



3 PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE AND UNETHICAL WORK BEHAVIOUR AMONG HOTEL EMPLOYEES IN ACCRA: THE ROLE OF GENDER AND MARITAL STATUS

Lolonyo Letsa¹, Foster Frempong², Christopher Mensah¹

Abstract

Ethics and organizational justice share common roots and patterns of development in that, employees' ethical behaviours are influenced by the perceived fairness of the company's policies, procedures and decision making. While this link has been established in many studies, whether this relationship is the same for different demographic groups has received little attention, particularly for the hospitality industry. This study, therefore, sought to examine perceived organisational justice and unethical work behaviours among hotel employees in Accra using gender and marital status as moderating variables. Data was collected from a sample of 379 employees of five four-star hotels in Accra. The moderated multiple regression technique, PROCESS by Hayes in SPSS was employed to test the significance of the moderating variables in the relationship between organisational justice and unethical work behaviour among hotel employees in Accra. The results showed that gender was significant in interactive justice effect on unethical work behaviours; while marital status was significant in distributive justice and procedural justice' effect on unethical work behaviours among the hotel employees. The study recommends specific strategies for discouraging unethical workplace behaviours and encouraging organisational citizenship.

Keywords: Organisational Justice, Unethical Behaviour, Ethics, Hotel, Ghana

INTRODUCTION

The hospitality industry plays a crucial role in the overall development of an economy. For instance, the industry contributed 3% to Ghana's Gross Domestic Product employing about 155,000 people directly and 388, 000 people indirectly in 2018 (Ghana Tourism Authority, 2019). The sustainability of the hotel industry largely depends on innovation, service quality and customer satisfaction (Anthony, 2015). However, the manifestation of the aforesaid attributes is predicated on the mechanisms, policies and structures put in place by the management of the hotels (Anthony, 2015). Among such measures is organisational justice. According to Asadullah, Akram, Imran and Arain (2017), organisational justice simply refers to an employee's

perception of fairness within an organisation. As indicated by Roch and Shannock (2006), employees' impression of equity influences organisational attitudes and behaviours, which are either positive or negative and have implications for employee performance and organisational success. Furthermore, employees' perceptions affect compliance with managerial decisions and have implications for both direct and indirect impacts on employees' commitment to work (Wu & Wang, 2008). As stated by Akanbi and Ofoegbu (2013), organisational justice ensures fairness, trust, loyalty and satisfaction of employees in order to drive the realization of organizational vision.

Unethical behaviours are behaviours that are inconsistent with the organisational prescribed policies,

1. Department of Hospitality And Tourism Management, Ho Technical University. E-mail: lletsa@htu.edu.gh, cmensah@htu.edu.gh

2. Department of Geography And Rural Development, K.N.U.S.T Ghana. E-mail: fosterfrempong@yahoo.com



values and norms. Examples of such behaviours in a hotel are; withholding customers change, stealing customers property, and eating the hotel food and drinks without permission (Baker, Hunt & Andrews, 2006). Unethical behaviour in organizations also impacts many organizational factors such as leadership, culture, and individual predispositions (Myung, 2018). In contrast, organisational justice is aimed at ensuring ethical behaviour such as honesty, integrity, loyalty, fairness, accountability, concern and respect for others, trustworthiness, commitment to excellence, reputation and morale (Myung, 2018). When employees behave ethically, they discharge their duties with integrity, devoid of deceptive and dishonest practices. These employees adhere to the company's code of ethics and ethical standards in dealing with customers which in the long run helps to develop a mutually beneficial relationship with customers. Dimitriou (2013) observed that, discrimination, sexual harassment, and lack of diversity in the workplace, violation of international trade and cultural standards, environmental injustice and sustainability, marketing and pricing, theft and blame-shifting are some of the ethical scandals that are common in the hotel sector.

Ethics and organisational justice share common roots and patterns of development in that, employees' ethical behaviours are influenced by the perceived fairness of the company's policies, procedures and decision making (Baker, Hunt & Andrews, 2006). Thus, an employee's perception of the fairness of the company's policies would have impacts on his or her ethical decision-making and moral intent (Johnson, 2007). Despite this link, previous studies basically focused on the effect of organisational justice on other variables such as employee performance (Kalay, 2016; Iqbal, 2017), work attitudes, workplace and personal outcomes (Choudhary, Deswal & Philip, 2013),

workplace aggression (Jawahar, 2002) and employee job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Abekah-Nkrumah & Ayimbillah-Atinga, 2013; Gyekye & Haybatollahi, 2015; Addai, Kyeremeh, Abdulai & Sarfo, 2018; Boateng & Hsieh, 2019).

Again, there is a paucity of studies that established a link between organisational justice and unethical behaviour in the hotel sector (Eleswed, 2017). Also, studies on ethics in the hotel industry mostly explored ethical behaviours from the manager's perspective (Varinli, 2004); without factoring the crucial role of employees in organisational unethical behaviour either as culprits or victims. In addition, related studies on organisational justice and unethical behaviour focused extensively on insurance companies and the public sector. Some of these studies include the impact of organizational justice on employee workplace and personal outcome in the Indian insurance sector (Choudhary et al., 2013), mismanaging unethical behaviour in the workplace (Singh & Twalo, 2015), and unethical pro-organizational behaviour concept, measurements and empirical research (Liu & Qiu, 2015). Again, such studies were mostly conducted in developed countries with little attention on the subject in developing countries like Ghana. Frempong (2019) investigated the concept of unethical behaviour in the hotel industry in Ghana, however, the study was limited to hotels in Kumasi. This study, however, focused on Accra the capital of Ghana and the hub of the hotel industry in Ghana. This study aims at examining perceived organisational justice and unethical behaviour among hotel employees by examining employees' perceptions on the subject of organisational justice and its effect on unethical behaviour. This study also investigated how socio-demographic factors influence unethical behaviour.



LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework

The concepts of organisational justice and unethical behaviour can be explained by a number of theories. These include equity theory (Adams, 1965), social exchange theory (Thibaut & Kelley (1959), moral disengagement theory (Bandura, 1986), general strain theory (Agnew, 1985) and social bond theory. The equity theory, as upheld by Adams (1965) is based on the employee's judgement of their proportion of inputs in relation to the rewards received from the employer, compared to other organisations. Greenberg (2007) asserts that distributive justice centres on the views of people about receiving fair work outcomes in form of pay, recognition and other rewards. It is the perceptions of employees' equitable gains received from organizational resources, rewards and penalties (Nirmala & Akhilesh, 2006). Through the Social Exchange Theory, Chernyak-Hai and Tziner (2014) postulated that employees' perceptions of organizational justice would reflect their attitudes in the exchange relationship. Employees would fulfil their obligation based on the perceptions of the extent to which management has fulfilled its exchange obligations. Bandura's (1986) theory of moral disengagement is an extension of social cognitive theory, stating that an individual's propensity to disengage morally was an important factor; thus, the more morally disengaged a person is, the more that person behaves unethically. Strain's theory says that individuals resort to unethical conduct when they are unable to accomplish their objectives by lawful means (Kaptein, 2011).

