

**Examining employees' turnover intention based on organizational
justice, pay satisfaction and job satisfaction in the hospitality and
tourism industry**

by

Tianyue Yue

A Thesis

presented to

The University of Guelph

In partial fulfilment of requirements
for the degree of
Master of Science
in
Tourism and Hospitality

Guelph, Ontario, Canada
© Tianyue Yue, May 2019

ABSTRACT

EXAMINING EMPLOYEE'S TURNOVER INTENTION BASED ON ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE, PAY SATISFACTION AND JOB SATISFACTION IN THE HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM INDUSTRY

Tianyue Yue
University of Guelph, 2019

Advisor(s):
Dr. William Murray
Dr. Erna van Duren

This study examines the relationship among organizational justice, pay satisfaction, job satisfaction and turnover intention in the Canadian hospitality and tourism industry. 199 valid surveys were collected through Qualtrics with an on-going project and researchers' social media networks. Independent T Test, Exploratory factor analysis (EFA), Hierarchical regression analysis and Sobel Test were performed to analyze the data. The findings reveal that both distributive justice and procedural justice contribute to employees' pay and job satisfaction. Informational justice only shown a positive effect on employees' job satisfaction, but not on pay satisfaction. Pay satisfaction does not have a direct relationship with employees' turnover intention. But job satisfaction has a negative impact on turnover intention. The study results provide deep understanding of each dimension and its influence and provide managers with insights into perceived justice and employees' needs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to extend my sincerest gratitude to my outstanding advisors, Dr. William Murray and Dr. Erna van Duren. They have guided me, mentored me, motivated me and encouraged me. This thesis couldn't have been possible without your guidance and support. Dr. William Murray always support me and help me to discover my interest in research. He spent time with me go over all details and provide me excellent feedbacks. I was very lucky to work with Dr. Erna van Duren since the first semester of my Master. She spent a great deal of time with me as her Teaching Assistant. And after she become my advisor, she has shown me a high level of professionalism in the academic research.

In addition, to my advisors, I was lucky to have Dr. Mark Holmes as my thesis commitment member. Thank you so much for your support throughout my research process and spending time on reading my thesis and always provide me valuable feedbacks. I would like to gratefully thanks Professor. Joan Flaherty for serving as my external examiner and Dr. Chris Choi for chairing my thesis defence. I appreciate that you attended my defense and provided lots of valuable feedbacks based on your professional experience.

My gratitude also goes to everyone in the School of Hospitality, Food and Tourism Management (HFTM). I would like to express my great appreciation to faculty and staff members, namely Dr. Statia Elliot, Dr. WooMi Jo, Dr. Marion Joppe, Barb Piccoli, Amy Tyszka, Melinda Heijl and Cori Wells for all your support.

Many thanks to my lovely classmates, Brittany Lutes, Pensongze Xue and Yiting Zhao. We helped each other and shared thoughts all the time. Without you supporting and encouraging, I won't be able to finish the thesis. I also want to say thanks to everyone else in the HFTM family, Michael Lever, Katya Van Embden, Jiayin Liu, You Jia Lee, Yi Wen, and Xiaoyan Yang.

Last, but not least, my deepest gratitude goes to my family. Family are always my motivation when I face any difficulties in my life. Without my parents' unconditional love and support, I won't be able to stay in Canada for eight years and complete my undergraduate and graduate degree in the University of Guelph. I also want to say thanks to all my family members and close friends. They are the group people always support me and trust me.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Organizational Justice	5
2.1.1 Distributive justice	7
2.1.2 Procedural justice	7
2.1.3 Interactional justice	8
2.2 Pay Satisfaction	9
2.3 Distributive Justice and Pay Satisfaction	10
2.4 Procedural Justice and Pay Satisfaction	12
2.5 Interpersonal Justice and Pay Satisfaction	13
2.6 Informational Justice and Pay Satisfaction	14
2.7 Job Satisfaction	14
2.8 Distributive Justice and Job Satisfaction	16
2.9 Procedural Justice and Job Satisfaction	17
2.10 Interpersonal Justice and Job Satisfaction	18
2.11 Informational Justice and Job Satisfaction	19
2.12 Turnover Intention	20
2.13 Pay Satisfaction and Turnover Intention	22
2.14 Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention	22
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	24
3.1 Study population and sample size	24
3.2 Data Collection	25
3.3 Questionnaire Design	26
3.4 Measurement	27
3.4.1 Organizational justice.....	27
3.4.2 Pay satisfaction	28
3.4.3 Job satisfaction.....	28
3.4.4 Turnover intention	28
3.5 Data analysis	29
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	30
4.1 Profile of Respondents	30
4.2 Independent Sample T Test	35
4.3 Exploratory factor analysis for organizational justice	37
4.4 Exploratory factor analysis for satisfaction and turnover intention	40
4.5 Hierarchical regression analysis	43
4.5.1 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for pay satisfaction	45
4.5.2 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for job satisfaction	48

4.5.3 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for job satisfaction (with pay satisfaction).....	50
4.5.4 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for turnover intention	52
4.6 Sobel Tests.....	56
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION	57
CHAPTER 6: IMPLICATIONS	61
6.1 Theoretical Implications	61
6.2 Practical Implications.....	62
CHAPTER 7: LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	64
References	66
Appendix 1 – Survey Questionnaire	77

List of Tables

Table 1. The social-demographic characteristics of participants (N=199)	32
Table 2. The work characteristics of participants (N=199)	34
Table 3. Group Difference for justice dimensions (completed and incompleted surveys).....	35
Table 4. Group Difference for justice dimensions (two sample populations)	36
Table 5. The exploratory factor analysis results of satisfaction scale (N=199)	38
Table 6. The exploratory factor analysis results of satisfaction scale (N=199)	41
Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of items used for data analysis	44
Table 8. HRA results for pay satisfaction	47
Table 9. HRA results for job satisfaction.....	49
Table 10. HRA results for job satisfaction (with pay satisfaction)	51
Table 11. HRA results for turnover intention	54
Table 12. Results of Regression Analysis.....	55
Table 13. Mediation effects of pay and job satisfaction on justice and turnover intention (N=199)	56

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Restaurants Canada reports that labour issues currently present the most significant challenge within the Canadian restaurant industry (Elliott, 2018), with high turnover remaining one of the top labour challenges (Bufquin, DiPietro, Partlow, & Smith, 2018). High turnover rates are also a serious issue within the hospitality and tourism industry. According to the Canadian Tourism Human Resource Council (now Tourism HR Canada), the overall turnover rate in the overall tourism industry (including food and beverage services, accommodation, transportation, recreation and entertainment, and travel services) is just over 23 percent (R.A. Malatest & Associates, 2012). An increasing number of journal articles during the past few decades have concentrated on the antecedents and consequences of restaurant employee turnover intention (Simons & Hinkin, 2001; Wang, 2014), discussing the costly nature of employee turnover and its potential negative impact on restaurants. Simons and Hinkin (2001) estimated the costs of replacing hourly front-line and salaried employees at \$1,500 and \$3,000, respectively. Although their study was carried out 17 years ago, we can extrapolate this information with respect to inflation and increases in the cost of living; the cost of replacing hourly front-line and salaried employees today could be easily estimated at \$2,033 and \$4,068, respectively (Inflation Calculator).

There is value in exploring the antecedences of turnover intention. Jung and Yoon (2014) found that if employees experience job stress and develop the intention of leaving their organization, they can often perform negatively toward customers, thus reducing customers' revisit intentions and negatively impacting positive word-of-mouth. Heathfield (2018) reported that including in the top ten reasons employees quit their job is the relationships between

themselves and both their boss and coworkers. Khan, Nawaz, Qureshi, and Khan (2016) suggested that justice is the principle of human relations. In an organizational context, organizational justice denotes employees' perception of fairness (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Employees' perception of justice has been shown to be important, affecting many other important organizational attitudes, such as pay satisfaction (Till & Karren, 2011) and turnover intention (Luo, Qu, & Marnburg, 2013). Therefore, the current study will investigate organizational justice in the hospitality and tourism industry.

A large volume of the extant literature appears to treat organizational justice as a multidimensional construct comprised of four dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice and informational justice (Colquitt, 2001). Employees can often build their perceptions of justice by comparing their own situations and circumstances to others; for instance, workers might compare the compensations they received against their peers within their organizations (Milkovich, Newman, Gerhart, & Yap, 2017). Through such comparisons, employees form beliefs of their relative value to their organizations, including the value of their skill level, knowledge, and abilities (Vandenberghe & Tremblay, 2008). Some studies have opted to treat organizational justice as a single construct, exploring its relationship an employees' pay satisfaction (DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004), but only few studies have unpacked the various dimensions of justice against pay satisfaction (Jawahar & Stone, 2011). For instance, Tremblay, Sire, and Balk (2000) studied three Canadian organizations and found that, when examining at the relationship of both distributive and procedural justice with pay satisfaction, distributive justice appears to be a predictor of pay satisfaction. Till and Karren (2011) found that distributive, procedural, and informational justice are all positively related to pay satisfaction, although the study was limited in size and thus only exploratory in nature. Jawahar and Stone

(2011) tested the relationship between organizational justice and pay satisfaction in an international consulting company; they suggested that future studies should focus on different industries and different backgrounds. They also recommended that future studies seek to measure other consequences of organizational justice, such as job satisfaction and turnover intention.

While many studies have contemplated the relationships between organizational justice and pay satisfaction in other countries (Day, 2011), very few have explored the multi-dimensional impact of all dimensions of employees' perceived justice with regards to their pay satisfaction within the hospitality and tourism industry. Ghorbanalizadeh and Tayebi (2012) investigated the relationship between organizational justice, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, finding only found procedural justice to be positively related with job satisfaction; this study was challenged by a tight focus within Iran's Ministry of Sport Workers and limited to only 112 participants filled out surveys. Khan et al. (2016) claim to have explored the effect of all dimensions of organizational justice and employee turnover intention; yet, their study failed to provide either a clear research methodology or any supporting data.

This study attempts to address some of these gaps in the extant literature in three specific ways. First, it investigates the relationship between all four dimensions of organizational justice and pay satisfaction within the hospitality and tourism industry. Second, building on the suggestion of Jawahar and Stone (2011), it includes an examination of the relationship between employees' perceptions of justice and job satisfaction. Finally, it examines the effects of both pay satisfaction and job satisfaction on turnover intention. To facilitate this investigation, three steps hierarchical regression analysis was used to test the relationships among these constructs.

By addressing some gaps, this research makes the following contributions to the literature on labour issues in the hospitality and tourism industry. First, it tests the effect of each dimensions of organizational justice on pay satisfaction and job satisfaction and provide deep understanding of each dimension and its influence. Second, it investigates the antecedents of turnover intention in the hospitality and tourism industry to help inform managers and owners about possible ways in which to decrease turnover rates. Lastly, it provides managers with insights into perceived justice and employees' needs. For instance, management can apply a pay transparency policy within their organizations.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Organizational Justice

Individuals can often evaluate against some set of standards in order to motivate themselves to improve. People seek to understand their worth in many different aspects, including personal and professional areas, and this assessment of relative values could appear in terms of their attractiveness, wealth and/or other success measures (Judge, Hurst, & Simon, 2009). In order to gauge their relative values regarding their own skills and own abilities, individuals often make comparisons with others, an idea grounded in social comparison theory proposed by Festinger (1954). Social comparison theory suggests that people can create a self-image when they compare themselves to others (Festinger, 1954). However, they may also develop attitudes which are highly unrealistic or judgemental about themselves or others during the process (Ozimek, Bierhoff, & Hanke, 2018). This is because these evaluations are based on individuals' perceptions, which may be influenced by implicit personality and other factors (Hellriegel, Slocum, Jr., Woodman, & Bruning, 1998).

Individuals tend to compare themselves with people who have similar ability in order to receive an accurate evaluation (Festinger, 1954). Individuals not only make comparisons in their personal lives but also their professional lives and their places of work. For instance, they may compare the treatment they have received from managers and coworkers to that which others receive. When individuals make such a comparison, they often use three reference points: the self, the other and the system (Goodman, 1974). The self-referent estimation suggests that individuals will compare their present input-to-output ratio with their other ratios, which have special meaning for them; for instance, their past work experience. The other refers to

individuals who work within the same organization and do similar jobs as well as individuals who work for other organizations. The 'system' refers to the employer and the organization system. For example, when employees get a promotion, their inputs for the job will likely increase; however, if they believe that their compensations do not reflect the promotion, the ratio of inputs to outputs is no longer consistent. When employees compare themselves to these referents, they ask, "Is this fair?"

In an employment context, organizational justice denotes employees' perception of fairness (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997) and includes individual behaviours and reactions to perceived fairness (Greenberg, 1993). Most of the existing academic literature use fairness and justice as interchangeable constructs (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Schminke & Ambrose, 2000). A number of studies have demonstrated the positive impacts of organizational justice (or fairness) in areas such as job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviour (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010), job engagement (Ghosh, Rai, & Sinha, 2014), and organization commitment. For example, individuals who feel fairly treated by their coworkers or supervisors may show an increased collective identity, which will indirectly affect their organizational commitment indirectly (Luo, Song, Marnburg, & Øgaard, 2014). Other studies have revealed negative impacts of organizational injustice, such as increased turnover intention, social loafing behaviour (Luo, Qu & Marnburh, 2013), and organizational deviant behavior (Demir, 2011). These cases show that understanding justice, as a construct, has value within the workplace and with labour outcomes.

The theory of organizational justice has typically been divided into three dimensions: distributive, procedural and interactional (Colquitt, 2001). Many studies have explored organizational justice in the hospitality and tourism industry, but most of the studies did not use all three dimensions of justice (Jawahar & Stone, 2011). Akgunduz and Cin (2015) found that

distributive justice is negatively associated with employees' turnover intention, but they did not include other dimensions in their study. Research has shown that all dimensions of organizational justice are correlated to each other (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001); thus other studies that only include one or two dimensions might be not accurate, and the results of those studies might be suspect. Therefore, this study will use all three dimensions of organizational justice to ensure the various construct aspects are fully captured.

