.77
Help for absent colleagues	3.90	0.82
Help to other colleagues for more productivity	3.88	0.83
Not duty but help to the new comers	3.87	0.88
If help to the colleagues job, sharing personal stuff	3.87	0.83

Appendix A (Continued)

	Mean	Std. deviation
Respect to other persons rights and preferences	4.00	0.81
Consult about the decisions which create effect on others	4.17	0.80
Consult before making any decision	4.08	0.76
Complaints about the nonsense situations in the org.	2.85	0.95
Finding a mistake for every kind of decision making in the org.	2.46	0.69
Feeling anger and unsafe because of the innovations in the org.	2.31	0.85
Giving priority to personal problems	2.23	1.07
Not reading the brochures and documents related to the org.	2.40	1.03
Being punctual	3.94	0.77
Attendance is over the average	3.85	0.75
If attendance is not possible, making the others to know about it	4.23	0.91
Being organized in the org.	4.10	0.69
Being aware of the improvements in the org.	3.94	0.84
Attending to the meetings and telling about opinions	3.71	0.86
Job satisfaction		
Being satisfied with the amount of pay received for the job done	3.38	0.90
Being satisfied with the working conditions	3.73	0.86
Feeling of getting paid fairly	3.27	1.06
Being relatively well rewarded financially for the work	2.54	1.10
Distributive justice		
Fair rewards with regard to responsibilities	3.63	0.96
Fair rewards with regard to education level	3.67	1.02
Fair rewards with regard to the efforts	3.85	0.87
Fair rewards with regard to stress and the tension created by the job	3.38	1.01
Fair rewards with regard to the fulfilled responsibilities	3.88	0.91
Procedural justice		
Being neutral about decision making	3.63	0.79
Listening to others before decision making	3.56	0.91
Collecting right information related to the topic for decision making	3.75	0.73
Giving additional information when necessary	3.58	0.79
Decisions are implemented to everyone consistently	4.17	0.78
Right to deny or accept the decision	3.42	1.03
Interactional justice		
Being polite and concerned for decisions about my job	3.73	0.79
Being respectful and careful for decisions about my job	3.58	0.79
Being sensitive to personal needs for decisions about my job	3.65	0.78
Being sincere for decisions about my job	3.50	0.82
Giving importance to personal rights for decisions about my job	3.65	0.81
Implications of the decisions about my job is told to me	4.04	0.76
Explanation for the decisions related to my job	3.79	0.79
Logic explanations for decisions taken about my job	3.67	0.78
Clear explanation for decisions related to my job	3.46	1.07
Turnover intentions		
Often thought of quitting	2.65	1.04
Looking for a new job next year probably	2.50	0.82
Leaving the job next year	2.44	0.93

References

- Adams, J.S., 1965. Inequity in social exchange. In: Berkowitz, L. (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 2. Academic Press, New York, pp. 267–299.
- Alexander, S., Ruderman, M., 1987. The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research* 1 (2), 177–198.
- Amick, D.J., Walberg, H.J., 1975. *Introductory Multivariate Analysis*. McCutchan Publishing Corporation, California.
- Armario, E.M., Castro, C.B., Ruiz, D.M., 2004. The influence of employee organizational citizenship behavior on customer loyalty. *International Journal of Service Industry Management* 15 (1), 27–53.
- Athanasou, M.G.C., King, J.N., 2002. Job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour: a study of Australian human-service professionals. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 17 (4), 287–297.
- Bell, J.S., Menguc, B., 2002. The employee–organization relationship, organizational citizenship behaviors, and superior service quality. *Journal of Retailing* 78, 131–146.
- Bienstock, C.C., DeMoranville, C.W., Smith, R.K., 2003. Organizational citizenship behavior and service quality. *Journal of Services Quality* 17 (4), 357–378.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., Klesh, J., 1979. The Michigan organizational assessment questionnaire. Unpublished manuscript. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Carbery, R., Garavan, T.N., O'Brien, F., McDonnell, J., 2003. Predicting hotel managers' turnover cognitions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 18 (7), 649–679.
- Chiang, F.F.T., Birtch, T.A., 2008. Achieving task and extra-task-related behaviors: a case of gender and position differences in the perceived role of rewards in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 27 (4), 491–503.
- Cho, S., Johanson, M.M., Guchait, P., 2009. Employees intent to leave: a comparison of determinants of intent to leave versus intent to stay. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 28 (3), 374–381.
- Colquitt, J.A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C.O., Ng, K.Y., 2001. Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86 (3), 424–445.
- Cropanzano, R., Folger, R., 1991. Procedural justice and worker motivation. In: Steers, R.M., Porter, L.W. (Eds.), *Motivation and Work Behavior*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Cropanzano, R., Greenberg, J., 1997. Progress in organizational justice: tunneling through the maze. In: Cooper, C.L., Robertson, I.T. (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 12. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, pp. 317–372.
- Cropanzano, R., Randall, M., 1993. Justice in the workplace: a historical review. In: Cropanzano, R. (Ed.), *Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management*. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 3–20.
- Deery, M.A., Iverson, R.D., 1996. Enhancing productivity: intervention strategies for employee turnover. In: Johns, N. (Ed.), *Productivity Management in Hospitality and Tourism*. Cassell, London.
- Deutsch, M., 1975. Equity, equality and need: what determines which value will be used as the basis for distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues* 31, 317–372.
- Fahr, J.L., Podsakoff, P.M., Organ, D.W., 1990. Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management* 16, 705–721.