The Concept of Organisation Justice

Organisational justice is the study of people's perceptions of fairness in an organisation. The choice of the word study implies that perceptions of fairness could

vary by people and over time and should be researched and monitored (Greenberg & Baron, 2003). By extension, this definition includes how perceptions of organisational justice influence the employee's behaviour. In addition, Rafei-Dehkordi, Mohammadi, and Yektayar (2013) referred to organisational justice as a fair and equitable relationship between organisations and their employees. Most of the related definitions focus on perceptions, however, Rafei-Dehkordi, Mohammadi, and Yektayar (2013) measured organisational justice through the behaviour of employees which is more physical than psychological. Unlike all the other definitions, Pérez-Rodríguez, Topa and Beléndez (2019) specified the perceptions of fairness to be in relation to resource allocation and not the entire organisational structure. The above definitions of organisational justice described the concept as more of a psychological mechanism by which people render judgment of fairness (Cropanzano & Ambrose, 2015). Hence, "organisational justice has great and significant implications for the individual and the organisations as a whole" (Yesil & Dereli, 2013:199).

Distributive Justice

Distributive justice is defined as the fairness associated with the decision related to the distribution of resources within an organization (Colquitt, 2001). As such, distributive justice pertains to the allocation of financial or non-financial resources such as giving a bonus to an employee who has achieved some assigned organizational or performance targets. The resources distributed may be tangible (financial), for example, salary; or intangible (non-financial), such as praise. Distributive justice is perceived to be achieved when employees notice that their efforts and rewards are assessed equally. Based on the equity theory, the rule of equality and allocation based on the need are two



common approaches to distribute justice (Cook & Hegtvedt, 1983; Wagstaff, 1994). If employees emphasize these two approaches when distributing resources, the issue of unequal or unfair distribution of resources can be eliminated.

Procedural Justice

Procedural justice refers to employees' perception of the fairness of the management policies and procedures that regulate a process leading to decision outcomes (Colquitt, 2001). Procedural justice focuses on the process, i.e., the steps taken by management to reach a just decision. Procedural issues, such as equal unemployment opportunities in manpower planning, fair disciplinary actions and reward systems, and the trustworthiness of the decision-making authority, are important to enhance employees' perception of procedural justice. If the managerial processes and procedures are perceived to be fair, then employees will be more satisfied and more likely to form a positive attitude towards management's decisions, which will indirectly lead to less conflict between employer and employees.

Interactional Justice

Interactional justice is defined as the just treatment that an employee receives as a result of managerial decisions (Colquitt, 2001). Specifically, interactional justice is the interpersonal transactions that employees encounter with those in authority (Cropanzano, Bowen & Gilliland, 2007). Interactional justice can be enhanced by providing the necessary information and explanation on the rationale for decisions made by management (Bies, 2001). Colquitt (2001) suggests that interactional justice consists of two elements of justice, i.e., interpersonal and informational justice. Interpersonal justice refers to the perception of

respect in one's treatment (i.e., whether employees are treated with courtesy and respect while, informational justice refers to the perception of whether an employer is providing timely and adequate information and explanation (i.e., whether management is willing to share relevant information with employees).

Employees' Perception of Organisational Justice

Studies regarding organizational justice start with Adams' equity theory. Inequity theory, the degree of job success and job satisfaction of individuals are related to perceived equity/inequity by employees of the work environment (Luthans, 1981; 197). In this theory, working individuals compare what they achieve through their own efforts with those achieved by the other colleagues, such as applying the rule of 'equal pay for equal work' to employees in an equal manner, and having rights in giving permissions. The perception of justice is not confined to the comparison of outputs alone. The organizational rules and principles, and the way these rules are applied as well as the interaction between employees are also taken into consideration (Ozdevecioglu, 2003).

In general, organizational justice is examined in three basic dimensions. Distributive justice explains the fact that the administration distributes rewards, punishment or resources in line with given criteria as well as the reactions of the individuals to the consequences of this distribution. Procedural justice, on the other hand, stands for the perception of justice pertaining to the administration of the procedures applied by them while taking decisions. Interactional justice, however, represents the perceptions of the individuals with regard to how decision-makers treat people with respect and sensitivity and explain the rationale for decisions thoroughly; while the



organizational procedures are being applied (Colquitt & Greenberg, 2003).

Demographic Factors and Organisational Justice

Findings from studies that investigated demographic factors and their impact on organisational justice are diverse and inconsistent. Erkilic, Gazeloblu and Aytekin (2018) reported that there were no significant differences between sub-dimensions of organisational justice perception and demographic characteristics such as level of education, marital status, department, position, working years in business and total working years. Erturk (2018) found that there were no significant differences between age and organisational justice perception. Brienza and Bobocel (2017) on the other hand, found a significant difference between age of employees and their organisational justice.

The Concept of Unethical Behaviour

Kaptein (2011) describes unethical conduct as a breach of regulations, norms and morals and implied actions that are morally unacceptable to the wider society. Unethical conduct in the organisation can be defined as misbehaviour, rule-breaking, criminal harm and non-compliance, such as corruption, in the workplace (Ashforth & Anand, 2003; Vardi & Weitz, 2004; Neill, Stovall & Jinkerson, 2005; Blader & Tyler, 2005). Thus, unethical behaviour includes any deed that violates the law and is seen as a threat to human relations and the organisation with the potential of causing harm in both financial and non-financial terms (Den-Nieuwenboer, 2008).

Factors Influencing Unethical Behaviour

Factors that affect unethical conduct of employees include the frame of mind towards the

circumstance, individual qualities, proficient condition, legitimate condition, and business condition (Leonard, Cronan, & Kreie, 2004). Regarding frame of mind, employees with high Machiavellian traits (distrust in others, desire for control, desire for status, and amoral manipulation) are more likely to act unethically in the organisation. In an organisational setting, organisational culture and atmosphere are factors that determine whether individuals act ethically or unethically. Treviño, Butterfield and McCabe (2001) were of the view that organisational culture or climate impact unethical conduct of employees as this culture may promote or prohibit unethical behaviour. In the Social Bond Theory, Palazzo, Krings and Hoffrage (2012) proposed that individuals should act in healthy or bad respects, ethically or unethically, on the basis of their engagement with an organisation. When employees feel that they are treated unfairly or are mistrusted, they tend to behave unethically (Skarlicki, Folger & Tesluk 1999).