2.1.1 Distributive justice

Distributive justice refers to the perception of fairness in outcomes (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010) and considers various kinds of rewards that individuals receive for their efforts (Demir, 2011). Rewards could include promotion opportunities, incentives, and salary raises provided by organizations. According to Adam's equity theory, individuals use an input-to-output ratio to determine if they are fairly treated by comparing the ratio of what they put into their work in comparison to what they get out of their work (Adams & Jacobsen, 1964; Till & Karren, 2011). Inputs include abilities, behaviours and work effort; outputs refer to a collection of both monetary and non-monetary benefits. When employees examine this, it will influence how they perceive their current state of equity; balanced ratios should create perceptions of equity while dissimilar ratios may well lead to the perception of inequity (Lawler, 1971).

2.1.2 Procedural justice

Procedural justice includes all formal rules and policies that may affect employees (Schminke, Ambrose, & Cropanzano, 2000), such as giving employees proper notice before implementing a new policy. When distributive justice focuses on the fairness in

outcomes, whereas procedural justice refers to the individuals' perceptions of fairness regarding the methods that are used to reach those outcomes (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997).

Distributive justice and procedural justice are considered structural aspects of organizational justice (Johnson, Lanaj, & Barnes, 2014). Distributive justice is often related to personal-referenced outcomes, such as job satisfaction and procedural justice is often related to organizational-referenced outcomes, such as organizational citizenship behavior (Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993).

2.1.3 Interactional justice

Interactional justice refers to the degree to which feel that they are treated with respect and dignity by other parties of an organization (Colquitt et al., 2001). For instance, if individuals feel that they are treated with respect, openness, and politeness by their supervisors or coworkers, they should perceive a high level of interactional justice. Of these three dimensions, only interactional justice focuses on the interplay between people and how they compare their situations to evaluate relative value (Bies & Moag, 1986).

There are two sub-dimensions of interactional justice: interpersonal and informational (Greenberg, 1993). Greenberg suggests that these two sub-dimensions have different effects and are based on different types of treatment that people can receive. Interpersonal justice refers to individuals' perceptions of treatment they received from other parties in the organization, whereas informational justice refers to perceptions of the adequacy of justifications and explanations received by individuals (Colquitt et al., 2001; Roy, Bastounis, & Mininbas-Poussard, 2012). Greenberg (1993) also claims that both interpersonal justice and informational justice are social aspects of organizational justice, because they require interplay between people.

The former reveals how fair people feel they have been treated, while the latter looks at the fairness of available information.

Compared to distributive and procedural justice, the rules of interpersonal justice can be very broad since they are based on the unstructured communication between two parties. Employees consider interpersonal justice to be the most meaningful and relevant form of justice to employees, since it relates to employees' daily lives (Game & Crawshaw, 2015; Holtz & Harold, 2012). Many studies have explored the consequences of interpersonal justice. For example, some research has demonstrated that an outcome of interpersonal justice is employee trust (DeConinck, 2010) and that negative outcomes of interpersonal injustice include negative employee attitudes and behaviours (Jones, 2009; Lavelle, Rupp, & Brockner, 2007).

2.2 Pay Satisfaction

Choudhury and Gupta (2011) define pay satisfaction as “the amount of overall positive or negative feelings individuals have towards their pay.” Pay satisfaction has been explored in several studies within the past few decades (Chiang & Birtch, 2010; Vandenberghe & Tremblay, 2008). Some earlier research has treated pay satisfaction as a unidimensional construct (Adams & Jacobsen, 1964; Dreher, 1980), under the premise that pay satisfaction is based only on the individual's comparison between the amount of money they received and their ideal pay from the organizations. They considered pay as the key form of compensations, omitting in their consideration other forms of compensations in their considerations. More recent studies (Heneman & Schwab, 1985; Jung & Yoon, 2015) propose pay satisfaction in four dimensions: pay level (e.g., current pay), pay raises (e.g., changes in pay level), benefits (e.g., vacations and insurance), and pay structure and administration (e.g., the method to distribute the pay). These

four dimensions are differentiated because compensation is formed by different parts beyond the pay rate (Heneman & Schwab, 1985). Researchers also found that the four facets of pay satisfaction are correlated with each other (Williams, McDaniel, & Nguyen, 2006). Thus, the current study will consider pay satisfaction as a multidimensional construct.

Williams et al. (2006) produced a meta-analysis on pay level satisfaction, in which they assert that pay level satisfaction is a perceptual value determined by the discrepancy between what people actually get paid against what people believe they should be paid. The study also revealed that job withdrawal intentions, such as turnover intentions, and withdrawal behaviours, such as absenteeism, arise as consequences of low pay level satisfaction (Jung & Yoon, 2015; Kinicki, McKee-Ryan, Schriesheim, & Carson K.P., 2002). However, the study only included one dimension of pay satisfaction, and Williams et al. (2006) caution regarding the potential inaccuracy of the results of studies that include only one or two dimensions of pay satisfaction might be inaccurate. Based on the cautions expressed by William et al., the current study will include all four dimensions.

Some studies have shown that pay satisfaction has a positive impact on affective commitment and normative commitment and has a negative impact on turnover intention (Vandenberghe & Tremblay, 2008). Jung and Yoon (2015) found that benefits provide the most influential dimension on job engagement; in contrast, pay raises were not found to affect job engagement. The results indicate that a fair pay system is essential for organizations to ensure their employees' satisfaction.

2.3 Distributive Justice and Pay Satisfaction

Pay satisfaction refers to employees' positive emotions regarding their pay situation (Tekleab, Bartol, & Liu, 2005). Equity theory states that people compare their inputs and outputs

with relative referents: the self, the other, and the system (Adams & Jacobsen, 1964); compensation for work, in whatever combination of pay and benefits, is the prime output source for workers. If employees perceive their compensations to be equitable, they should express greater satisfaction with their pay (DeConinck, Stilwell, & Brock, 1996).

Past research demonstrates that distributive justice is often related to personally referenced outcomes (Colquitt et al., 2001; Jawahar & Stone, 2011). Such outcomes include both pay level and pay raises. Many studies have indicated a positive relationship between distributive justice and pay level satisfaction (DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004; Luo et al., 2013). DeConinck and Stilwell (2004) found that distributive justice is positively related to employees' pay satisfaction and that distributive justice is better at predicting individuals' outcomes (e.g., pay) than general outcomes (e.g., organizational commitment). A meta-analysis (Williams et al., 2006) found a high correlation between distributive justice and pay level satisfaction. However, distributive justice was found to be more strongly related to general pay satisfaction because distributive justice is a direct evaluation of outcomes related to pay that covers all types of compensations. Howard (1999) has found a positive relationship between distributive justice and pay raises, since pay raise is also a key aspect of pay outcomes (Jawahar & Stone, 2011; Williams, Brower, Ford, Williams, & Carraher, 2008). Williams et al. (2008) state that employees' raise adequacy is positively related to their pay raise satisfaction. Raise adequacy refers to whether the pay raise meet employees' expectation or not, and outcome expectation is an aspect of distributive justice. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1a: Distributive justice is positively related to employees' pay satisfaction.

2.4 Procedural Justice and Pay Satisfaction

Procedural justice refers to employees' perceptions of the process of determining outcomes (Colquitt et al., 2001). Previous studies have found that procedural justice is an antecedent to different outcomes, such as organizational trust (Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002), organizational commitment (Lemons & Jones, 2001; Poon, 2012), and pay satisfaction (Jawahar & Stone, 2011; Till & Karren, 2011). Jawahar and Stone (2011) demonstrate that procedural justice is positively related to employees' satisfaction with pay raise, benefit, and structure and administration. These researchers state that most people believe if their performances is above average within their organizations, they should receive relative pay raises; as a result, people are sensitive to pay raises and the rules used to determine the pay raises (Alicke, Klotz, Breitenbecher, Yurak, & Vredenburg, 1995). Therefore, if they believe that the procedures used to determine pay raises are fair, they are more likely to be satisfied with their pay (Jawahar & Stone, 2011).

Past studies also demonstrate that procedural justice is often related to organizational-referenced outcomes (Colquitt et al., 2001; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993) including benefits, pay structure, and pay administration. Positive relationships have also been found between procedural justice and satisfaction with benefits (Terpstra & Honoree, 2003; Tremblay et al., 2000). In general, people join an organization for a combination of monetary and psychological rewards; therefore, procedures that might influence psychological rewards are also important (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Some benefits, serving as psychological rewards, are valuable to employees over time, such as vacations that can help employees get rest and release stress (Jawahar & Stone, 2011). Therefore, if employees perceived these procedures as fair, they are

more likely to be satisfied with their benefit (Tekleab et al., 2005). Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H2a: Procedural justice is positively related to employees' pay satisfaction.

2.5 Interpersonal Justice and Pay Satisfaction

Interpersonal justice, the first sub-dimension of interactional justice, explores individuals' perception of treatment they have received from other parties within their organizations (Greenberg, 1993); essentially, do employees feel that they have been treated well and fairly by other people. Past research in other industries show that interpersonal justice is positively related to pay satisfaction (Andersson-Straberg, Sverke, & Hellgren, 2007; Jawahar & Stone, 2011). Harris, Anseel, and Lievens (2008) state that employees believe they are undercompensated in general. Because in their perceptions, they often overestimate the compensation level of those who are at similar levels to them (Milkovich et al., 2017). Employees also believe their performance to be above average within their organizations, and thus that they feel more likely to get pay raises; however, if employees do not receive any, they are more likely to receive unfavourable outcomes (Jawahar & Stone, 2011). Greenberg (1994) argues that interpersonal justice alters reactions to any decision outcomes because a supervisor's sensitivity and respect will help employees feel better about unfavourable outcomes. Therefore, interpersonal justice can influence employees' pay satisfaction.

Andersson-Straberg, Sverke, and Hellgren (2007) find that both interpersonal and informational justice affects on employees' pay satisfaction. The results reveal that not only justifications and information given by supervisors, but also the manner and the way in which

they are communicated to their employees are important. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3a: Interpersonal justice is positively related to employees' pay satisfaction.

2.6 Informational Justice and Pay Satisfaction

Informational justice, as the sub-dimension of interactional justice, is operationalized an individuals' judgment as to whether or not they feel they have received accurate explanations and justifications about operational decisions (Colquitt et al., 2001). These decisions can include how decisions around compensations and benefits are determined and allocated. Research done by Till and Karren (2010) reveals that informational justice has a positive impact on employees' pay satisfaction. For example, when employees feel that they are treated unfairly and complain, and their managers can provide accurate explanations and reasonable justifications for their employees' wages, the employees are more likely to be satisfied with their pay level. The positive relationship between informational justice and job satisfaction has been found in earlier studies, and a similar result might be expected in terms of pay satisfaction, since it is a major component of job satisfaction (Colquitt et al., 2001). Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H4a: Informational justice is positively related to employees' pay satisfaction.

2.7 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction refers to “ employees' general affective evaluation of their job” (W. G. Kim, Leong, & Lee, 2005). Job satisfaction has been researched extensively in the hospitality and tourism industry, in part because an employees' job satisfaction has a direct influence on

both customers satisfaction and customer loyalty (Yeh, 2013). In this industry, employees typically engage in direct interaction with customers, during which customers develop perceptions of the hotels or restaurants which the employees represent. Past work has shown that when employees are satisfied with their jobs, they are more likely to treat customers with respect (Kim et al., 2005).

Back, Lee and Abbott (2011) state that job satisfaction is related to employees' self-esteem and organizational commitment, both of which help organizations to achieve long-term success and, important to this study, improved employee retention. Ehrhart, Witt, Schneider, & Perry (2011) assert that employees are considered internal customers and that it is important to keep and improve relationships with employees in order to maintain a good relationship with external customers. Chuang, Yin, and Dellmann-Jenkins (2009) find that casino hotel chefs are satisfied with their supervision, but dissatisfied with their career growth and hotel policies. Kim et al. (2005) state that, if restaurant employees are satisfied with their jobs, they are less likely to develop the intention to leave. Kim's study also emphasizes the importance of organization supports, especially for new employees, because they help employees maintain a high level of job satisfaction and decrease turnover intention.

Some studies consider pay satisfaction as a component of job satisfaction (Till & Karren, 2011). Tsai and Wu (2010) believe that job satisfaction is a broad construct that includes satisfaction with leadership and management, workload, work pressure and salary. However, Judge, Piccolo, Podsakoff, Shaw, and Rich (2010) argue that pay satisfaction is a distinct construct from job satisfaction, because when employees are satisfied with their pay, they might be still unsatisfied with their job. The current study will explore pay satisfaction and job satisfaction as two separate constructs, using the job satisfaction scale by Hartline and Ferrell

(1996), which focuses solely on an employees' satisfaction with their job, supervisor, organization, and organizational support. Therefore, the current study will explore pay satisfaction and job satisfaction as two separate constructs.

2.8 Distributive Justice and Job Satisfaction

Distributive justice refers to employees' perception of fairness in outcomes, which include money and other intangible incentives (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010). Therefore, Luo et al. believe that if employees perceive fairness in their work outcomes, distributive justice regarding their pay and other benefits, then they are more likely to express satisfaction with their jobs (2013).