- Fields, D., Pang, M., Chiu, C., 2000. A comparative field study of the effects of distributive and procedural justice in Hong Kong. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour* 21 (5), 547–562.
- Folger, R., 1987. Distributive and procedural justice in the workplace. *Social Justice Research* 1 (2), 143–159.
- Folger, R., Konovsky, M.A., 1989. Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal* 32 (1), 115–130.
- Fornell, C., Larcker, D.F., 1981. Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: algebra and statistics. *Journal of Marketing Research* 18 (3), 382–388.
- Fulford, M.D., 2005. That's not fair! The test of a model of organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among hotel employees. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism* 4 (1), 73–84.
- Gill, A.S., 2008. The role of trust in employee–manager relationship. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 20 (1), 98–103.
- Greenberg, J., 1987. A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review* 12, 9–22.
- Hartline, M.D., Keith, C.J., 1996. Employee performance cues in a hotel service environment: influence on perceived service quality, value, and word-of-mouth intentions. *Journal of Business Research* 35 (March), 207–215.
- Hinkin, T.R., Tracey, J.B., 2000. The cost of turnover. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administrative Quarterly* June, 1.
- Hom, P.W., Griffeth, R.W., 1995. *Employee Turnover*. South Western College, Cincinnati, OH.
- James, K., 1993. The social context of organizational justice: cultural, intergroup and structural effects on justice behaviors and perceptions. In: Cropanzano, R. (Ed.), *Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management*. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 21–50.
- Konovsky, M.A., Pugh, S.D., 1994. Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal* 37, 656–669.
- Konovsky, M.A., Cropanzano, R., 1991. Justice considerations in employee drug testing. In: Cropanzano, R. (Ed.), *Justice in the Work Place: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management*. Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 171–192.
- Konovsky, M.A., Organ, D.W., 1996. Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational, citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 17, 253–266.
- Lepine, J.A., Erez, A., Johnson, D.E., 2002. The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: a critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87 (1), 52–65.
- Leventhal, G.S., 1976. The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 9, 91–131.
- Lind, E.A., Tyler, T.R., 1988. *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. Plenum Press, New York.
- Low, R.H., Vodanovich, S.J., 1995. A field study of distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 10 (1), 99–114.
- Lucas, G., Babakus, E., Ingram, T., 1990. An empirical test of the job satisfaction–turnover relationship: assessing the role of job performance for retail managers. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 18, 199–208.
- Lynch, B., Verdin, J.A., 1987. Job satisfaction in libraries: a replication. *Library Quarterly* 57, 190–202.
- Manley, H., 1996. Hospitality head hunting. *Australian Hotelier* April, 8–11.
- Martin, C.L., Bennett, N., 1996. The role of justice judgments in explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Group and Organization Management* 21 (1), 84–104.
- Martinez-Tur, V., Peiró, J.M., Ramos, J.Y., Moliner, C., 2006. Justice perceptions as predictors of customer satisfaction: the impact of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 36 (1), 100–119.
- McFarlin, D., Sweeney, P.D., 1992. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal* 35 (3), 626–637.
- Mobley, W.H., 1977. Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 62 (2), 237–240.
- Moorman, R.H., 1991. Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76 (6), 845–855.
- Moorman, R.H., Blakely, G.L., 1995. Individualism–collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 16, 127–142.