Unethical Behaviours in the Hospitality Industry

Hospitality is associated with human interactions, where there are many exchange processes between service providers and customers (Pizam & Shani, 2009). As such, the hospitality industry is confronted with many ethical issues manifested in several areas and such acts are committed by both managers and employees (Guler & Yukselen, 2010). In a study conducted in a hotel by Wong and Li (2015), the following unethical behaviours emerged: making a telephone call in a guest room; consuming drinks before the bar begins operation; consuming minibar beverages and charging them to a guest's account. Kincaid, George and Childs (2008) also found that charging guests for food or drinks that were not served to them, stealing food and drinks from the restaurant and charging credit



cards after the guest has signed the receipt are unethical behaviours exhibited by restaurant employees.

Frempong (2019) in a study on the effect of ethical issues on decision making in the hotel industry in Kumasi metropolis in Ghana also identified presenting misleading information to customers, acting in favour of clients for a bribe and discriminating against guests on the basis of age, colour, religion and gender; charging guests for beverages they did not consume, releasing room numbers to strangers, releasing guest information to friends, using the guestroom toilet and not changing the bedsheets in the guest room.

Demographic Factors and Unethical Behaviour

It emerged from numerous studies that gender has no relationship with employee ethical issues (Dimitriou & Ducette, 2018; Gupta, Walker & Swanson, 2011; Roxas & Stoneback, 2004; McCabe, Ingram & Dato-On, 2006). However, D'Aquila, Bean and Procario-Foley (2004) found a significant difference between male and female employees' perceptions regarding the role of ethical standards in an organisation. They opined that females believe that ethical standards strengthen an organisation's competitive position whereas males shared the opposite view. In spite of these discrepancies in findings, studies revealed that gender is consistently a significant predictor of ethical employee behaviour (Rucinski & Bauch, 2006; Comer & Vega, 2008). Glover, Bumpus, Sharp and Munchus (2002) also concluded that gender is a strong predictor of ethical behaviour.

The notion of marital status having some kind of impact on ethical decisions has not been investigated a great deal. There have been studies on the impact of marital status and quality of life (Tang, 2007) and marital status and birth order (Rawwas & Isakson, 2010). Sharma and Jyoti (2009) found that married

adults are generally better adjusted than unmarried adults and appeared to have a higher work satisfaction rate than unmarried adults. However, there is not a substantial amount of research found when it comes to investigating the effect of marital status on ethical work behaviours.

Serwinek (1992) investigated the ethical attitudes of subjects based on age, sex, marital status, education level, number of dependent children, the region of their country, and how many years they had been working in their current work as explanatory variables. The researcher examined employees' ethical attitudes inside a small business organisation and analysed whether demographic information could predict their ethical behaviours. Results showed that the age predictor was the most significant, with gender having a strong impact. The results also showed that marital status has little effect on ethical behaviours.

Organisational Justice and Unethical Behaviour

Various studies have shown that organisational justice significantly influences employees' work-related attitudes such as unethical behaviour. According to Colquitt et al. (2006), the perception of organisational justice predicts and controls employees' intentions to maintain high moral and ethical standards at their workplace. Thus, perception of organisational justice influences the occurrence of deviant workplace behaviour of employees.

According to Vardi and Weitz (2004), unethical behaviours of employees is related to employees' perception of inequity and mistreatment. Counterproductive work behaviours such as "theft, damage to the properties of the organisation, misuse of sensitive information, waste of labour time and other resources, absenteeism and intentional low quality of work are as a result of a violation of fairness in an



organisation (Jiranek & Kals, 2012). Syaebani and Sobri (2013) in their study on the relationship between organisational justice perception and engagement in deviant workplace behaviour, revealed that there was a significant negative relationship between distributive justice and deviant workplace behaviours.

METHODS

The present study is part of a large research examining the perception of organizational justice and unethical behaviour among hotel employees in Accra, Ghana. Accra is the capital city of Ghana that hosts many international hotel brands such as Kempinski Gold Coast Hotel, Labadi Beach Hotel, Movenpick Ambassador Hotel, Holiday Inn Hotel and Golden Tulip Hotel. Of all the cities in the country, it is only Accra that has all the different categories of accommodation facilities and serves as one of the most visited cities by tourists. Giving the strategic importance of Accra in Ghana's hospitality industry and the importance of employee satisfaction on organisational performance, research on organisational justice among hotel employees in Accra is imperative. Questionnaires were used as the data collection instrument. The completed self-administered questionnaire used in collecting data for the study was divided into three sections. The first section elicited data on respondents' demographic characteristics. The second section was on their unethical behaviour while the third section related to organizational justice using a sixteen item rated scale. Examples of items used in the scales are "Not changing the bedsheets in the guest room due to workload" for Unethical Work Behaviours; "My work schedule is fair" for Distributive Justice; "My manager makes sure that employee concerns are heard before decisions are made" for Procedural Justice; and "My manager explains very

clearly any decisions made about my job" for interactive justice.

The population of employees in hotels in Accra was taken as unknown. Smith (2006) noted that for unknown population size the following formula is used to determine the sample size.

Necessary Sample Size

$$= (Zscore)^2 \times \frac{StdDev(1 - StdDev)}{(margin\ of\ error)^2}$$

According to Smith (2006), since the survey is yet to be conducted, the safe decision for standard deviation is to use .5 – this is the most forgiving number and ensures that your sample will be large enough. The study will employ a confidence interval of 95% (i.e. 5% margin of error), which implies a Z-score of 1.96.

The necessary sample size is, therefore:

$$Necessary\ Sample\ Size = (1.96)^2 \times \frac{0.5(1 - 0.5)}{(0.05)^2}$$

The necessary sample size for the study is therefore 384. However, the actual sample size applied was 379 which is about a 99% response rate. A descriptive cross-sectional design with a quantitative approach was adopted for this study using five out of a total of seven 4-star rated hotels. Four-star hotels were chosen because they are in the majority of hotels in Accra, Ghana. The random sampling technique was used as the sampling strategy. The inclusion criteria for the participants is that an employee should have at least six months of working experience at their respective hotels, this criterion was to ensure that each respondent had ample knowledge on the subject or might have personally be involved or witnessed incidences of unethical behaviour.

Additionally, a structured questionnaire was used as the main research instrument. The employees' perceptions were rated using a Likert scale ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree to 5(Strongly agree). The questionnaire was pre-tested among 20 Technical University students offering hotel industry courses.