However, Lambert, Hogan, and Griffin (2007) report that distributive justice appears to have no direct effect on job satisfaction, while finding an indirect impact through job stress. This could be explained by their unique study location and sample - a private youth correctional facility in the United States, and the researchers only select participants aged fourteen to nineteen years old. Since the study setting and the study populations different from the current study, it is important to determine if the same findings holds true. Kim (2017) states that there is no direct relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction because wages are not a strong predictor of job satisfaction; yet, Kim's work does reveal an indirect relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction and that the relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction is fully mediated by organizational support. However, this study is conducted within twelve sports associations in Hong Kong; the results might different from current study because of the different cultural backgrounds and different study setting. Because Kim et al. (2005) state that compensation and benefits programs are important to restaurant employees,

they are likely to compare their rewards with coworkers, which may in turn influence their job satisfaction.

Ohana (2012) provide two distinctions between distributive justice and job satisfaction: instrumental and deontic. Instrumental indicates that, if organizations fairly distribute resources and benefit to their employees that meet their expectations, employees are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs. Deontic refers to an organization's moral behaviour, which makes employees more likely to be satisfied with their jobs. The study also stated that organizational support is a mediator between distributive justice and job satisfaction. This means that, when individuals believe that they have been treated fairly by their organizations, they will feel supported by their organizations and that they are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs (Ohana, 2012; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Therefore, considering previous findings, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1b: Distributive justice is positively related to employee job satisfaction.

2.9 Procedural Justice and Job Satisfaction

The relationship between procedural justice and job satisfaction has been well studied in many disciplines (DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004; Lambert et al., 2007). Procedural justice focuses on the process that organizations use to make decisions (DeConinck, 2010). Schappe (1998) finds that procedural justice has been considered a strong predictor of employee job satisfaction because if organizations establish open communication and a competitive environment and their employees believe that their voices are heard in the decision-making process, their employees are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs.

Lambert et al. (2007) find that procedural justice has a direct impact on job satisfaction because it represents employees' perception of their legitimacy in their organizations. When employees perceive procedural justice in their organizations, they are more likely to have favourable feelings towards their job. According to the meta-analysis by Colquitt et al.'s (2001), procedural justice is an antecedent of job satisfaction. Furthermore, Yadav and Gupta (2017) find that procedural justice has a direct impact on job satisfaction and the relationship between these constructs is mediated by organizational trust in the Indian tourism industry. They suggest that, if employees believe that the decision-making process is fair, they are more likely to perceive organizational trust, which may make them more satisfied with their job eventually. Therefore, based on the above discussions, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H2b: Procedural justice is positively related to employees' job satisfaction.

2.10 Interpersonal Justice and Job Satisfaction

Interpersonal justice refers to how employees are treated by their supervisors and coworkers (Colquitt, 2001); if they believe that their supervisors and coworkers treat them respectfully and in a dignified manner, they are more likely to perceive interpersonal justice. Van den Bos, Lind, and Wilke (2001) believe that the supervisor's respect is an indication of employees' relationship with their organizations because respectful treatment from supervisors might be representative of the employees' standing in the workplace (Bies, 2001). However, if employees perceive interpersonal mistreatment, they are more likely to lose their sense of social belonging; as a result, they may develop negative job attitudes and demonstrate negative job behaviours (Tyler, 1999). Therefore, when employees are treated by their supervisors and

coworkers with respect and dignity, they are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs (Wilczynska, Batorski, & Torrent-Sellens, 2017).

Loi and Yang (2009) present a study in which they asked 266 full-employees in Hong Kong to complete daily questionnaires about interpersonal justice for 25 working days, and they found that daily interpersonal justice to be positively related to employees' daily job satisfaction. Schminke et al. (2000) find that interpersonal justice is related to job satisfaction and that it may also mediate the relationship between organization size and job satisfaction. They believe that employees from smaller organizations are more likely to display higher job satisfaction than those in larger organizations, because employees might have more opportunities to interact and communicate with their supervisors in smaller organizations. Therefore, given the above discussions, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3b: Interpersonal justice is positively related to employees' job satisfaction.

2.11 Informational Justice and Job Satisfaction

Employees care not only about the interpersonal treatment from their supervisors and coworkers but also about the quality of justifications and explanations from others, which together comprise informational justice (Ghosh et al., 2014). Bies (2005) reports that, if supervisors share information related to organization matters with employees regularly, employees are more likely to perceive higher levels of informational justice. When employees perceived a higher level of informational justice, they were less likely to perceive dishonesty in their organization and were more likely to develop trustworthiness with other organizational members (Colquitt, 2001). As a result, employees were more likely to be satisfied with their jobs

(Colquitt et al., 2001). In support of this claim, Loi and Yang (2009) find that employees daily informational justice is positively related to their daily job satisfaction.

Ismail et al. (2011) find that interactional justice is positively related to job satisfaction, thus mediating the relationship between the adequacy of pay and job satisfaction. The existing literature only focuses on the relationship between interpersonal justice and job satisfaction (Ilies, Scott, & Judge, 2006), and some literature use interactional justice to include both interpersonal and informational justice (Ismail & Zakaria, 2009). However, the current study expects that informational justice also has a positive impact on job satisfaction. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H4b: Informational justice is positively related to employees' job satisfaction.

2.12 Turnover Intention

For many decades, both social scientists and practitioners have found employee turnover in the hospitality and tourism industry to be a significant issue (Regts & Molleman, 2013). There are two main types of employee turnover in human resource management practice: voluntary and involuntary turnover (Shaw, Delery, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1998). Voluntary turnover refers to an employee's decision to leave an organization; involuntary turnover represents an employer's decision to terminate the employment of a worker (Shaw et al., 1998). For the purpose of this study, involuntary turnover will not be discussed. This study will concentrate solely on voluntary turnover, because voluntary turnover: 1) is caused by employees and is hard to control; 2) decreases overall business performance, since dissatisfied employees may convey negative attitudes and behaviour to customers (Luo et al., 2013); and 3) negatively effects organizations' financial situation and replacement costs (including both training and loss of production)

(Simons & Hinkin, 2001). The hospitality and tourism industry's high voluntary turnover rates make this a pertinent area of investigation.

Since it is rather difficult to conduct and obtain the exact number of employees who leave organizations, the current study will use turnover intention as a construct, which is also known as turnover cognition, because it is the best predictor of actual turnover rate (Sager, Griffeth, & Hom, 1998). A common, well-accepted definition of turnover intention is “a deliberate willingness to leave a particular organization” (Luo et al., 2013).

Many studies have focused on the antecedents of turnover intention, concluding that job satisfaction, organizational commitment and co-worker support all have a negative impact on turnover intention (Armeli, Eisenberger, & Rhoades, 2001; Tews, Michel, & Ellingson, 2013). Therefore, occupational stress and emotional exhaustion yield a positive effect on turnover intention (Hwang, Lee, Park, Chang, & Kim, 2014). Moreover, the most significant consequence of turnover intention is turnover cost, which includes the costs of separation, replacement and training (Wright & Bonett, 2007). Employee turnover is extremely expensive and thus has negative effects on the company's financial situation. However, there are few studies that have focused on the turnover intentions among restaurant employees. Han, Bonn, and Cho (2016) found that the relationship between customer incivility and turnover intentions of frontline employees is fully mediated by job burnout in the United States. Jang and Kandampully (2018) reveal that servant leadership, which is a type of leadership that focuses on employees' development and interest, impacts frontline restaurant employees' turnover intention. Understanding the predictors of employees' intention to leave their organizations and the industry is becoming essentially to organizational success, and therefore, the current study will investigate the antecedents of employees' turnover intention.

2.13 Pay Satisfaction and Turnover Intention

The relationship between pay satisfaction and turnover intention has been proposed and developed in many studies (Jung & Yoon, 2015; Mohamed, Mohamad, & Awad, 2017).

However, some studies find that pay satisfaction to only explain modest variance of turnover intention (Williams et al., 2006). This might be because there are some moderators that affect the relationship between pay satisfaction and turnover intention (Mohamed et al., 2017), such as individual differences (Pappas & Flaherty, 2006). Folger and Konovsky (1989) believe that, when employees are dissatisfied with their pay and pay distribution, they are more likely to perform job withdrawal behaviors (Jung & Yoon, 2015).

One overt expression of value and respect is how much someone is compensated (Vandenberghe & Tremblay, 2008), especially in comparison to others. Individuals, who are dissatisfied with their pay are more likely to believe that they are not important and valuable to their organization and are more likely to leave their organization (Back et al., 2011). Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H5: Pay satisfaction is negatively related to turnover intention.

2.14 Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention

Job satisfaction reflects an employees' emotional response to their job situation (Vidal, Valle, & Isabel, 2007). The negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention has been identified in the existing literature (Tsai & Wu, 2010). Back et al. (2011) express that, if employees are satisfied with their job, they are more likely to stay in their organizations and

spread positive word of mouth with their coworkers. Indeed, Tsai and Wu (2010) find that, in the nursing field, employees' job satisfaction is negatively related to their turnover intention.

Zopiatis et al. (2014) reveal that only extrinsic job satisfaction is negatively related to employees' turnover intention, and they find no relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and turnover intention. This might be because some jobs in the hospitality and tourism industry are seasonal or part-time jobs, and employees are less likely to care about their intrinsic job satisfaction. Chen, Brown, Bowers, and Chang (2015) find that work-to-family conflict partially mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention. This is because, if employees are unable to balance work and their families, they are more likely to have negative attitudes toward their job and perform negatively; as a result, they are more likely to develop the intention to leave their organizations. Although there are many studies explore the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention in other industries (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014; Tsai & Wu, 2010), limited studies investigate the direct relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention in the hospitality and tourism industry. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H6: Job satisfaction is negatively related to turnover intention.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Study population and sample size

The target population of this study focuses on employees who currently work in the Canadian hospitality and tourism industry. Participants were screened to be older than 18 years of age, because employees between the ages of 14 to 18 get paid at a lower, “student” minimum wage, and they are only permitted to work 28 hours or fewer (Ministry of Labour, 2018). Moreover, according to Statistics Canada, majority of these young workers are part-time worker and they may still rely on others financially (Martin, 2012).

The ideal sample size for social science research was calculated based on the confidence interval approach, the equation is as follows (Burns & Bush, 1995):

$$n = \frac{z^2(pq)}{e^2} = \frac{1.96^2(0.5 \times 0.5)}{0.05^2} = 385$$

where n = sample size

z = z-value for desired confidence level 95%

p = estimated variability of 50%

q = (1-p)

e = acceptable error $\pm 5\%$

This equation generated $\pm 5\%$ margin of error at 95% confidence level. And this equation used an estimated variability of 50% to adapt a worst possible case. Therefore, the suggested sample size by Burns and Bush (1995) was 385. However, as a rule of thumb, a sample above 50 is enough for correlation or regression analysis (Van Voorhis & Morgan, 2007). This number was based on Green (1991)'s suggestions. According to Green (1991), the estimated sample size $N > 50 + 8m$ (where m is the number of independent variables) for testing

the overall fit of regression model (R^2) and $N > 104 + m$ for testing individual predictors (β). He also suggested that if the study will test both, they should use the larger sample size. In the current study, there were six independent variables and based on the formula suggested by Green (1991), the estimated sample size was greater than 110. Therefore, taking these two suggestions into consideration, a minimum target sample of 110 and an ideal target sample of 385 were chosen.

3.2 Data Collection

The data was collected through two stages. The first part of the data collection involved surveys included in a larger ongoing project on hospitality labour issues. The purpose of the project is to understand workplace inequalities, such as glass ceilings and perceptions of wage gaps among employees in the tourism industry. The surveys were sent to members of the Women in Tourism and Hospitality Organization (WITH.org) and the Ontario Restaurant, Hotel and Motel Association (ORHMA). The survey used for the larger study consists of 159 questions, including 3 screening questions, 27 social-demographic questions, and 129 questions for measuring key constructs. An email invitation letter and a survey link were sent to the members of WITH.org and ORHMA. A consent form was presented to the participants when they click the link; if they click accept, they will be continued to the next page, otherwise, they will be exited from the survey. A total of 202 surveys were collected from these two associations. After filtering out the responses that failed to meet the screening questions ($n = 35$), had incomplete answers ($n = 7$), or did not finish surveys ($n = 51$), 109 usable data were collected for use in the analysis.

In order to increase the sample size, a shorter questionnaire designed specifically for this research project was distributed through the researchers' social media networks. The survey used

for this project contains 57 questions, including 3 screening questions, 10 social-demographic questions, and 44 questions for measuring key constructs. A short invitation letter and a survey link were posted through the researchers' LinkedIn and Facebook profiles to reach out to industry professionals. Screening questions appeared at the beginning of the questionnaire to screen for respondents who did not meet the requirements. The screening questions included the respondents' ages, "Are you 18 years of age or older?"; the respondents' current residence, "Are you currently employed in Canada?"; and the respondents' current job, "Are you currently employed in the hospitality and tourism industry?" Respondents who were under 18 years old, lived outside of Canada, and were not employed in the hospitality and tourism industry were automatically eliminated from the study. Drawing from the social media networks, 181 surveys were collected. To clean up the data, same data cleaning procedures have been applied. After filtering out the responses that failed to meet the screening questions ($n = 56$), had incomplete answers ($n = 1$), or did not finish surveys ($n = 34$), 90 usable surveys were used for analysis. Therefore, a total of 199 useable surveys were entered for the analysis, including 109 collected from the two associations and 90 from the social media networks. One point that must be addressed is that the results from different channels feature aspects differently in terms of statistics. A detailed discussion will be provided in the results section.

3.3 Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was delivered through Qualtrics, which allows participants to use their phone or computer to complete the survey. A pre-test was conducted with 50 respondents and questions revised for readability based on feedbacks. The questionnaire contained two parts. The first part asked employees demographic questions (regarding age, gender, positions, length of

stay in the restaurant and education level, etc.). The second part included the measurement scales for each construct, all of which are adapted from prior studies (see Appendix). All of the measurement scale used a 5-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) because they are easy and simple for participants to understand and create less confusion (Dawes, 2008).