- Moorman, R.H., Niehoff, B.P., Organ, D.W., 1993. Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 6, 209–225.
- Moorman, R.H., Blakely, G.L., Niehoff, B.P., 1998. Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal* 41, 351–357.
- Nadiri, H., 2003. How quality contributes consumer satisfaction: a preliminary study to investigate how hotel attributes quality perceived by customers. In: 6th International Conference: Quality Management and Organizational Development. Refereed Paper, Paris.
- Nadiri, H., Hussain, K., 2005. Diagnosing the zone of tolerance for hotel services. *Managing Service Quality* 15 (3), 259–277.
- Niehoff, B.P., Moorman, R.H., 1993. Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal* 36, 527–556.
- Organ, D., Konovsky, M., 1989. Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 74, 157–164.
- Organ, D.W., 1988. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. D.C. Heath and Company, Lexington, MA/Toronto.
- Organ, D.W., 1990. The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In: Staw, B.M., Cummings, L.L. (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, vol. 12. JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp. 43–72.
- Organ, D.W., Moorman, R.H., 1993. Fairness and organizational citizenship behavior: what are the connections? *Social Justice Research* 6 (1), 5–18.
- Oshagbemi, T., 2000. Gender differences in the job satisfaction of university teachers. *Women in Management Review* 15 (7), 331–343.
- Pizam, A., Thornburg, S.W., 2000. Absenteeism and voluntary turnover in Central Florida hotels: a pilot study. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 19, 211–217.
- Price, J.L., Mueller, C.W., 1981. A causal model of turnover for nurses. *Academy of Management Journal* 24 (3), 543–565.
- Robbins, S.P., 2001. *Organizational Behavior*. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Robinson, S.R., Morrison, E.W., 2000. The development of psychological contract breach and violation: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 21, 525–546.
- Schmit, M.J., Allscheid, S.P., 1995. Employee attitudes and customer satisfaction: making theoretical and empirical connections. *Personnel Psychology* 48, 521–532.
- Shaw, J.D., Delery, J.E., Jenkins, G.D., Gupta, N., 1998. An organization-level analysis of voluntary and involuntary turnover. *Academy of Management Review* 41 (5), 511–525.
- Staines, G.L., Fudge, D.A., Pottick, K.J., 1986. Wives' employment and husbands' attitudes toward work and life. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 71, 1118–1128.
- Suh, J., Yoon, M.H., 2003. Organizational citizenship behaviors and service quality as external effectiveness of contact employees. *Journal of Business Research* 56, 597–611.
- Sweeney, P.D., McFarlin, D.B., 1997. Process and outcome: gender differences in the assessment of justice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 18, 83–98.
- Tang, T.L., Sarsfield-Baldwin, L.J., 1996. Distributive and procedural justice as related to satisfaction and commitment. *SAM Advanced Management Journal* 61 (3), 25–31.
- Tanova, C., Holtom, B., 2008. Using job embeddedness factors to explain voluntary turnover in four European countries. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 19 (9), 1553–1568.
- Tyler, T.R., 1989. The psychology of procedural justice: a test of the group value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 57 (5), 830–838.
- Williams, S., Pitre, R., Zainuba, M., 2002. Justice and organizational citizenship behavior intentions: fair rewards versus fair treatment. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 142 (1), 33–44.
- Wood, R.C., 1997. Personnel management, labour turnover and the role of trade unions. In: Wood, R.C. (Ed.), *Working in Hotels and Catering*. International Thompson Business Press, Oxford.
- Woods, R.H., 1997. *Managing Hospitality Human Resources*, 2nd ed. American Hotel and Motel Association, Lansing, MI.
- Yoon, M.H., Sharon, E.B., Jaeboem, S., 2001. The effect of work climate on critical employee and customer outcomes. *International Journal of Service Industry Management* 12 (5), 500–521.