Their comments were collated and used to update the questionnaire before final data collection. Data gathered from the questionnaire was keyed into SPSS version 22 and analysed using the Moderation Multiple Regression (MMR) Technique, Process by Hayes.

The general model for MMR is given as follows:

$$Y' = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3(X_1 \times X_2)$$

The specific models in the context of this study is therefore presented as:

$$UWB = b_0 + b_1DJ + b_2Gender + b_3(DJ \times Gen): \text{Model 1}$$

$$UWB = b_0 + b_1PJ + b_2Gender + b_3(PJ \times Gen): \text{Model 2}$$

$$UWB = b_0 + b_1IJ + b_2Gender + b_3(IJ \times Gen) : \text{Model 3}$$

$$UWB = b_0 + b_1DJ + b_2MS + b_3(DJ \times MS) : \text{Model 4}$$

$$UWB = b_0 + b_1PJ + b_2MS + b_3(PJ \times MS) : \text{Model 5}$$

$$UWB = b_0 + b_1IJ + b_2MS + b_3(IJ \times MS) : \text{Model 6}$$

Where:

UWB = Unethical Work Behaviour

DJ = Distributive Justice

PJ = Procedural Justice

IJ = Interactive Justice

Gen = Gender (Male (0), Female (1))

MS = Marital Status (Unmarried (0), Married (1))

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Profile of the Participants

Although the demographic focus of this study was on gender and marital status, the demographic

characteristics of respondents analysed consisted of gender, age, marital status, level of education, and duration of experience at the current hotel. Out of the 383 questionnaires retrieved, 379 were complete and adequate for the analysis. Hence, the analysis is based on 379 results (see Table 1). Out of the 379 respondents, the majority were females (58.8%). In terms of age, most of the respondents (63.3%) were aged 40 and below. In relation to marital status, the majority of the respondents were married (64.3%) while 35.7% were unmarried. Regarding education, most of the respondents were Higher National Diploma holders (43%), followed by employees with postgraduate degrees (21.8%) while the least was basic school leavers (8.1%). With department, the majority of the respondents (26.9%) were in the administrative section of the hotel, 24% were in the housekeeping department while 16.6% were in the food and beverage department.

With regard to the employees' years of experience at their respective hotels, it emerged that majority (i.e. 38.4%) of the respondents had worked at their hotels for between 2- 4 years, while 18.2% had worked with the hotel for below 2 years. Furthermore, the majority of the respondents were full-time employees (74%) while 13% were part-time employees and the same proportion (13%) were students on internship.

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	156	41.2
Female	223	58.8
Total	379	100

**Table 1 Continued**

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age		
Below 26	57	15
26-30	81	21.4
31-35	83	21.9
36-40	19	5.0
41-45	14	3.7
46-50	78	20.6
51 and above	47	12.4
Total	379	100
Marital Status		
Married	216	64.3
Unmarried	120	35.7
Total	336	100
Level of Education		
Basic (JHS/Middle School)	29	8.1
Secondary/SSS	59	16.5
HND	154	43.0
Bachelor's Degree	38	10.6
Postgraduate	78	21.8
Total	358	100
Department		
Administration	102	26.9
Food and Beverage	63	16.6
Front Office	55	14.5
Housekeeping	91	24.0
Production	52	13.7
Security	16	4.2
Total	379	100
Years of Work with Hotel		
Below 2 years	69	18.2
2 - 4 years	146	38.4
5 – 7 years	78	20.5
Above 7 years	86	22.8
Total	379	100
Employment Status of Respondents		
Full-time	281	74
Part-time	49	13
Attachment Student	49	13
Total	379	100

Perceptions of Organisational Justice

Table 2 presents the perception of hotel employees regarding organisational justice. More specifically, the table shows the perception of hotel

employees on the dimensions of organisational justice. By the category mean scores, distributive justice recorded 3.95 which means that about 79% of employees agreed that distributive justice practices were



fair. Procedural justice recorded 3.91, which means that about 78.2% of employees agreed that procedural justice practices were fair; and Interactive justice recorded 3.60, which means that about 72% of employees agreed that interactive justice practices were fair.

Distributive justice had a mean score of 3.95; Procedural Justice, 3.91; and Interactive Justice, 3.60.

This means that respondents indicated distributive justice very high in hotels. This is in contrast to the findings of Lawrence-Chuku, Eketu & Needorn (2018) who reported a high level of interactional injustice in hotels.

Table 2: Perceptions of Employees on Organisational Justice

Organisational Justice	Percentage Agreement	in	Mean	Standard Deviation
<i>Distributive Justice</i>				
My work schedule is fair	72.9		3.83	1.236
I think that my level of pay is fair.	73.8		3.95	1.157
I consider my workload quite fair.	76.0		4.05	1.097
Overall, the rewards I receive here is quite fair	79.4		4.00	1.056
I feel that my job responsibility is fair	75.0		3.93	1.035
Category Mean			3.95	1.108
<i>Procedural Justice</i>				
To make job decisions, my manager collect accurate and complete information requested by employees	73.7		3.93	1.017
My manager makes sure that employee concerns are heard before decisions are made	73.9		4.06	0.974
Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by their managers	66.8		3.87	1.049
Job decisions are made in a biased manner	68.0		3.85	1.046
All jobs decisions are applied consistently to all affected employees	66.9		3.86	1.004
My manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees	65.6		3.86	0.966
Category Mean			3.91	1.009
<i>Interactional Justice</i>				
When decisions are made about my job, the manager treats me with kindness and consideration	66.2		3.82	1.040
When decisions are made about my job, the manager treats me with respect and dignity.	63.4		3.75	1.081
When decisions are made about my job, the manager is sensitive to my personal need	62.8		3.70	1.100
When decisions are made about my job, the manager deals with me in a truthful manner.	65.0		3.66	1.099
When decisions are about my job, the manager shows concern for my right as an employee.	57.8		3.62	1.071
Concerning decisions made about my job, the manager discusses with me the implications of the decisions.	62.3		3.68	1.108
The manager offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job.	58.1		3.55	1.175
When making decisions about my job, the manager offers explanations that make sense to me.	53.9		3.47	1.134
Category Mean			3.60	1.107



Unethical Behaviour of Hotel Employees

Going by the category means, benefit at expense of hotel had a mean of recorded 1.52; Benefit at expense of guest; 1.57; Infringement of guest privacy, 1.41; Unethical workplace behaviours among

employees, 1.44; and Tips and Grey areas, 1.40. Respondents, therefore, indicated that benefit at the expense of guests was the most prevalent unethical behaviour among hotel employees.