3.4 Measurement

3.4.1 Organizational justice

Distributive justice was measured using four items on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) which was developed by Colquitt (2001). Colquitt's (2001) study confirmed the dimensionality of organizational justice and tested the construct validity in two different setting (university classroom and automotive parts manufacturing company). Moreover, this measurement scale was convertible, which means that researchers can parenthesize different outcomes to ensure that each item works appropriately for its context (Jawahar & Stone, 2011).

Procedural justice was measured with six items on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) which was developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). Compared to the measurement scale developed by Colquitt (2001), Niehoff and Moorman (1993) used the declarative sentence, which will help participants easily to understand the situations.

Interactional justice was measured with nine items on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) which was developed by Colquitt (2001). This measurement scale was chosen because it distinguishes between both interpersonal justice and informational justice. Interpersonal justice was measured with four items and informational justice will be measured with five items.

3.4.2 Pay satisfaction

Pay satisfaction was measured with eighteen items on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly dissatisfied, 5=strongly satisfied) which was developed by Heneman and Schwab (1985). They developed an eighteen-item questionnaire that they call the Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire (PSQ). It includes four dimensions of pay satisfaction: pay raise (four items), pay level (four items), benefits (four items) and structure and administration (six items) (Shrader & Singer, 2014). Thus, the current study will use PSQ, since it has been used in the hotel industry (Jung & Yoon, 2015) and is the most comprehensive measurement scale compared to other scales (Lievens, Anseel, Harris, & Eisenberg, 2007), such as the Job Descriptive Index (JDI).

3.4.3 Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured with four items on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) developed by Hartline and Ferrell (1996). This is a well-established scale and has been used in previous studies (Lu, Lu, Gursoy, & Neale, 2016).

3.4.4 Turnover intention

Turnover intention was measured with three items on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) developed by Singh, Verbeke, and Rhoads, (1996). It has often been used in previous studies (Karatepe & Aleshinloye, 2009; Karatepe & Douri, 2012) and evaluates employee turnover intention in restaurants.

3.5 Data analysis

The IBM SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 25 was used for data analysis. First, the descriptive results were produced to understand the demographic information and work characteristics of participants. Second, two independent T Test were conducted to ensure the type II error does not exist in the current study, which means null hypothesis is not false. Third, two exploratory factor analysis were conducted to ensure the dimensionality of organizational justice, satisfaction and turnover intention. Fourth, a reliability test was used to analyze the internal consistency of factors. Fifth, four hierarchical regression analysis was performed to test the hypotheses. By using hierarchical regression analysis, researchers can enter control variables and independent variables at different steps to examine the incremental influence of each variables. Finally, the Sobel test statistics were conducted to explore the potential mediation effects of pay and job satisfaction on the relationship between each of the dimensions of organizational justice on turnover intention. See Appendix for the measurement items for each variable.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

4.1 Profile of Respondents

Table 1 shows the social-demographic information of the study respondents (n=199). The study sample was 59.3% female and 40.1% male. More than half of the respondents marked their race as Caucasian or white (56.3%), and 28.1% were Chinese. In terms of educational level, most respondents claimed to have an undergraduate degree (44.2%) or post high school or college diploma (27.6%). In terms of annual individual income, more than half of the respondents had incomes between \$20,000CAD and \$79,999CAD. With regard to marital status, more than half of the respondents (61.8%) were married, in a committed relationship or common law. The majority of the respondents were from Ontario (81.7%).

Table 2 reveals the work characteristics of the study respondents. In terms of segment, most of the respondents (63.3%) worked in the food and beverage industry, followed by accommodation (25.6%). Regarding job tenure, the majority of respondents had worked more than one year in the hospitality and tourism industry (88.4%) and in their current organization (69.8%). Finally, respondents' work positions were distributed evenly including 19.6% top-level managers, 34.2% mid-level managers, 17.6% entry-level managers and 28.6% frontline employees.

It is notable that the study samples collected from the two channels emphasized different features. Most of the study respondents from the larger study were senior managers (80%), had worked in the hospitality and tourism industry for more than 10 years (79.8%), and had worked for their current organizations for more than 4 years (66%). However, most of the study respondents from the social media networks were frontline employees and entry-level managers

(80.0%), had worked in the hospitality and tourism industry for less than 10 years (80.1%), and had worked for their current organizations for less than 4 years (77.7%).

Table 1. The social-demographic characteristics of participants (N=199)

		Overall		Larger study		Social media	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	81	40.7	56	51.4	25	27.8
	Female	118	59.3	53	48.6	65	72.2
Ethnicity	Caucasian/White	112	56.3	95	87.2	17	18.9
	South Asian	8	4.0	4	3.7	4	4.4
	Chinese	56	28.1	1	0.9	55	61.1
	Black	1	0.5	1	0.9	—	—
	Filipino	7	3.5	1	0.9	6	6.7
	Latin American	2	1.0	1	0.9	1	1.1
	Arab	1	0.5	1	0.9	—	—
	Southeast Asian	4	2.0	2	1.8	2	2.2
	Korean	3	1.5	—	—	3	3.4
	Japanese	2	1.0	1	0.9	1	1.1
	Other	3	1.5	2	1.8	1	1.1
Education	High school or under	23	11.6	17	15.6	6	6.6
	Post high school or college	55	27.6	39	35.8	16	17.8
	Undergraduate	88	44.2	36	33.0	52	57.8
	Graduate degree	33	16.6	17	15.6	16	17.8
Income	Under \$20,000	34	17.1	7	6.4	27	30.0
	\$20,000 - \$39,999	49	24.6	9	8.3	40	44.4
	\$40,000 - \$59,999	32	16.1	20	18.3	12	13.3
	\$60,000 - \$79,999	31	15.6	26	23.9	5	5.6
	\$80,000 - \$99,999	18	9.0	15	13.8	3	3.3
	\$100,000 - \$119,999	17	8.5	15	13.8	1	1.1

	\$120,000 - \$139,999	3	1.5	3	2.8	—	—
	\$140,000 - \$159,999	4	2.0	3	2.8	1	1.1
	\$160,000 - \$179,999	3	1.5	3	2.8	—	—
	\$180,000 - \$199,999	2	1.0	2	1.8	—	—
	\$200,000 or more	6	3.0	6	5.5	—	—
	Single/Separated/Divorced	76	36.2	25	22.9	51	56.6
Marital Status	Committed relationship/ Married/Common Law	123	61.8	84	77.1	39	43.3
	Ontario	163	81.9	86	78.9	77	85.6
Residence	Outside Ontario	35	17.6	23	20.2	13	14.4

Table 2. The work characteristics of participants (N=199)

		Overall		Large study		Social media	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Industry	Accommodation	51	25.6	41	37.6	10	11.1
	Food and Beverage	126	63.3	57	52.3	69	76.7
	Other	22	10.9	11	10.1	11	12.2
Tenure in hospitality and tourism industry	<1 year	23	11.6	1	0.9	22	24.4
	1-3 years	40	20.1	6	5.5	34	37.8
	4-6 years	15	7.5	6	5.5	9	10.0
	7-9 years	17	8.5	9	8.3	8	8.9
	>10years	104	52.3	87	79.8	17	18.9
Tenure in current organization	<1year	60	30.2	15	13.8	45	50.0
	1-3 years	47	23.6	22	20.2	25	27.8
	4-6 years	25	12.6	18	16.5	7	7.8
	7-9 years	14	7.0	8	7.3	6	6.7
	>10years	53	26.6	46	42.2	7	7.8
Position	Top level management	39	19.6	35	31.5	4	4.4
	Mid-level management	68	34.2	55	49.5	14	15.6
	Entry level management	35	17.6	10	9.0	25	27.8
	Front line employee	57	28.6	11	9.9	47	52.2

4.2 Independent Sample T Test

To ensure the Type II error does not exist in the current study, two independent sample T Tests were conducted. The independent sample T Test helps researchers to determine whether there is significant difference between two groups of respondents. The first independent T Test was run to test whether there is statistically significant difference between the means of completed and incompleted surveys. One question from each dimensions of organizational justice was selected; therefore, four questions were entered into independent T Test. Table 3 presents the T Test results for the mean of four dimensions organizational justice. The T Test results indicate there were no significant differences in mean of procedural justice, interpersonal justice and informational justice between the completed and incompleted surveys. However, the T Test result shows that there was a significant difference in mean of distributive justice between the completed and incompleted surveys ($t(211) = -2.246, p < 0.05$). The perceived distributive justice level for respondents who completed the surveys ($M=3.51, SD=1.28$) was higher than the perceived distributive justice level for respondents who incompleted the surveys ($M=2.71, SD=1.38$).

Table 3. Group Difference for justice dimensions (completed and incompleted surveys)

	Completed		Incompleted		df	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Distributive	3.51	1.28	2.71	1.38	211	-2.246*
Procedural	3.77	1.21	3.80	0.63	12.608	0.906
Interpersonal	4.45	0.79	4.40	0.60	217	0.795
Informational	4.25	0.95	4.00	0.82	213	0.306

Note. N=199 * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

The second independent T Test was conducted to test whether there is statistically significant different between the means of two sample population (larger study VS. social media networks). One question from each dimensions of organizational justice was selected; therefore,

four questions were entered into independent T Test. The T Test results indicate there were no significant differences in mean of procedural justice, interpersonal justice and informational justice between the two-sample population.

Table 4. Group Difference for justice dimensions (two sample populations)

	Large study		Social media		df	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Distributive	3.36	1.385	3.7	1.136	196.995	-1.915
Procedural	3.72	1.261	3.83	1.144	197	-0.63
Interpersonal	4.53	0.752	4.34	0.81	197	1.692
Informational	4.18	1.02	4.31	0.882	197	-0.933

Note. N=199 *p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001

4.3 Exploratory factor analysis for organizational justice

This study used four dimensions of organizational justice. To assess the dimensionality of organizational justice, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted. Bartlett's test of sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test were performed to ensure the sampling adequacy. The results indicate that KMO was 0.924 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was $\chi^2 = 3552.198$, $p < 0.001$ (see Table 5), which demonstrate that the study data were adequate and appropriate for principal component analysis (Norusis, 1998). Therefore, this study applied a principal component analysis (PCA) with a varimax rotation to identify organizational justice. As a result, 19 items were retained, representing four organizational justice dimensions, explaining 78.21% of the total variance.

Table 3 shows the results of EFA for organizational justice, including factor analysis, eigenvalues and variance explained. Four factors were identified for organizational justice. The first dimension, distributive justice (four items), explained 15.197% variance. The second dimension, procedural justice (six items), explained 49.766% variance. The third dimension, interpersonal justice (four items), explained 5.764% variance. The fourth dimension, informational justice (five items), explained 7.487% variance.

To ensure the reliability of the constructs, reliability tests were conducted on each of the four constructs to analyze the internal consistency of factors. The Cronbach's alpha (see Table 5) of each construct shows 0.971 for distributive justice, 0.935 for procedural justice, 0.846 for interpersonal justice, 0.901 for informational justice, respectively, indicating good to excellent internal consistency levels, as recommended by Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (1995).

Table 5. The exploratory factor analysis results of satisfaction scale (N=199)

Factor/Item	Factor Loading	Eigenvalues	Variance explained (%)	α
Distributive Justice		2.887	15.197	0.971
My compensation reflects the effort I put into my work.	0.911			
My compensation appropriate for the work I have completed.	0.926			
My compensation reflects what I have contributed to the organization.	0.930			
Consider about my performance, my compensation got justified.	0.938			
Procedural Justice		9.455	49.766	0.935
Job decisions are made by the supervisors or managers in an unbiased manner.	0.758			
My supervisors or managers makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.	0.799			
To make job decisions, my supervisors or managers collects accurate and complete information.	0.839			
My supervisors or managers clarify decisions and provides additional information when requested.	0.794			
Job decisions are applied consistently across all impacted employees.	0.790			
Employees are allowed to challenge, or appeal job decisions made by supervisors and/or managers.	0.740			
Interpersonal Justice		1.095	5.764	0.846
My coworkers, supervisors and managers treat me in a polite manner.	0.857			
My coworkers, supervisors and managers treat me with ethically.	0.823			
My coworkers, supervisors and managers treat me with respect.	0.825			
My coworkers, supervisors and managers do not make inappropriate remarks and/or comments in our daily interactions.	0.584			
Informational Justice		1.423	7.487	0.901
My supervisor and/or manager has been candid and open in their communication with me.	0.708			
My supervisor and/or manager has thoroughly explained the rationale behind my current pay level.	0.717			

The rationale behind my current pay level, as explained by my supervisor and/or manager, was clear and reasonable.	0.706
My supervisor and/or manager communicates information to me in a timely manner.	0.747
My supervisor and/or manager explains information and details in a personalized manner.	0.703

Note. KMO Sampling Adequacy test = 0.924; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: $\chi^2 = 3552.198$, $p < 0.001$; Total variance explained = 78.21%.

4.4 Exploratory factor analysis for satisfaction and turnover intention

To assess the dimensionality of satisfaction and turnover intention, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted. Bartlett's test of sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test were performed to ensure the sampling adequacy. The results indicate that KMO was 0.937 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was $\chi^2 = 4874.728$, $p < 0.001$ (see Table 6), which demonstrate that the study data were adequate and appropriate for principal component analysis (Norusis, 1998). Therefore, this study applied a principal component analysis (PCA) with a varimax rotation to identify satisfaction. As a result, 25 items were retained, representing four satisfaction dimensions, explaining 78.66% of the total variance.

Table 6 shows the results of EFA for satisfaction, including factor analysis, eigenvalues and variance explained. Five factors were identified for satisfaction. The first factor, satisfaction with pay level and raises (seven items), explained 49.032% variance. The second factor, satisfaction with pay structure and administration (seven items), explained 10.541% variance. The third factor, satisfaction with benefit (four items), explained 8.502% variance. The fourth factor, job satisfaction (four items), explained 6.283% variance. The fifth factor, turnover intention (three items), explained 4.299% variance. The results indicate three dimensions of pay satisfaction, which is different from the previous studies proposed four dimensions (Heneman & Schwab, 1985).

The reliability alpha (see Table 6) of each construct shows 0.944 for pay level and raises satisfaction, 0.908 for pay structure and administration satisfaction, 0.969 for benefit satisfaction, 0.906 for job satisfaction and 0.935 for turnover intention, respectively, indicating excellent internal consistency levels (Hair et al., 1995).

Table 6. The exploratory factor analysis results of satisfaction scale (N=199)

Factor/Item	Factor Loading	Eigenvalues	Variance explained (%)	α
Pay level and raises satisfaction		12.258	49.032	0.944
My overall level of pay.	0.843			
My current salary.	0.837			
Size of my current salary.	0.825			
My take-home pay.	0.789			
My most recent raise.	0.778			
The raises I have typically received in the past.	0.725			
How my raises are determined.	0.601			
Pay structure and administration satisfaction		2.635	10.541	0.908
Differences in pay among jobs in the company.	0.810			
Pay of other jobs in the company.	0.775			
Consistency of the company's pay policies.	0.713			
How the company administers pay.	0.632			
Information the company gives about pay issues of concern to me.	0.552			
The company's pay structure.	0.531			
Influence my supervisor has on my pay.	0.423			
Benefit satisfaction		2.126	8.502	0.969
My benefit packages.	0.900			
The number of benefits I receive.	0.898			
The value of my benefits.	0.891			
Amount the company pays toward my benefits.	0.867			
Job satisfaction		1.571	6.283	0.906
I am satisfied with my supervisor.	0.814			
I am satisfied with my organization.	0.807			
I am satisfied with the support provided by my organization.	0.769			
I am satisfied with my job.	0.699			
Turnover intention		1.057	4.299	0.935
I plan to be leaving my current place of work within the next year.	0.940			
I plan to be looking for a new job within the next year.	0.921			

I often think about quitting my current job.

0.811

Note. *KMO Sampling Adequacy test = 0.937; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: $\chi^2 = 4874.728, p < 0.001$; Total variance explained = 78.66%.*

4.5 Hierarchical regression analysis

To test all the hypotheses, four hierarchical regression analysis were conducted. The study selected respondents' gender, industry, tenure in current organization and positions as control variables. Industry was selected because people who work in different industry may have different criteria when they evaluate their organizational justice, pay satisfaction and job satisfaction. Gender has been related to organizational justice and pay satisfaction in the past (Clay-Warner, Culatta, & James, 2013). S.O. and Bolade. O. (2014) found employees job tenure significantly influence their job satisfaction.

The overall model included 44 measurements items. In order to run regression analysis in SPSS, new constructs were created upon merging all of the independent factors for each variable. The descriptive statistics of items used for data analysis were conducted before running the regression analysis. Among all constructs, interpersonal justice had the highest mean score ($\bar{x} = 4.34$, $SD = 0.72$), followed by informational justice ($\bar{x} = 3.93$, $SD = 0.95$), job satisfaction ($\bar{x} = 3.89$, $SD = 0.97$), procedural justice ($\bar{x} = 3.72$, $SD = 1.05$), and distributive justice ($\bar{x} = 3.49$, $SD = 1.26$). The variables of pay satisfaction ($\bar{x} = 3.33$, $SD = 0.91$) and turnover intention ($\bar{x} = 2.76$, $SD = 1.45$) have relatively lower mean value.

To test the data normality, which refers to shape of the distribution of data (Hair Jr, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010), both Skewness and Kurtosis test was performed to ensure the data was normally distributed. Based on the suggestion given by Kline (2011), the absolute value of Skewness lower than 3 and Kurtosis value lower than 10 are acceptable. Therefore, the absolute values of Skewness of all items in this study (-0.147 to 1.786) are within acceptable range (<3) and the absolute values of Kurtosis of all items in this study (-0.237 to 4.511) are within acceptable range (<10).

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of items used for data analysis

	N	M	SD	Skewness		Kurtosis	
				Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Control variables							
Gender	199	1.59	0.493	-0.381	0.172	-1.74	0.343
Industry	199	2.94	0.925	1.786	0.172	4.511	0.343
Tenure in organization	199	2.76	1.592	0.340	0.172	-1.462	0.343
Position	199	2.55	1.104	0.070	0.172	-1.346	0.343
Constructs							
Distributive Justice	199	3.49	1.26	-0.496	0.172	-0.933	0.343
Procedural Justice	199	3.72	1.05	-0.718	0.172	-0.237	0.343
Interpersonal Justice	199	4.34	0.72	-1.259	0.172	2.068	0.343
Informational Justice	199	3.93	0.95	-0.695	0.172	-0.214	0.343
Pay satisfaction	199	3.33	0.91	-0.021	0.172	-0.759	0.343
Job satisfaction	199	3.89	0.97	-0.659	0.172	-0.413	0.343
Turnover Intention	199	2.76	1.45	0.157	0.172	-1.408	0.343
Pay level and raises satisfaction	199	3.30	1.06	-0.294	0.172	-0.721	0.343
Pay structure and administration satisfaction	199	3.36	0.91	-0.147	0.172	-0.500	0.343
Benefit satisfaction	199	3.36	1.27	-0.380	0.172	-0.985	0.343
Pay structure and administration satisfaction	199	3.36	0.91	-0.147	0.172	-0.500	0.343
Benefit satisfaction	199	3.36	1.27	-0.380	0.172	-0.985	0.343

4.5.1 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for pay satisfaction

To investigate whether all four dimensions of organizational justice contributed to explain the variance in pay satisfaction as dependent variables, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to test the proposed hypotheses (see Table 8). Before running the analysis, this study collapsed industry into three groups: accommodations (N=51), food and beverage services (N=126) and other industries (N=22), because the majority of participants work for accommodation and food and beverage service industries. This study used a three-step hierarchical regression analysis to show that adding organizational justice explained more variance in pay satisfaction than the control variables did. In the first step, respondents' gender was entered as a control variable. In the second step, three work characteristics (i.e., industry, tenure in current organization and position) were also entered as control variables; these three control variables are related to employees' working experiences, which may have different impacts on their pay and job satisfaction when compared to their demographic information, such as gender. In the third step, the four dimensions of organizational justice predicting pay satisfaction were entered in addition to the control variables.

As shown in the Table 8, gender was entered as a control variable into the regression in the first step. However, the results show that gender cannot predict pay satisfaction because R^2 (0.132 or 13.2%) was not significant at $F = 3.471$, $p > 0.05$. In the second step, employees' work characteristics were entered to regression model. As Table 8 indicates, industry significantly predicates pay satisfaction. The results show that people who work in accommodations ($\beta = -0.260$, $p < 0.05$) and food and beverage services ($\beta = -0.249$, $p < 0.05$) tend to have lower pay satisfaction when compare to people who work in other industries (i.e., transportation, recreation and entertainment, travel service). It is also interesting that the study results show that the

participants who worked for their current organizations between 7 to 9 years ($\beta = -0.231$, $p < 0.05$) demonstrate lower pay satisfaction when compared to those who have worked more than 10 years. Moreover, frontline employees tend to develop lower pay satisfaction when compared to top managers. In Step 2, with three work characteristics (industry, tenure in current organization and position), demonstrated an improvement over the earlier model, with an R^2 of 0.141, explaining 14.1% of the variance ($F = 3.085$, $p < 0.01$). In the third step, the four dimensions of organizational justice were added to the regression model. The results shows four dimensions of justice significantly contributed to the model, which explained 55.7% variance in the pay satisfaction ($F = 16.444$, $p < 0.001$). The relative importance of each dimension was tested using regression weight. Distributive justice was likely to have the most significant effect on predicting pay satisfaction. The result indicates that distributive justice ($\beta = 0.557$, $p < 0.001$) and procedural justice ($\beta = 0.206$, $p < 0.05$) have unique contribution to predict pay satisfaction. Hypotheses 1a and 2a were supported (see Table 12). Both interpersonal justice ($\beta = -0.118$, ns) and informational justice ($\beta = 0.080$, ns) did not influence employees' pay satisfaction. Hypotheses 3a and 4a were not supported (see Table 12). In this step, the regression weight for frontline employees changed significantly changed when the four dimensions of organizational justice were entered ($\beta = -0.104$, ns).

Table 8. HRA results for pay satisfaction

	Pay Satisfaction		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Gender (Female)			
Male	0.132	0.115	0.071
Industry (Other)			
Accommodation	—	-0.260*	-0.306***
Food & beverage	—	-0.249*	-0.266**
Tenure in current organization (>10 years)			
Less than 1 year	—	-0.031	-0.091
1 to 3 years	—	-0.008	-0.061
4 to 6 years	—	-0.078	-0.021
7 to 9 years	—	-0.231*	-0.127*
Position (Top-level management)			
Mid-level management	—	-0.111	0.029
Entry-level management	—	-0.123	0.024
Front line employees	—	-0.281*	-0.104
Distributive Justice	—	—	0.557***
Procedural Justice	—	—	0.206*
Interpersonal Justice	—	—	-0.118
Informational Justice	—	—	0.080
R ²	0.017	0.141	0.556
ΔR ²	0.017	0.124	0.415
F	3.471	3.085**	16.444***

Note. N=199. *p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001

4.5.2 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for job satisfaction

After testing the relationship between the four dimensions of organizational justice and pay satisfaction, the three-step procedures were repeated for job satisfaction. As shown in Table 9, respondents' gender was entered in the first step as a control variable. In step 1, R^2 (0.079 or 0.79 %) was not significant at $F = 1.235$, $p > 0.05$; this shows that gender could not predict job satisfaction. In the second step, the respondents' work characteristics were entered as control variables. The results indicate that position significantly predicts job satisfaction. As Table 9 indicates, frontline employees ($\beta = -0.520$, $p < 0.001$), entry-level managers ($\beta = -0.413$, $p < 0.001$) and mid-level managers ($\beta = -0.305$, $p < 0.01$) tend to demonstrate lower job satisfaction when compare to top managers. In step 2, respondents' work characteristics (industry, tenure in current organization and position), produced a greater value of $R^2 = 0.157$, explaining 15.7% of the variance ($F = 3.491$, $p < 0.001$). The four dimensions of organizational justice were entered in the third step. The results indicate that procedural justice ($\beta = 0.291$, $p < 0.001$) was the most significant predictor in explaining job satisfaction, followed by informational justice ($\beta = 0.252$, $p < 0.01$) and distributive justice ($\beta = 0.239$, $p < 0.001$). Hypotheses 1b, 2b, and 4b were supported (see Table 12). Step 3 shows that four dimensions of organizational justice significantly contributed to the model, which explain the additional 43.1% variance of job satisfaction (58.8%) ($F = 18.737$, $p < 0.001$). In particular, the effect of interpersonal justice ($\beta = 0.101$, ns) was non-significant. Thus, interpersonal justice does not influence employees' job satisfaction in this model and hypothesis 3b was not supported (see Table 12).

Table 9. HRA results for job satisfaction

	Job Satisfaction		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Gender (Female)			
Male	0.079	0.046	-0.005
Industry (Other)			
Accommodation	—	-0.081	-0.139
Food & beverage	—	-0.051	-0.089
Tenure in current organization (>10 years)			
Less than 1 year	—	0.124	-0.017
1 to 3 years	—	0.085	0.012
4 to 6 years	—	-0.026	0.024
7 to 9 years	—	-0.086	0.038
Position (Top-level management)			
Mid-level management	—	-0.305**	-0.141*
Entry-level management	—	-0.413***	-0.192*
Front line employees	—	-0.520***	-0.225*
Distributive Justice	—	—	0.239***
Procedural Justice	—	—	0.291***
Interpersonal Justice	—	—	0.098
Informational Justice	—	—	0.252**
R ²	0.006	0.157	0.588
ΔR ²	0.006	0.150	0.431
F	1.235	3.491***	18.737***

Note. N=199. *p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001

4.5.3 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for job satisfaction (with pay satisfaction)

To investigate whether pay satisfaction contributed to explaining job satisfaction as a dependent variable, hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted (see Table 10). As shown in the Table 10, gender was entered as a control variable into the regression in the first step. However, the results show that gender cannot predict pay satisfaction because R^2 (0.006 or 0.6%) was not significant at $F = 1.235$, $p > 0.05$. In the second step, employees' work characteristics were entered to regression model. The results indicate that position significantly predicts job satisfaction. frontline employees ($\beta = -0.520$, $p < 0.001$), entry-level managers ($\beta = -0.413$, $p < 0.001$) and mid-level managers ($\beta = -0.305$, $p < 0.01$) tend to demonstrate lower job satisfaction when compare to top managers. In step 2, respondents' work characteristics (industry, tenure in current organization and position), produced a greater value of $R^2 = 0.157$, explaining 15.7% of the variance ($F = 3.491$, $p < 0.001$). The results indicate that procedural justice ($\beta = 0.291$, $p < 0.001$) was the most significant predictor in explaining job satisfaction, followed by informational justice ($\beta = 0.252$, $p < 0.01$) and distributive justice ($\beta = 0.239$, $p < 0.001$). Step 3 shows that four dimensions of organizational justice significantly contributed to the model, which explain the additional 43.1% variance of job satisfaction (58.8%) ($F = 18.737$, $p < 0.001$). In step 4, pay satisfaction was entered to test whether pay satisfaction contributed to explain job satisfaction. The results indicate that pay satisfaction was a predictor of job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.400$, $p < 0.001$) and pay satisfaction also significantly contributed to the model, which explain the additional 7.1% variance of job satisfaction (65.9%) ($F = 23.569$, $p < 0.001$).