Table 3: Unethical Workplace Behaviours among Hotel Employees

Unethical Workplace Behaviours	Mean	SD
<i>Benefitting at the expense of the hotel</i>		
Upgrading a 'familiar' guest to a higher-grade room type when a guest does not qualify	1.05	1.414
Offering free coffee or tea to friends in the restaurant without issuing a captain's order	1.61	1.567
Drinking or eating company food at the back of the house	1.65	1.54
Breaking a glass or plate but blaming it on a guest's carelessness	1.5	1.543
Taking the hotel suppliers/items home without permission	1.56	1.567
Offering free drinks to friends	1.66	1.593
Check-in guests into rooms and pocketed the money	1.54	1.597
Eating leftover food from the buffet at the Back of the House	1.61	1.581
Category Mean	1.52	
<i>Benefitting at the expense of the guest</i>		
Collecting leftover fruits from guest rooms for personal consumption	1.59	1.568
Consuming minibar beverages and charging them to a guest's account	1.5	1.607
Category Mean	1.57	
<i>Infringement of guest privacy</i>		
Releasing guest information to friends	1.21	1.456
Accessing information about a guest through computer out of curiosity	1.21	1.414
Releasing guest room number to a stranger	1.41	1.605
Using the toilet in a guest room	1.51	1.632
Listening to radio in a guest room	1.48	1.565
Category Mean	1.41	
<i>Unethical Workplace Behaviours Among Hotel Employees</i>		
Watching TV or movie in a guest room	1.59	1.658
Picking up items left behind by guests without reporting to Lost & Found/hotel management	1.45	1.543
Category Mean	1.44	
<i>Tips and grey areas</i>		
Not changing the bedsheets in the guest room due to workload	1.01	1.414
Sexual relations with guests	1.58	1.695
Intentionally wasted the hotel's materials or supplies	1.49	1.569
Accepting tips to arrange or change a room for a customer	1.27	1.497
Category Mean	1.40	

Scale: (0) Never, (1) Hardly, (2) Sometimes to (3) Often



This result is contrary to the report of Yeung (2004), who indicated theft from the hotel and sexual harassment as the two prevailing unethical behaviours among hospitality employees. Also, some of the unethical behaviour identified by Yeung (2004) such as deliberate contamination of products with bodily fluids served to guests, using or selling drugs in the workplace, stealing tips from other employees and accepting bribes from purveyors to smuggle in their products were not reported by this study. However, the other unethical behaviours reported by Yeung (2004), Kincaid, George and Childs (2008), Wong and Li (2015) and Frempong (2019) were confirmed in this study.

Moderating Effects of Demographic Factors on the effect of Organisational Justice on Unethical Work Behaviour

To assess the effect of Demographic Factors (Gender and Marital Status) on Unethical Work Behaviour, the Moderation Multiple Regression (MMR) was run using the Hayes' Process in SPSS with gender as a moderator; and second, marital status as a moderator for the various types of distributive justice (Distributive, Procedural, and Interactive).

Tables 4 and 5 present the results before discussion and conclusion.

Table 4. Results for Gender as a Moderator

Dependent Variable (Unethical Work Behaviour)			
	Coefficient (Effect)	P-value	Implication
Distributive Justice (DJ)	0.4187	0.0754	
Gender	0.9125	0.1223	
Int_1(DJ_by_Gender)	-0.2205	0.1268	Gender is insignificant
Male (1)	n/a	n/a	
Female (2)	n/a	n/a	
Procedural Justice (PJ)	0.1107	0.7062	
Gender	-0.5093	0.4665	
Int_1(PJ_by_Gender)	0.1344	0.4439	Gender is insignificant
Male (1)	n/a	n/a	
Female (2)	n/a	n/a	
Interactive Justice (IJ)	0.4686	0.0829	
Gender	1.2689	0.0342	
Int_1(IJ_by_Gender)	-0.3449	0.0316	Gender is significant
Male (1)	0.1237	0.3240	
Female (2)	-0.2212	0.0266	Significant effect on female employees

Moderating effect of gender on the effect of distributive justice on unethical behaviour

Table 4 shows the results for the MMR with gender interaction with distributive justice. From Table

5, the overall model summary (regardless of the moderator, gender) show a p-value of 0.3201 (greater than 5%), which implies that distributive justice is not a good predictor of unethical work behaviour among hotel employees in Accra. The second stage of the results



(Model) shows that gender (p -value=0.1223) is insignificant, and Int_1 which measures the interaction in the effect of distributive justice on unethical work behaviour recorded a p -value of 0.1268 (greater than 5%). This means that gender is not a significant factor in the effect of distributive justice on unethical work behaviour among hotel employees in Accra.

From Table 4, the overall model summary (regardless of the moderator, gender) show a p -value of 0.0021 (less than 5%), which implies that procedural justice is a good predictor of unethical work behaviour among hotel employees in Accra. The second stage of the results (Model) shows that gender (p -value=0.8646) is insignificant, and Int_1 which measures the interaction in the effect of procedural justice on unethical work behaviour recorded a p -value of 0.4793 (greater than 5%). This means that gender is not a significant factor in the effect of procedural justice on unethical work behaviour among hotel employees in Accra.

Moderating effect of Gender on the effect of Interactive Justice on Unethical behaviour

From Table 4, the overall model summary (regardless of the moderator, gender) show a p -value of 0.1150 (greater than 5%), which implies that interactive justice is not a strong predictor of unethical work behaviour among hotel employees in Accra. The second stage of the results (Model) shows that gender (p -value=0.0342) is significant, and Int_1 which measures the interaction in the effect of procedural justice on unethical work behaviour recorded a p -value of 0.0316 (less than 5%). This means that gender is a significant factor in the effect of interactive justice on unethical work behaviour among hotel employees in Accra. Since gender is significant, we move to the third stage of the results (Conditional effects of the focal predictor at

values of the moderator(s)) which indicates which gender is significant; and which is not. It shows that Males (1) recorded a p -value of 0.3240 (greater than 5%) hence insignificant, and females (2) recorded a p -value of 0.0266 (less than 5%) hence significant, and the coefficient is -0.2212. This means that fair interactive justice has a significant effect on ethical work behaviour among females than male hotel employees in Accra.