Table 10. HRA results for job satisfaction (with pay satisfaction)

	Job Satisfaction			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
Gender (Female)				
Male	0.079	0.046	-0.005	-0.033
Industry (Other)				
Accommodation	—	-0.081	-0.139	-0.016
Food & beverage	—	-0.051	-0.089	0.017
Tenure in current organization (>10 years)				
Less than 1 year	—	0.124	-0.017	0.019
1 to 3 years	—	0.085	0.012	0.036
4 to 6 years	—	-0.026	0.024	0.032
7 to 9 years	—	-0.086	0.038	0.089
Position (Top-level management)				
Mid-level management	—	-0.305**	-0.141*	-0.153*
Entry-level management	—	-0.413***	-0.192*	-0.202*
Front line employees	—	-0.520***	-0.225*	-0.184*
Distributive Justice	—	—	0.239***	0.016
Procedural Justice	—	—	0.291***	0.209*
Interpersonal Justice	—	—	0.098	0.145*
Informational Justice	—	—	0.252**	0.220*
Pay satisfaction	—	—	—	0.400***
R ²	0.006	0.157	0.588	0.659
ΔR ²	0.006	0.150	0.431	0.071
F	1.235	3.491***	18.737***	23.569***

Note. N=199. *p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001

4.5.4 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for turnover intention

To investigate whether pay satisfaction and job satisfaction contributed to explaining turnover intention as a dependent variable, hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to test the proposed hypotheses (see Table 11). As shown in the Table 11, respondents' gender was entered in step 1. The result indicates that males tend to have less turnover intention when compare to females ($\beta = -0.183$, $p < 0.05$). At step 1, R^2 (0.034 or 3.4%) was significant at $F = 6.853$, $p < 0.05$; this shows that gender is a predictor of employees' turnover intention, but it only explains 3.4% variance in employees' turnover intention. The work characteristics were entered in the second step as control variables. The result demonstrates that employees who have worked for their current organizations for a period between 1 to 3 years ($\beta = -0.179$, $p < 0.05$) demonstrate higher turnover intention when compare to those who have worked for more than 10 years. Furthermore, frontline employees ($\beta = 0.288$, $p < 0.05$) and entry-level managers ($\beta = 0.190$, $p < 0.05$) tend to have higher turnover intention when compare to top managers. In step 2, with three work characteristics (industry, tenure in current organization and position) produced an improvement over the earlier model, explaining 14.6% of the variance ($F = 4.383$, $p < 0.001$). Four dimensions of organizational justice were entered in the third step. The results indicate that organizational justice contributed to the model, which explains the additional amount of 10% variance of turnover intention (28.9%) ($F = 5.345$, $p < 0.001$). In step 4, three dimensions of pay satisfaction (pay level and raises satisfaction, pay structure satisfaction and benefit satisfaction) were entered. The results present that none of the pay satisfaction dimensions were significantly related to turnover intention. Hypothesis 5 was not supported (see Table 12.). Job satisfaction was entered in step 5. The results indicate that job satisfaction contributed to the model, which explains the additional amount of 9% variance of

turnover intention (40.8%) ($F = 6.905$, $p < 0.001$). Job satisfaction is a significant predictor of turnover intention ($\beta = -0.524$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, hypothesis 6 was supported.

To ensure all the constructs have no multicollinearity issues, variance inflation factors (VIF) was tested. As indicates in Table 11, the value of all the VIF were below 10, ranging from 1.294 to 3.753, which demonstrate that these constructs have no multicollinearity issues (Stevens, 2002).

Table 11. HRA results for turnover intention

	Turnover Intention					Collinearity Statistics	
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Tolerance	VIF
Gender (female)							
Male	-0.183*	-0.119	-0.096	-0.089	-0.107	0.773	1.294
Industry (other)							
Accommodation	—	0.084	0.092	0.037	0.028	0.356	2.812
Food & beverage	—	0.122	0.124	0.073	0.087	0.345	2.901
Tenure in current organization (>10 years)							
Less than 1 year	—	0.169	0.205*	0.190	0.196	0.438	2.284
1 to 3 years	—	0.179*	0.192*	0.179	0.196*	0.551	1.814
4 to 6 years	—	0.150	0.098*	0.112	0.120	0.639	1.564
7 to 9 years	—	0.075	0.010	-0.010	0.035	0.754	1.326
Position (Top-level management)							
Mid-level management	—	0.047	-0.024	-0.064	-0.124	0.456	2.195
Entry-level management	—	0.190*	0.085	0.096	-0.008	0.426	2.348
Front line employees	—	0.288*	0.165	0.160	0.063	0.341	2.936
Distributive justice	—	—	-0.224**	-0.088	-0.076	0.395	2.532
Procedural justice	—	—	-0.019	0.030	0.124	0.391	2.559
Interpersonal justice	—	—	-0.128	-0.154	-0.083	0.486	2.056
Informational justice	—	—	-0.062	-0.036	0.080	0.358	2.795
Pay level and raises satisfaction	—	—	—	-0.104	-0.064	0.266	3.753
Pay structure satisfaction	—	—	—	-0.206	-0.026	0.299	3.348
Benefit satisfaction	—	—	—	0.101	0.120	0.539	1.855
Job Satisfaction	—	—	—	—	-0.524***	0.327	3.057
R ²	0.034	0.189	0.289	0.319	0.408		

ΔR^2	0.034	0.155	0.100	0.029	0.090
F	6.853*	4.383***	5.354***	4.982***	6.905***

Note. N=199. *p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001

Table 12. Results of Regression Analysis

Hypotheses	Result
H1a: Distributive Justice → Pay Satisfaction (+)	Supported
H1b: Distributive Justice → Job Satisfaction (+)	Supported
H2a: Procedural Justice → Pay Satisfaction (+)	Supported
H2b: Procedural Justice → Job Satisfaction (+)	Supported
H3a: Interpersonal Justice → Pay Satisfaction (+)	Not Supported
H3b: Interpersonal Justice → Job Satisfaction (+)	Not Supported
H4a: Informational Justice → Pay Satisfaction (+)	Not Supported
H4b: Informational Justice → Job Satisfaction (+)	Supported
H5: Pay Satisfaction → Turnover Intention (-)	Not Supported
H6: Job Satisfaction → Turnover Intention (-)	Supported

4.6 Sobel Tests

Based on the results from last two hierarchical regression analysis (see Table 10. &11.), the might be potential mediation effects of pay and job satisfaction on the relationship between each of the dimensions of organizational justice on turnover intention. To explore these potential mediation effects, the Sobel test statistics were calculated (see Table 13.) with the assistance of on-line interactive calculator used in prior studies of mediation effect (Jung & Yon, 2016); the calculator used the input betas and standard errors from the included completed regression calculations in this study (Sobel, 1982). Results from the Sobel test demonstrate that the impact on turnover intention by all four dimensions of justice appears to be mediated through pay and job satisfaction respectively. Additional exploration of these mediation effects are beyond the scope of this current study but should be examined in future research.

Table 13. Mediation effects of pay and job satisfaction on justice and turnover intention (N=199)

	a	b	sa	sb	Test Stat	Sd Err	pVal
DJ - PS - TI	0.475	-0.447	0.038	0.140	-3.094	0.069	0.002
DJ - JS - TI	0.401	-0.728	0.047	0.105	-5.381	0.054	0.000
PJ - PS - TI	0.369	-0.499	0.055	0.116	-3.621	0.051	0.000
PS - JS - TI	0.597	-0.908	0.050	0.117	-6.510	0.083	0.000
IntJ - PS - TI	0.296	-0.493	0.086	0.106	-2.096	0.050	0.004
IntJ - JS - TI	0.708	-0.743	0.080	0.106	-5.495	0.096	0.000
InfJ - PS - TI	0.418	-0.510	0.060	0.117	-3.685	0.058	0.000
InfJ - JS - TI	0.655	-0.923	0.055	0.116	-6.616	0.091	0.000

DJ: Distributive justice; PJ: Procedural justice; IntJ: Interpersonal justice; InfJ: Informational justice; PS: Pay satisfaction; JS: Job satisfaction; TI: Turnover intention.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

The current study investigates the relationship among the four dimensions of organizational justice, pay satisfaction, and job satisfaction as well as the relationship among pay satisfaction, job satisfaction, and turnover intention in the hospitality and tourism industry in Canada.

The results indicate that employees' perception of higher-levels of distributive justice significantly influences their satisfaction with their pay. This finding is consistent with those of previous studies that found distributive justice to positively affect pay satisfaction (Jawahar & Stone, 2011; Till & Karren, 2011). Therefore, when employees perceive that outcomes related to their efforts are fair, they are more likely to be satisfied with their pay. Procedural justice is positively related to employees' pay satisfaction. This finding indicated that, when employees consider all formal rules and policies affecting them as fair, they are more likely to be satisfied with their pay. This finding is congruent with the past research that finds that procedural justice is strongly related to pay level satisfaction (Tekleab et al., 2005).

However, no significant relationship has been found between interpersonal justice and pay satisfaction. It is notable that the mean of interpersonal justice scale is 4.34, which indicates that most respondents believe that their managers, supervisors and coworkers treat them with dignity and respect. However, such respect and dignity from coworkers and supervisors does not influence employees' pay satisfaction directly. This result indicates that study respondents are well-educated workers, which is also consistent with the respondents' demographic characteristics that more than half of the respondents (60.4%) had an undergraduate or graduate degree. Supervisors have little power in influencing employees' pay level and pay equity adjustment processes; therefore, no matter how satisfied employees feel with the way supervisors

communicate with them, it does not change their perceptions of pay satisfaction. The study also find no significant relationship between informational justice and pay satisfaction. This result may have arisen because, when supervisors spent extra time explaining employees' pay levels to them, it led employees to the perception that the organization's compensation program is not administered properly or that they may have come to perceive the compensation program itself to be flawed (Day, 2011). If the compensation program is fair and well developed, such extra explanations will be unnecessary to employees.

The results reveal that both distributive justice and procedural justice are positively related to employees' job satisfaction. The results indicate that, if employees perceive fairness in the rewards they receive from organizations and the decision-making process, they are more likely to be satisfied with their job. This finding confirms the proposition by Lambert et al.'s (2007) that procedural justice represents employees' perception of legitimacy in their organizations; therefore, if employees perceive procedural justice, they are more likely to evaluate their job more positively. Standard coefficients show that procedural justice has a stronger impact on job satisfaction than distributive justice does (see Table 5). This indicates that employees' perceived fairness of organization procedures has a greater effect on their job satisfaction than their perceived fairness of wages, salary or incentives. The study results also indicate that employees' informational justice is positively related to their job satisfaction, which confirms the findings by Colquitt et al.' (2001) proposition that employees who received fair explanations and open communications from their supervisors are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs. However, no significant connection was found between interpersonal justice and job satisfaction. This result may have arisen because employees' job satisfaction depends on several factors, which means there might be some mediating factors influencing the relationship

between interpersonal justice and job satisfaction. For example, previous research found that organizational size mediates the relationship between interpersonal justice and job satisfaction (Schminke et al., 2000). The current study did not use organization size as a control variable, and the relationship between interpersonal justice and job satisfaction still needs further investigation with different mediators in the relationship. Because Schminke et al. (2000) believe that employees in larger organizations are less likely to interact and communicate with their supervisors and managers and these factors may influence employees' job satisfaction level. An additional finding from the relationship between the four dimensions of organizational justice and job satisfaction shows that frontline employees and entry-level managers tend to develop less job satisfaction when compare to top-level managers. A recent survey done by the American Psychological Association indicated that senior managers are more likely to view their workplace positively when compare to frontline employees (Poll, 2015). This is because senior managers believe that they can participate in training activities, be involved in decision-making process, and have flexible work practice (Poll, 2015). This finding highlights the importance of involving frontline employees and entry-level managers in organizations' decision-making process. It also demonstrates that top managers are more likely to have different perceptions of their organizations from those of employees.

It is notable that pay satisfaction does not have a direct relationship with employees' turnover intention. This result can be justified for two reasons. Firstly, it is possible that the current study setting is different from other studies. Previous research has revealed that pay satisfaction has a direct negative influence on employees' turnover intention among Canadian nurses (Singh & Loncar, 2010). However, the current study investigates the relationship between pay satisfaction and turnover intention in the hospitality and tourism setting. Most jobs in these

industries require employees to work long hours and during holidays. Therefore, one possible explanation of this result is that, even though employees are satisfied with their pay, they are likely still to have reasons to want to leave their current jobs. Secondly, it is possible that some mediating factors may influence the relationship between these variables. Past research has indicated that employees' work engagement can mediate the relationship between pay satisfaction and turnover intention (Memon, Salleh, & Baharom, 2017). They believe that when employees are satisfied with their pay level, they are more likely to engage in their job and become energetic and enthusiastic individuals in their work environment and less likely to leave their organizations. Therefore, consideration of such mediators within the current study will help to build up this relationship.

Job satisfaction is negatively related to turnover intention, which confirms results of previous studies that assert that employees' job dissatisfaction influences their intention to leave (Back et al., 2011; Tsai & Wu, 2010). The result implies that when employees have positive evaluations of their organizations, they are less likely to leave their current organizations.

CHAPTER 6: IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Theoretical Implications

This study has theoretical implications for research in the hospitality and tourism industry. First, the current study adopts the four dimensions of justice and investigates how each of them relate to both pay satisfaction and job satisfaction. In contrast with prior studies, which only focused on three dimensions of justice (i.e., distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) (Jawahar & Stone, 2011), this study separates interactional justice into two sub-dimensions and tests the relationship between interpersonal justice and informational justice to pay satisfaction and job satisfaction. Although we find no significant relationship between interpersonal justice and job satisfaction, we confirm the positive relationship between informational justice and job satisfaction. The study results also demonstrate that procedural justice has a stronger relationship with job satisfaction than do other justice dimensions.

Second, this study contributes to the existing literature by considering pay satisfaction and job satisfaction as two distinct constructs. Previous studies treated pay satisfaction as a component of job satisfaction, confirming that pay is an important criterion when employees evaluate their jobs (Tsai & Wu, 2010). However, also consistent with the arguments of previous studies, when employees are satisfied with their pay, they might still remain unsatisfied with their job (Judge et al., 2010). Therefore, the current study treats pay satisfaction and job satisfaction as different constructs and investigates how satisfaction constructs influence employee turnover intention in a Canadian hospitality and tourism setting. The results indicate that employees' pay satisfaction is not significantly related to their turnover intention, but their job satisfaction is negatively related to their turnover intention.

6.2 Practical Implications

The current study also provides practical implications for the hospitality and tourism industry. First, distributive justice ($\beta = 0.558$) is the strongest predictor for pay satisfaction among all dimensions of organizational justice. Procedural justice also plays an important role when employees evaluate their satisfaction level toward their pay. Therefore, managers should create a transparent and open environment within their organizations. Management may apply a pay transparency policy within their organizations, under which means organizations should disclose the information related to employees' compensation and allow employees information regarding their coworkers' wages and salaries. For instance, publish all employees' wages or salaries on organizations' official websites. By publishing employees' wages or salaries, employees can understand an organization's pay structure, and employees may also be more likely to be satisfied with their pay and become more productive and collaborative (Weller, 2017).

Second, management should develop fair procedures to maintain high job satisfaction among employees. However, it is also important to ensure that employees perceive that the end results of these procedures are fair. Therefore, managers can invite employees to become involved in the policy review process and ask employees for feedback after implementing new policies or procedures.

Finally, organizations should implement a policy that asks employees to fill out a staff satisfaction form every month. The study results indicate that employees' job satisfaction negatively affects turnover intention. If organizations can gauge employees' satisfaction level, it will help the management to understand their employees in time and influence employees' evaluation of their jobs. If they find that an employee has a lower level of job satisfaction,

supervisors can speak with the employee directly to determine their needs and concerns. As a result, employees may be less likely to leave their current organizations.

CHAPTER 7: LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study provides insights for social scientists and practitioners; however, it demonstrates some limitations. First, the study only involved participants who work in the Canadian hospitality and tourism industry; therefore, the study results may not be applicable to other countries or regions. To ensure the generalizability of the study results, future studies can test the effect of justice constructs, pay satisfaction, and job satisfaction on turnover intention in other demographics and cultures.

Second, the study participants include employees who work for several segments (i.e., accommodations, food and beverage services, transportation, entertainment, and tourism services) within the hospitality and tourism industry. In fact, people who work for different segments may perceive different levels of justice and concentrate on different criteria when they evaluate their pay and job. Future researchers can collect samples from a specific industry and engage in a deeper understanding of employees' perceived justice and its influence. It can also collect samples from different segments within the hospitality and tourism industry and compare the results among these segments to provide some insights into the industry.

Third, this study focuses only on the effect of the four dimensions of organizational justice on turnover intention through both pay and job satisfaction. Perreira, Berta, and Herbert (2018) find that interpersonal justice has a direct and negative impact on turnover intention among frontline nurses in Canada. Therefore, future study could investigate the direct relationship between organizational justice and turnover intention. Furthermore, the study indicates that pay satisfaction has a significant relationship with job satisfaction; therefore, there might be a mediator exist between pay satisfaction and turnover intention. Future studies should

investigate whether the relationship between pay satisfaction and turnover intention is mediated by job satisfaction, which is beyond the scope of this study.

Fifth, we argue the importance of interpersonal justice. Even though the current study did not find a significant relationship between interpersonal justice and pay satisfaction, it is also important for future studies to consider alternative models to further investigate the role of interpersonal justice. For instance, interpersonal justice might serve as a moderator to enhance the relationship between pay satisfaction and turnover intention.

Lastly, this study only received 199 useable surveys, which is considered as a small sample size. The study did not use confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural equation modeling (SEM), as both methods require 10 participants for each measurements (Nunnally, 1967). Thus, future studies may consider collecting more sample sizes and running both CFA and SEM. By using these analyses, researcher can build a complex model and test the predictors for multiple dependent variables (Yu & Downes, 2016).

References

- Adams, J. S., & Jacobsen, P. (1964). Effects of wage inequities on work. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 69*(1), 19–25.
- Akgunduz, Y., & Cin, F. M. (2015). Job embeddedness as a moderator of the effect of manager trust and distributive justice on turnover intentions. *Anatolia, 26*(4), 549–562. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2015.1020504>
- Alicke, M. D., Klotz, M. L., Breitenbecher, D. L., Yurak, T. J., & Vredenburg, D. S. (1995). Personal contact, individuation, and the above average effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 804–825.
- Amundsen, S., & Martinsen, O. L. (2014). Self–other agreement in empowering leadership: Relationships with leader effectiveness and subordinates’ job satisfaction and turnover intention☆. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*, 784–800.
- Andersson-Straberg, T., Sverke, M., & Hellgren, J. (2007). Perceptions of Justice in Connection with Individualized Pay Setting. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 28*(3), 431–464. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X07079356>
- Armeli, S., Eisenberger, R., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Affective Commitment to the Organization: The Contribution of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(5), 825–836.
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. W. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 267–285. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.138>
- Back, K.-J., Lee, C.-K., & Abbott, J. (2011). Internal Relationship Marketing: Korean Casino Employees’ Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *Human Resources Management, 52*(2), 111–124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965510370742>
- Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (in)justice: The sacred and the profane. In *Advances in organizational justice* (J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano, pp. 89–118). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bies, R. J. (2005). Are procedural justice and interactional justice conceptually distinct? In *Handbook of organizational justice* (J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquit, pp. 85–112). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In *Research on negotiations in organizations* (R.J. Lewicki, B.H. Sheppard, B.H. Bazerman, Vol. 1, pp. 43–55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Bufquin, D., DiPietro, R. B., Partlow, C., & Smith, S. J. (2018). Differences in social evaluations and their effects on employee job attitudes and turnover intentions in a restaurant setting. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 17(3), 375–396.
- Burns, A. C., & Bush, R. F. (1995). *Marketing Research*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Chen, I.-H., Brown, R., Bowers, B. J., & Chang, W.-Y. (2015). Work-to-family conflict as a mediator of the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 71(10), 2350–2363.
- Chiang, F. F. T., & Birtch, T. A. (2010). Pay for performance and work attitudes: The mediating role of employee–organization service value congruence. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29, 632–640. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.11.005>
- Choudhury, R. R., & Gupta, V. (2011). Impact of Age on Pay Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction Leading to Turnover Intention: A Study of Young Working Professionals in India. *Management and Labour Studies*, 36(4), 354–358.
- Chuang, N.-K., Yin, D., & Dellmann-Jenkins, M. (2009). *Intrinsic and extrinsic factors impacting casino hotel chefs' job satisfaction*. 21(3), 323–340.
- Clay-Warner, J., Culatta, E., & James, K. R. (2013). Gender and Organizational Justice Preferences. *Sociology Compass*, 7(12), 1074–1084.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.386>
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & 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), 425–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Colquitt, J. A., & Zipay, K. P. (2015). Justice, fairness and employee reactions. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2, 75–99.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: tunneling through the maze. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 317–372.
- Dawes, J. G. (2008). Do data characteristics change according to the number of scale points used? An experiment using 5 point, 7 point and 10 point scales. *International Journal of Market Research*, 50(1), 61–88.
- Day, N. E. (2011). Perceived pay communication, justice and pay satisfaction. *Employee Relations*, 33(5), 476–497. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425451111153862>

- DeConinck, J. B. (2010). The effect of organizational justice, perceived organizational support, and perceived supervisor support on marketing employees' level of trust. *Journal of Business Research*, *63*, 1349–1355.
- DeConinck, J. B., & Stilwell, C. D. (2004). Incorporating organizational justice, role states, pay satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction in a model of turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, *57*(3), 225–231. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(02\)00289-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00289-8)
- DeConinck, J. B., Stilwell, C. D., & Brock, B. A. (1996). A construct validity analysis of scores on measures of distributive justice and pay satisfaction. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *56*(6), 1026–1036.
- Demir, M. (2011). Effects of organizational justice, trust and commitment on employees' deviant behavior. *Anatolia*, *22*(2), 204–221. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2011.597934>
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for organizational research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 611–628.
- Dreher, G. F. (1980). Salary Satisfaction and Community Costs. *Research Notes*, *19*(3), 340–345.
- Ehrhart, K. H., Witt, L. A., Schneider, B., & Perry, S. J. (2011). *Service Employees Give as They Get: Internal Service as a Moderator of the Service Climate–Service Outcomes Link*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*(2), 423–431.
- Elliott, C. (2018). *Restaurant outlook survey* (pp. 1–10). Restaurants Canada.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A Theory of Social Comparison Processes. *Human Relations*, *7*(2), 117–140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675400700202>
- 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.
- Game, A. M., & Crawshaw, J. R. (2015). A Question of Fit: Cultural and Individual Differences in Interpersonal Justice Perceptions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *144*(2), 279–291. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2824-9>
- Ghorbanalizadeh, F., & Tayebi, S. M. (2012). Impact of Organizational Justice Perceptions on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: the Iran's Ministry of Sport Perspective. *Applied Science*, *6*(7), 179–188.
- Ghosh, P., Rai, A., & Sinha, A. (2014). Organizational justice and employee engagement: Exploring the linkage in public sector banks in India. *Personnel Review*, *43*(4), 628–652. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-08-2013-0148>

- Goodman, P. S. (1974). An examination of referents used in the evaluation of pay. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 12, 170–195.
- Green, S. B. (1991). How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis? *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 26, 499–510.
- Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management*. (Russel Cropanzano (Ed.), pp. 79–103). Erlbaum, Hillsdale, N.J.
- Greenberg, J. (1994). Using socially fair treatment to promote acceptance of a work-site smoking ban. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 288–297.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate data Analysis* (4th ed.). NJ: Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Black, J. W., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, E. R. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (Seventh). Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.
- Han, S. J., Bonn, M. A., & Cho, M. (2016). The relationship between customer incivility, restaurant frontline service employee burnout and turnover intention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 52, 97–106.
- Harris, M. M., Anseel, F., & Lievens, F. (2008). Keeping up with the Joneses: a field study of the relationships among upward, lateral, and downward comparisons and pay level satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 665–673.
- Hartline, M. D., & Ferrell, O. C. (1996). The management of customer-contact service employees: an empirical investigation. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(4), 52–70.
- Heathfield, S. M. (2018). Top 10 Reasons Why Employees Quit Their Jobs. Retrieved from the balance careers website: <https://www.thebalancecareers.com/top-reasons-why-employees-quit-their-job-1918985>
- Hellriegel, D., Slocum, Jr., J. W., Woodman, R. W., & Bruning, N. S. (1998). *Organizational Behaviour* (Canadian Eighth Edition). International Thomsom Publishing Company Nelson.
- Heneman, H. G., & Schwab, D. P. (1985). Pay satisfaction: Its multidimensional nature and measurement. *International Journal of Psychology*, 20, 129–141.
- Holtz, B. C., & Harold, C. M. (2012). Effects of leadership consideration and structure on employee perceptions of justice and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behaviors*, 34(4), 492–519.

- Howard, L. W. (1999). Validity evidence for measures of procedural/distributive justice and pay/benefit satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *14*(1), 135–147.
- Hwang, J., Lee, J. J., Park, S., Chang, H., & Kim, S. S. (2014). The Impact of Occupational Stress on Employee's Turnover Intention in the Luxury Hotel Segment. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, *15*(1), 60–77.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2014.872898>
- Ilies, R., Scott, B. A., & Judge, J. A. (2006). The interactive effects of personal traits and experienced states on intraindividual patterns of citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*, 561–575.
- Ismail, A., Mohamed, H., Hamid, N. S., Sulaiman, A. Z., Girardi, A., & Abdullah, M. M. B. (2011). Relationship between Performance Based Pay, Interactional Justice and Job Satisfaction: A Mediating Model Approach. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *6*(11), 170–180.
- Ismail, A., & Zakaria, N. (2009). Relationship between Interactional Justice and Pay for Performance as an Antecedent of Job Satisfaction: an Empirical Study in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *4*(3), 190–199.
- Jang, J., & Kandampully, J. (2018). Reducing Employee Turnover Intention Through Servant Leadership in the Restaurant Context: A Mediation Study of Affective Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, *19*(2), 125–141.
- Jawahar, I. M., & Stone, T. H. (2011). Fairness perceptions and satisfaction with components of pay satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *26*(4), 297–312.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941111124836>
- Johnson, R. E., Lanaj, K., & Barnes, C. M. (2014). The Good and Bad of Being Fair: Effects of Procedural and Interpersonal Justice Behaviors on Regulatory Resources. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *99*(4), 635–650. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035647>
- Jones, D. A. (2009). Getting even with one's supervisor and one's organization: Relationships among types of injustice, desires for revenge, and counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behaviors*, *30*, 525–542.
- Judge, T. A., Hurst, C., & Simon, L. S. (2009). Does It Pay to Be Smart, Attractive, or Confident (or All Three)? Relationships Among General Mental Ability, Physical Attractiveness, Core Self-Evaluations, and Income. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(3), 742–755.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015497>

- Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., Podsakoff, N. P., Shaw, J. C., & Rich, B. L. (2010). The relationship between pay and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 77*, 157–167.
- Jung, H. S., & Yoon, H. H. (2015). Understanding paysatisfaction: The impacts of pay satisfaction on employees' job engagement and withdrawal in deluxe hotel. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 48*, 22–26.
- Karatepe, O. M., & Aleshinloye, K. D. (2009). Emotional dissonance and emotional exhaustion among hotel employees in Nigeria. *Journal of Hospitality Management, 28*(3), 349–358.
- Karatepe, O. M., & Douri, B. G. (2012). Does Customer Orientation Mediate the Effect of Job Resourcefulness on Hotel Employee Outcomes? Evidence from Iran. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 19*, 1–10.
- Khan, I., Nawaz, A., Qureshi, Q. A., & Khan, Z. A. (2016). The impact of Distributive, Procedural and Interactive Justices on Job Turnover. *Industrial Engineering Letters, 6*(1).
- Kim, S. (2017). Perceived organizational support as a mediator between distributive justice and sports referees' job satisfaction and career commitment. *Annals of Leisure Research, 20*(2), 169–187.
- Kim, W. G., Leong, J. K., & Lee, Y.-K. (2005). Effect of service orientation on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention of leaving in a casual dining chain restaurant. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 24*(2), 171–193.
- Kinicki, A. J., McKee-Ryan, F. M., Schriesheim, C. A., & Carson K.P. (2002). Assessing the construct validity of the Job Descriptive Index: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 14–32.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling* (5th ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. (2007). *The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Journal of Criminal Justice*(35), 644–656.
- Lavelle, J., Rupp, D., & Brockner, J. (2007). Taking a multifoci approach to the study of justice, social exchange, and citizenship behavior: The target similarity model? *Journal of Management, 33*(6), 841–866.
- Lawler, E. (1971). *Pay and Organizational Effectiveness: A Psychological View*. New York, NY.: McGraw-Hill.