Moderating effect of Marital Status on the effect of Distributive Justice on Unethical Work Behaviour

Table 5 shows the results for the MMR with Marital Status interaction with Distributive Justice. From Table 8, the overall model summary (regardless of the moderator, marital status) show a p -value of 0.1417 (greater than 5%), which implies that distributive justice is not a good predictor of unethical work behaviour among hotel employees in Accra. The second stage of the results (Model) shows that Marital Status (p -value=0.1338) is insignificant, and Int_1 which measures Marital Status' interaction in the effect of distributive justice on unethical work behaviour recorded a p -value of 0.0619 (greater than 5%). This means that marital status is not a significant factor in the effect of distributive justice on unethical work behaviour among hotel employees in Accra.

The results also show the Conditional effects of the focal predictor at values of the moderator(s). It shows that unmarried employees (1) recorded a p -value of 0.0347 (less than 5%) hence significant with a coefficient of 0.2150, and Married employees (2) recorded a p -value of 0.3097 (greater than 5%) hence insignificant with a coefficient of 0.0752. This means that fair distributive justice has a significant effect on unethical work behaviour among unmarried than married hotel employees in Accra.

**Table 5. Results for Marital Status as a Moderator**

	Unethical Work Behaviour		
	Coefficient (Effect)	P-value	Implication
Distributive Justice (DJ)	0.3548	0.0291	
Marital Status (MS)	0.4005	0.1338	
Int_1(DJ_by_MS)	-0.1398	0.0619	Marital Status is insignificant
Unmarried (1)	0.2150	0.0347	Significant effect with unmarried employees
Married (2)	0.0752	0.3097	
Procedural Justice (PJ)	0.7442	0.0000	
Marital Status	0.7148	0.0109	
Int_1(PJ_by_MS)	-0.2398	0.0041	Marital Status is significant
Unmarried (1)	0.5044	0.0000	Significant with both unmarried and married employees
Married (2)	0.2646	0.0028	
Interactive Justice (IJ)	-0.1863	0.3594	
Marital Status	-0.2020	0.5183	Marital Status is insignificant
Int_1(IJ_by_MS)	0.0436	0.6793	
Unmarried (1)	n/a	n/a	
Married (2)	n/a	n/a	

Moderating effect of Marital Status on the effect of Procedural Justice on Unethical Work Behaviour

Table 5 below shows the results for the MMR with Marital Status interaction with Procedural Justice. From Table 5, the overall model summary (regardless of the moderator, marital status) show a p-value of 0.0001 (less than 5%), which implies that procedural justice is a good predictor of unethical work behaviour among hotel employees in Accra. The second stage of the results (Model) shows that Marital Status (p-value=0.0109) is significant, and Int_1 which measures Marital Status' interaction in the effect of procedural justice on unethical work behaviour recorded a p-value of 0.0041 (less than 5%). This means that marital status is a significant factor in the effect of procedural justice on unethical work behaviour among hotel employees in Accra.

The results also go on to show the Conditional effects of the focal predictor at values of the moderator(s). It shows that Unmarried employees (1)

recorded a p-value of 0.0000 (less than 5%) hence significant, with a coefficient of 0.5044; and Married employees (2) recorded a p-value of 0.0028 (less than 5%) hence significant with a coefficient of 0.2646. This means that fair procedural justice has a significant effect on unethical work behaviour among both unmarried and married hotel employees in Accra.

Moderating effect of Marital Status on the effect of Interactive Justice on Unethical Work Behaviour

Table 5 shows the results for the MMR with Marital Status interaction with Distributive Justice. From Table 5, the overall model summary (regardless of the moderator, marital status) show a p-value of 0.4658 (greater than 5%), which implies that interactive justice is not a good predictor of unethical work behaviour among hotel employees in Accra. The second stage of the results (Model) shows that marital status (p-value=0.5183) is insignificant, and Int_1 which measures marital status' interaction in the effect of



interactive justice on unethical work behaviour recorded a p-value of 0.6793 (greater than 5%). This means that marital status is not a significant factor in the effect of distributive justice on unethical work behaviour among hotel employees in Accra.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The general purpose of the study is to assess the role of demographic factors (gender and marital status) on the effect of organizational justice and unethical behaviour among hotel employees in Accra. Organisational justice is one of the predictors of ethical behaviours of employees. The findings have shown that for employees of hotels in Accra, fair interactive justice has a significant effect on ethical work behaviour. This does not support the findings of other studies (Dimitriou & Ducette, 2018; Gupta, Walker & Swanson, 2011; Roxas & Stoneback, 2004; McCabe, Ingram & Dato-On, 2006) but agrees with D'Aquila, Bean and Procaro-Foley (2004) who found a significant difference in the perceptions of male and female employees regarding the role of ethical standards in an organisation. Other studies also revealed that gender is a significant predictor of ethical employee behaviour (Rucinski & Bauch, 2006; Comer & Vega, 2008). Glover, Bumpus, Sharp and Munchus (2002) also concluded that gender is a strong predictor of ethical behaviour.

Furthermore, fair distributive justice has a more significant effect on unethical work behaviour of those who are unmarried compared to the married while fair procedural justice has a significant effect on unethical work behaviour among both those who are unmarried and married. The majority of hotel employees in Accra agreed that distributive justice was fair. This implies that the management of hotels in Accra, fairly allocated work schedule, pay, workload, rewards and job responsibilities. Despite the general low perceptions

of interactional justice, employees perceived that their managers treated them with kindness, consideration and dealt with them truthfully. The prevalent unethical behaviours of employees of hotels in Accra were aimed at employees benefitting at the expense of the hotels. These activities include the consumption of the hotel drinks, food and other items as well as keeping money meant for the hotels, which in the long run causes profit to plummet.

Theoretical Implication

An important theoretical implication is that this study extends the social bond theory to indicate that organisational justice is an important antecedent to cognitive self-control. Also, extant studies have not examined the role of marital status in the relationship between organisational justice and unethical work behaviour among hotel employees. This study, therefore, adds to the existing body of knowledge on the phenomenon of nexus between organisational justice and unethical behaviour by bringing to fore the significant demographic factors in the relationship

Managerial Implication

In view of the key findings that emerged from the study that the dominant unethical behaviour of employees is geared towards employees benefitting at the expense of the hotels, management of hotels should implement strategies that seek to check unethical behaviour like strict implementation of codes of conduct, leadership by example, reinforcement of the consequences of unethical behaviour, hiring of employees based on values, and the strengthening of internal controls. They should also implement strategies that encourage organisational citizenship like regular performance reports, non-monetary incentives for workers who behave ethically, as well as training



employees on the benefits of appropriate behaviour. This would decrease employees' negative attitudes.

Essentially, before remedial measures are put in place to mitigate unethical behaviours among employees, management of hotels in Accra should, first of all, assess the factors that influence the occurrence of these unethical behaviours in order to devise policies to curb their occurrence. In a nutshell, organisational justice is crucial in running a labour-intensive hospitality industry. Therefore, critical attention should be paid to all dimensions of organisational justice in order to reap the associated benefits thereof. Again, work procedures and interaction among employees and guests should be coordinated by the management of hotels with fairness in order to heighten the positive perception of these justices.

Limitations

There are however some limitations with the current study. Firstly, the sample for the study was taken from some categories of hotels in Accra. This limits generalisation of the results to hotels in general. Secondly, the study did not consider the factors that influence the perceptions of unethical behaviour and organisational justice. This would help researchers devise feasible solutions to the occurrence of unethical behaviour. Future studies should examine the factors that influence the perceptions of unethical behaviour and organisational justice. These notwithstanding, the results of the study provide a good basis for further studies on organizational justice and unethical behaviour in Ghana and other countries.

REFERENCES

- Abekah-Nkrumah, G., & Ayimbillah-Atinga, R. (2013). Exploring the link between organisational justice and job satisfaction and performance in Ghanaian hospitals: do demographic factors play a mediating role? *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 6(3), 189-204.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). *Inequity in social exchange*. New York Free Press.
- Addai, P., Kyeremeh, E., Abdulai, W., & Sarfo, J. O. (2018). Organisational justice and job satisfaction as predictors of turnover intentions among teachers in the Offinso South District of Ghana. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 7(2), 235-243.
- Agnew, R. (1985). A revised strain theory of delinquency. *Social Forces*, 64(1), 151-167.
- Akanbi, P. A., & Ofoegbu, O. E. (2013). Impact of perceived organisational justice on organisational commitment of a food and beverage firm in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(14), 207-218.
- Anthony, G. (2015). Hospitality management competency requirements from tertiary graduates in Ghana: industry and academia perspectives. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Cape Coast.
- Asadullah, M. A., Akram, A., Imran, H., & Arain, G. A. (2017). When and which employees feel obliged: a personality perspective of how organizational identification develops. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 33(2), 125-135.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Anand, V. (2003). The normalization of corruption in organisations. *Research in Organisational Behaviour*, 25, 1-52.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 193-209.
- Baker, T. L., Hunt, T. G., & Andrews, M. C. (2006). Promoting ethical behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviours: The influence of



- corporate ethical values. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(7), 849-857.
- Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (in)justice: the sacred and the profane. In *Advances in Organizational Justice*, ed. J. Greenberg, R. Cropanzano. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2005). How can theories of organisational justice explain the effects of fairness? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of Organisational Justice* (pp. 329-354). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Boateng, F. D., & Hsieh, M. L. (2019). Explaining job satisfaction and commitment among prison officers: The role of organizational justice. *The Prison Journal*, 99(2), 172-193.
- Brienza, J. P., & Bobocel, D. R. (2017). Employee age alters the effects of justice on emotional exhaustion and organizational deviance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 479.
- Chernyak-Hai, L., & Tziner, A. (2014). Relationships between counterproductive work behavior, perceived justice and climate, occupational status, and leader-member exchange. *Revista de Psicología Del Trabajo y de Las Organizaciones*, 30(1), 1-12.
- Choudhary, N., Deswal, R. K., & Philip, P. J. (2013). Impact of organizational justice on employees' workplace and personal outcomes: A study of Indian insurance sector. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 12(4), 3-14.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organisational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Greenberg, J. (2003). Organizational justice: A fair assessment of the state of the literature. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behaviour: The State of the Science* (p. 165-210). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Judge, T. A., & Shaw, J. C. (2006). Justice and personality: Using integrative theories to derive moderators of justice effects. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 100(1), 110-127.
- Comer, D. R., & Vega, G. (2008). Using the PET assessment instrument to help students identify factors that could impede moral behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77(2), 129-145.
- Cook, K. S., & Hegtvedt, K. A. (1983). Distributive Justice, Equity, and Equality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9, 217-241.
- Cropanzano, R. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2015). Organisational justice: Where we have been and where we are going. *The Oxford Handbook of Justice in the Workplace*, 3-14.
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, E. D., & Gilliland, W. S. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34-48.
- Cropanzano, R., & Molina, A. (2015). Organisational justice. *International Encyclopaedia of the Social & Behavioural Sciences*, 17(2), 379-384.
- D'Aquila, J. M., Bean, D. F., & Procario-Foley, E. G. (2004). Students' perception of the ethical business climate: A comparison with leaders in the community. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 51, 155-166.
- Den-Nieuwenboer, N. (2008). Spiraling down into corruption: a dynamic analysis of the social identity processes that cause corruption in organisations to grow. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 23(45), 6-33.



- Dimitriou, C. K. (2013, October). Factors influencing the ethical behavior of hotel employees. In Paper presented at the EuroCHRIE 2013, Freiburg, Germany.
- Dimitriou, C. K., & Ducette, J. P. (2018). An analysis of the key determinants of hotel employees' ethical behaviour. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 34*, 66-74.
- Eleswed, M. (2017). The impact of individual factors on unethical behaviors-egoism in the workplace: A predictive model development. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 8*(2), 127
- Erkılıc, E., Gazelöglu, C., & Aytekin, E. (2018). *Organisational justice perceptions of hospitality business employees in the scope of demographic characteristics: A study in Rize. Tourism human rights & sustainable environment*. UK: IJOPEC Publication Limited.
- Erturk, R. (2018). Investigation of the relationship between teachers' perceptions of organisational justice and organisational identity. *Journal of Educational Theory and Practice Research, 4*(1) 89-98.
- Frempong, F. (2019). Gender and ethical conduct of hotel employees in Kumasi Metropolis, Ghana. *Journal of Business Ethics, 154*(3), 721-731.
- Ghana Tourism Authority. (2019). *Tourism Fact Sheets*. Accra: GTA.
- Glover, S., Bumpus, M., Sharp, G. and Munchus, G. (2002), Gender differences in ethical decision making, *Women in Management Review, 17* (5), 217-227.
- Greenberg, B., & Baron, R.A. (2003) *Behaviour in organisation: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work* (7th Ed.). Prentice Hall, Upper Sadle River: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Greenberg, J. 2007. Positive organizational justice: From fairto fairer—and beyond. In *Exploring positive relationships at work: Building a theoretical and research foundation*, ed. J. E. Dutton, and B. R. Ragins, 159-78. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gupta, S., Walker, E. D., II, & Swanson, N. J. (2011). Ethical behaviour of graduate business students: An examination of the effect of age, gender, GPA, and work experience. *Southern Journal of Business and Ethics, 3*, 137-151.
- Guler, G. E., & Yukselen, C. (2010). Hotel employees' beliefs on unethical behaviour. *Social Responsibility Journal, 6*(2), 252-267.
- Gyekye, S. A., & Haybatollahi, M. (2015). Organisational justice: Antecedents and consequences of Ghanaian industrial workers. *International Journal of Organisation Theory & Behaviour, 18*(2), 177-205.
- Iqbal, M. Z. (2017). Determinants of organizational justice and its impact on job satisfaction: A Pakistan base survey. *International Review of Management and Business Research, 2*(1), 48-56.
- Jawahar, I. M. (2002). A model of organisational justice and workplace aggression. *Journal of Management, 28*(6), 811-834.
- Jiranek, M., & Kals, T. (2012). The quality of volunteers' motives: Integrating the functional approach and self-determination theory. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 156*(3), 310-327.
- Johnson, C. E. (2007). *Ethics in the workplace: Tools and tactics for organisational transformation*. London: Sage Thousand Oaks.
- Kalay, F. (2016). The impact of organisational justice on employee performance: A survey in Turkey and