- Lemons, M. A., & Jones, C. A. (2001). Procedural justice in promotion decisions: using perceptions of fairness to build employee commitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 16*, 268–280.
- Lievens, F., Anseel, F., Harris, M. M., & Eisenberg, J. (2007). Measurement Invariance of the Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire Across Three Countries. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 67*(6), 1042–1051.
- Loi, R., & Yang, J. (2009). Four-Factor Justice and Daily Job Satisfaction: A Multilevel Investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(3), 770–781.
- Lu, L., Lu, A. C. C., Gursoy, D., & Neale, N. R. (2016). Work engagement, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions: A comparison between supervisors and line-level employees. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 28*(4), 737–761.
- Luo, Z., Qu, H., & Marnburg, E. (2013). Justice perceptions and drives of hotel employee social loafing behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 33*, 456–464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.11.005>
- Luo, Z., Song, H., Marnburg, E., & Øgaard, T. (2014). The impact of relational identity on the relationship between LMX, interpersonal justice, and employees' group commitment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 41*, 21–27.
- Martin, T. (2012). *Provincial-Territorial Human Resource Module of the Tourism Satellite Account, 2012* (pp. 1–35). Retrieved from Statistics Canada website: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/13-604-m/13-604-m2014074-eng.pdf?st=uNxuAqIv>
- Memon, M. A., Salleh, R., & Baharom, M. N. R. (2017). The mediating role of work engagement between pay satisfaction and turnover intention. *International Journal of Economics, Management and Accounting, 25*(1), 43–69.
- Milkovich, G. T., Newman, J. M., Gerhart, B. A., & Yap, M. (2017). *Compensation* (Fifth Canadian). McGraw-Hill Ryerson.
- Ministry of Labour. (2018). Minimum wage increase. Retrieved from <https://www.ontario.ca/page/minimum-wage-increase>
- Mohamed, A. A., Mohamad, M. S., & Awad, A. E. (2017). The relationship between pay satisfaction and turnover intention in Egypt. *Journal of Competitiveness Studies, 25*(1), 64–80.
- Nadiri, H., & Tanova, C. (2010). An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in hospitality industry. *International*

Journal of Hospitality Management, 29(1), 33–41.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.05.001>

- 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*, 36(3), 527–556.
- Norusis, M. J. (1998). *SPSS professional statistics*. Upper Sadler River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Nunnally, J. (1967). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY.: McGraw-Hill.
- Ohana, M. (2012). Perceived organisational support as a mediator of Distributive justice and job satisfaction: The Moderating Role of Group Commitment. *The Journal of Applied Business Research*, 28(5), 1063–1072.
- Ozimek, P., Bierhoff, H.-W., & Hanke, S. (2018). Do vulnerable narcissists profit more from Facebook use than grandiose narcissists? An examination of narcissistic Facebook use in the light of selfregulation and social comparison theory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 124, 168–177.
- Pappas, J. M., & Flaherty, K. E. (2006). The moderating role of individual-difference variable a in compensation research. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(1), 19–35.
- Perreira, T. A., Berta, W., & Herbert, M. (2018). The employee retention triad in health care: Exploring relationships amongst organisational justice, affective commitment and turnover intention. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 27.
- Poll, H. (2015). *2015 Work and Well-Being Survey*.
- Poon, J. M. L. (2012). Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Affective Commitment, and Turnover Intention: A Mediation–Moderation Framework. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(6), 1505.
- R.A. Malatest & Associates. (2012). *2012 Canadian Tourism Sector Compensation Study*. Ottawa: Canadian Tourism Human Resources Council (CTHRC).
- Regts, G., & Molleman, E. (2013). To leave or not to leave: When receiving interpersonal citizenship behavior influences an employee's turnover intention. *Human Relations*, 66(2), 193–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726712454311>
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698–714.

- Roy, J. L., Bastounis, M., & Mininbas-Poussard, J. (2012). Interactional Justice and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating role of negative emotions. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 40(8), 1341–1356.
- Sager, J. K., Griffeth, R. W., & Hom, P. W. (1998). A Comparison of Structural Models Representing Turnover Cognitions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 53, 254–273.
- Schappe, S. P. (1998). Understanding Employee Job Satisfaction: The Importance of Procedural and Distributive Justice. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 12(4), 493–503.
- Schminke, M., & Ambrose, M. L. (2000). The Effect of Organizational Structure on Perceptions of Procedural Fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(2), 294–304.
<https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.85.2.294>
- Schminke, M., Ambrose, M. L., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). The Effect of Organizational Structure on Perceptions of Procedural Fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(2), 294–304.
- Shaw, J. D., Delery, J. E., Jenkins, D., & Gupta, N. (1998). An Organization-Level Analysis of Voluntary and Involuntary Turnover. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 41(5), 511–525.
- Shrader, J. C., & Singer, L. (2014). The impact of personality on pay satisfaction among small business managers in the United States and China. *Journal of Technology Management in China*, 9(2), 123–132.
- Simons, T., & Hinkin, T. (2001). The Effect of Employee Turnover on Hotel Profits. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 65–69.
- Singh, J., Verbeke, W., & Rhoads, G. K. (1996). Do Organizational Practices Matter in Role Stress Processes? A Study of Direct and Moderating Effects for Marketing-Oriented Boundary Spanners. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(3), 69–86.
- Singh, P., & Loncar, N. (2010). Pay satisfaction, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. *Industrial Relations*, 65(3), 470–490.
- S.O., O., & Bolade. O., M. (2014). The Influence of Sex, Marital Status, and Tenure of Service on Job Stress, and Job Satisfaction of Health Workers in a Nigerian Federal Health Institution. *An International Multidisciplinary Journal*, 8(1), 126–133.
- Stevens, J. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum: Mahwah.

- Sweeney, P. D., & McFarlin, D. B. (1993). Workers' evaluations of the "ends" and "means": An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 23–70.
- Tekleab, A. G., Bartol, K., & Liu, W. (2005). Is it pay levels or pay raises that matter to fairness and turnover? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 899–921.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.352>
- Terpstra, D. E., & Honoree, A. L. (2003). The relative importance of external, internal, individual, and procedural equity to pay satisfaction. *Compensation and Benefits Review*, 35, 69–74.
- Tews, M. J., Michel, J. W., & Ellingson, J. E. (2013). The Impact of Coworker Support on Employee Turnover in the Hospitality Industry. *Group & Organization Management*, 38(5), 630–653. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601113503039>
- Till, R. E., & Karren, R. (2011). Organizational justice perceptions and pay level satisfaction", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(1), 42–57.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941111099619>
- Tremblay, M., Sire, B., & Balkin, D. B. (2000). The Role of Organizational Justice in Pay and Employee Benefit Satisfaction, and Its Effects on Work Attitudes. *Group & Organization Management*, 25(3), 269–290.
- Tsai, Y., & Wu, S.-W. (2010). The relationships between organisational citizenship behaviour, job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 19, 3564–3574.
- Tyler, T. R. (1999). Why people cooperate with organizations: An identity based perspective. In *Research in organizational behavior* (R. I. Sutton & B. M. Staw, Vol. 21, pp. 201–246). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Van den Bos, K., Lind, E. A., & Wilke, H. A. M. (2001). The psychology of procedural and distributive justice viewed from the perspective of fairness heuristic theory. In *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice* (Vol. 2, pp. 49–66). Mahwah, NJ.
- Van Voorhis, C. R. W., & Morgan, B. L. (2007). Understanding Power and Rules of Thumb for Determining Sample Sizes. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 3(2), 43–50.
- Vandenberghe, C., & Tremblay, M. (2008). The Role of Pay Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Turnover Intentions: A Two-Sample Study. *J Bus Psychol*, 22, 275–286.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-008-9063-3>

- Vidal, M. E. S., Valle, R. S., & Isabel, B. A. (2007). Antecedents of repatriates' job satisfaction and its influence on turnover intention: evidence from Spanish repatriated managers. *Journal of Business Research*, *60*, 1272–1281.
- Wang, E. S.-T. (2014). The effects of relationship bonds on emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions in frontline employees. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *28*(4), 319–330. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-11-2012-0217>
- Weller, C. (2017). A CEO who makes everyone's salary transparent says people are more productive than ever. Retrieved from Business Insider website: <https://www.businessinsider.com/sumall-ceo-says-salary-transparency-makes-people-more-productive-2017-5>
- Wilczynska, A., Batorski, D., & Torrent-Sellens, J. (2017). Job Satisfaction of Knowledge Workers. The Role of Interpersonal Justice and Flexible Employment. *Polish Sociological Review*, 329–349.
- Williams, M. L., Brower, H. H., Ford, L. R., Williams, L. J., & Carraher, S. M. (2008). A comprehensive model and measure of compensation satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *81*, 639–668.
- Williams, M. L., McDaniel, M. A., & Nguyen, N. T. (2006). A Meta-Analysis of the Antecedents and Consequences of Pay Level Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(2), 392–413. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.2.392>
- Wright, T. A., & Bonett, D. G. (2007). Job Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being as Nonadditive Predictors of Workplace Turnover. *Journal of Management*, *33*(2), 141–160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206306297582>
- Yadav, L. K., & Gupta, P. (2017). Procedural Justice, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Mediating Role of Organizational Trust—Indian Tourism Industry Study. *Management and Labour Studies*, *42*(3), 275–292.
- Yeh, C. M. (2013). Tourism involvement, work engagement and job satisfaction among frontline hotel employees. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *42*, 214–239.
- Yu, J., & Downes, P. E. (2016). The Problem of Effect Size Heterogeneity in Meta-Analytic Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(10), 1457–1473.
- Zopiatis, A., Constanti, P., & Theocharous, A. L. (2014). Job involvement, commitment, satisfaction and turnover: Evidence from hotel employees in Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, *41*, 129–140.

Appendix 1 – Survey Questionnaire

Distributive justice (Colquitt, 2001)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My compensation reflects the effort I put into my work.					
My compensation appropriate for the work I have completed.					
My compensation reflects what I have contributed to the organization.					
Consider about my performance, my compensation got justified.					

Procedural justice (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Job decisions are made by the supervisors or managers in an unbiased manner.					
My supervisors or managers makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.					
To make job decisions, my supervisors or managers collects accurate and complete information.					
My supervisors or managers clarify decisions and provides additional information when requested.					
Job decisions are applied consistently across all impacted employees.					
Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by supervisors and/or managers.					

Interpersonal justice (Colquitt, 2001)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My coworkers, supervisors and managers treat me in a polite manner.					
My coworkers, supervisors and managers treat me with ethically.					

My coworkers, supervisors and managers treat me with respect.

My coworkers, supervisors and managers do not make inappropriate remarks and/or comments in our daily interactions.

Informational justice (Colquitt, 2001)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My supervisor and/or manager has been candid and open in their communication with me.					
My supervisor and/or manager has thoroughly explained the rationale behind my current pay level.					
The rationale behind my current pay level, as explained by my supervisor and/or manager, was clear and reasonable.					
My supervisor and/or manager communicates information to me in a timely manner.					
My supervisor and/or manager explains information and details in a personalized manner.					

Pay satisfaction (Heneman and Schwab, 1985)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My take-home pay. (L)					
My benefit packages. (B)					
My most recent raise. (R)					
Influence my supervisor has on my pay. (R)					
My current salary. (L)					
Amount the company pays toward my benefits. (B)					
The raises I have typically received in the past. (R)					
The company's pay structure. (S/A)					
Information the company gives about pay issues of concern to me. (S/A)					
My overall level of pay. (L)					
The value of my benefits. (B)					
Pay of other jobs in the company. (S/A)					

Consistency of the company's pay policies.
(S/A)

Size of my current salary. (L)

The number of benefits I receive. (B)

How my raises are determined. (R)

Differences in pay among jobs in the
company. (S/A)

How the company administers pay. (S/A)

Job satisfaction (Hartline & Ferrell, 1996)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I am satisfied with my job.					
I am satisfied with my supervisor.					
I am satisfied with my organization.					
I am satisfied with the support provided by my organization.					

Turnover intention (Singh, Verbeke and Rhoads, 1996)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I often think about quitting my current job.					
I plan to be looking for a new job within the next year.					
I plan to be leaving my current place of work within the next year.					