- Turkish context. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 6(1), 1-20.
- Kaptein, M. (2011). Understanding unethical behavior by unraveling ethical culture. *Human Relations*, 64(6), 843–869.
- Kincaid, D., George, H., & Childs, D. (2008). Florida's positive behaviour support project's; *Positive Behaviour Support Project*. Annual Report. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida.
- Lawrence-Chuku, E. J., Eketu, C. A., & Needorn, R. (2018). Organisational justice and workers' citizenship behaviour: a study of hotels in Port Harcourt. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research*, 4(5), 67-88
- Leonard, L. N., Cronan, T. P., & Kreie, J. (2004). What influences IT ethical behaviour intentions—planned behavior, reasoned action, perceived importance, or individual characteristics? *Information & Management*, 42(1), 143-158.
- Liu, Y., & Qiu, C. (2015). Unethical Pro-Organizational Behavior: Concept, Measurement and Empirical Research. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 03(03), 150–155.
- Luthans, F. (1981). *Organizational Behavior*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- McCabe, A. C., Ingram, R., & Dato-On, M. C. (2006). The business of ethics and gender. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 64(2), 101-116.
- Myung, E. (2018). Progress in hospitality ethics research: A review and implications for future research. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 19(1), 26-51.
- Neill, J. D., Stovall, O. S., & Jinkerson, D. (2005). A critical analysis of the accounting industry's voluntary code of conduct. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 59, 101-108.
- Nirmala, M. C., & Akhilesh, K. B. (2006). An attempt to redefine organizational justice: In the rightsizing environment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 19(2), 136–153.
- Ozdevecioglu, M. (2003). Relationship perceived organizational support and organizational commitment. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(2), 113-130.
- Palazzo, G., Krings, F., & Hoffrage, U. (2012). Ethical blindness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109(3), 323-338.
- Pérez-Rodríguez, V., Topa, G., & Beléndez, M. (2019). *Organisational justice and work stress: The mediating role of negative, but not positive, emotions. Personality and individual differences*. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill Irwin.
- Pizam, A., & Shani, A. (2009). The nature of the hospitality industry: present and future managers' perspectives. *Anatolia*, 20(1), 134-150.
- Rafei-Dehkordi, F., Mohammadi, S., & Yektayar, M. (2013). Relationship of organisational justice and organisational commitment of the staff in general directorate of youth and sports in Chahar Mahal Va Bakhtiari Province. *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, 3(3), 696-700.
- Rawwas, M. Y. A., & Isakson, H. R. (2010). Ethics of Tomorrow's Business Managers. The Influence of Personal Beliefs and Values, Individual Characteristics, and Situational Factors. *Journal of Education for Business*, 75(6), 321–330.
- Roch, S. G., & Shanock, L. R. (2006). Organisational justice in an exchange framework: Clarifying organisational justice distinctions. *Journal of Management*, 32(2), 299-322.
- Roxas, M. L., & Stoneback, J. Y. (2004). The importance of gender across cultures in ethical



- decision-making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 50(2), 149-165.
- Rucinski, D., & Bauch, P. A. (2006). Reflective, ethical, and moral constructs in educational leadership preparation: effects on graduates' practices. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(5), 487-508.
- Serwinek P J. (1992). Demographic & Related Differences in Ethical Views Among Small Businesses. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11, 555–566.
- Sharma, R. D., & Jyoti, J. (2009). Job satisfaction of university teachers An empirical study. *Journal of Services Research*, 9(2), 51–80.
- Singh, P., & Twalo, T. (2015). Mismanaging unethical behaviour in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, 31(2), 515-530.
- Skarlicki, D. P., Folger, R., & Tesluk, P. (1999). Personality as a moderator in the relationship between fairness and retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1), 100-108.
- Smith, S. M. (2006). *Determining Sample Size- How to ensure you get the correct sample size*. Department of Statistics and Operations Research, University of North Carolina, USA.
- Syaebani, M. I., & Sobri, R. R. (2013). Relationship between organisational justice perception and engagement in deviant workplace behaviour. *The South East Asian Journal of Management*, 5(1), 37-50.
- Tang, T. L. P. (2007). Income and quality of life: Does the love of money make a difference? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72(4), 375–393.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Treviño, L. K., Butterfield, K. D., & McCabe, D. L. (2001). The ethical context in organizations: Influences on employee attitudes and behaviours. Dienhart, J., Moberg, D., & Duska, R. (Ed.) *The next phase of business ethics: integrating psychology and ethics (Research in Ethical Issues in Organizations Vol. 3)*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, pp. 301-337.
- Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2004). *Misbehaviour in Organisations: Theory, Research and Management*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Varinli, I. (2004). Evaluation of non-ethical behaviour of workers in service businesses: An application in hotel businesses. *Journal of Ege Academic View*, 4 (1), 44-53
- Wagstaff, G. F. (1994). Equity, equality, and need: Three principles of justice or one? An analysis of “equity as desert.” *Current Psychology*, 13(2), 138–152. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02686797>
- Wong, S. C. K., & Li, J. S. (2015). Will hotel employees' perception of unethical managerial behaviour affect their job satisfaction? A study of Chinese hotel employees in China. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(5), 853-877.
- Wu, X., & Wang, C. (2008). The impact of organizational justice on employees' pay satisfaction, work attitudes and performance in Chinese hotels. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 72(2), 181-195.
- Yesil, S. & Dereli, S.F. (2013). An empirical investigation of the organisational justice, knowledge sharing and innovation capability. *Journal of Procedia, Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 75, 199-208.
- Yeung, S. (2004). Hospitality ethics curriculum: An industry perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16(4), 253–262