

A RESEARCH ON EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND THEIR PROPENSITY TO LEAVE: CASE STUDY OF 4 AND 5 STAR HOTELS IN THE PROVINCE OF ANTALYA

Assoc. Prof. **Şule AYDIN TÜKELTÜRK** Ph.D  
Assist. Prof. Fehmi Volkan AKYÖN  
**Göksu DEMİREL**

**Abstract:** The justice is a perceptual concept, and therefore it has been interpreted in various ways either in social or in work environments. This study aims to identify the employees' perceptions of justice and its relation to their propensity to leave. The scope of the study includes the employees of four and five star hotels (all departments) located in the province of Antalya. A quantitative survey method has been used during the research; the questions and statements had been prepared in a manner that they will not lead the interviewed towards a certain answer in anyway. The data were collected through face to face interviews, online survey portal and e-mail communications. Research findings suggest that, the propensity to leave effects interactional justice, although on a low-scale. It can be said that employees with a tendency to leave develop a higher perception of interactional justice. However, propensity to leave does not have an effect on procedural or distributive justice.

**JEL classification: C01, K49**

**Keywords :** Organizational justice, propensity to leave, hotel establishments, employee, Antalya

## INTRODUCTION

Distribution of gains of organizational justice can be described with the operations used during decision-making and rules and social norms developed during the interactions between people. First studies, which started with Adams' Equity Theory, examine the employees' perception of fairness of organizational benefits. However the recent studies focus on perception of justice of interpersonal relationships (with supervisors and colleagues) within the organization. Theoreticians describe the organizational justice as a classification based on fairness of the gains (distributive justice), procedures (procedural justice) and relations of the people (interactional justice) (Eker, 2006).

Distributive justice indicates the fairness of the person's gains (tasks, goods, services, opportunities, penalties / rewards, roles, statuses, rates, promotions, etc.), on the other hand procedural justice indicates the fairness of the procedures and methods used during the decision making process. While the studies continue to examine distributive justice and procedural justice; researchers has started to study the

interactional justice, which deals with organizational practices associated with interpersonal behaviors and interaction between management and the employees. Interactional justice is a concept that indicates the characteristics of interpersonal practices between people. Employees perceive the attitude of the organization towards them as an indicator of justice in their organization. (Eker, 2006).

Propensity to leave is one of the destructive actions taken by the employees if they are unsatisfied with the work conditions (Rusbelt et al., 1988); in other words, it is a preliminary indication of the actual absence and brings significant cost to the businesses (Scott et al., 2006). Employees' propensity to leave causes many problems such as loss of skilled staff, need for recruitment of additional staff and increased costs of management. (Gül et al., 2008; 4). Many studies has been completed and many studies has been continuing to suggest solutions to how to eliminate such problems for businesses and also to contribute to the literature about the positive or negative effects of organizational justice on propensity to leave.

In this framework, the purpose of this study is to examine the employees' perspectives of justice at hotel establishments and to determine the relationship between propensity to leave and justice perspectives. In this context, the literature section of this research includes explanations about the concept of organizational justice, the dimensions of organizational justice perceptions, the concept of propensity to leave, reasons for propensity to leave and results of propensity to leave.

In the final part of the study, a survey was conducted to determine to if there is a relationship between organizational justice and propensity to leave and the findings were evaluated accordingly.

### 1. EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

In today's rapidly changing business world, organizational justice is increasingly important for employees (Vahtera et al., 2002). Because, the perception of organizational justice is an important factor that effects employees' commitment to the organization (Tan, 2006).

Organizational justice is a concept that indicates employees 'perceptions of how fair they were treated and how this perception effects the organization (organizational commitment, job satisfaction, propensity to leave etc.). Employees 'perceptions of justice carries an importance in terms of personal and job satisfaction and effective functioning of the organization. In other words, employees' opinions on fairness of the organization reveal the importance of justice (Thibaut et al., 1975).

Organizational justice consists of three types. They are; distributive justice, which is about perceptions of fairness of the results, procedural justice, which is about perceptions of fairness of decision-making procedures and interactional justice, which is the result of the interaction between the individuals in the organization (Söyük, 2007).

Distributive justice is about perceptions of the results and their distribution. The question of "Have I got what I deserve?" is the main foundation of the discussions about distributive justice (Atalay, 2007).

The concept is originated from Adams's "Equity Theory" (Adams, 1965) and according to that, the employees decide if their rewards received within the organization are fair or not in line with "Equality Rule". Employees compare their performance inputs (education, training, experience, work stress and tensions endured,

seniority, etc.) with outputs of rewards (salary, promotion etc.). If they perceive an inequality between inputs and outputs, they think their rewards were not fair enough (Tan, 2006).

A broad definition of distributive justice can be stated as the employees' perceptions of fairness of the distribution of the resources within the organization (Folger and Konovsky 1989).

Procedural justice, points out the individuals' perceptions of their participation in decision-making process and neutrality and objectivity of it (Moon et al., 2008).

This dimension of the organizational justice is not limited to the financial expectations (wages, promotion, bonus, contribution etc.) of the employees. It is related to the level of fairness of the strategies and policies in decisions about working conditions (Jahangir et al., 2006). In this framework, it is acknowledged that source of procedural justice attributed to the managers and the organization. The management dimension of procedural justice emphasis on fairness of the managers, who are implementing the decisions, and their attitudes and behaviors; on the other hand the organizational dimension of procedural justice emphasis on employees' perception of fairness of the principles and the policies adopted by the organization (Kim, 2005).

There are three important factors in employees' perception of procedural justice (Greenberg, 1990):

- Impartial functioning of the decision-making process,
- Level of confidence in decision-making authority,
- Organizational culture based on respect, trust, good intention and cooperation.

Procedural justice carries an importance because it has a significant role in establishing consistent attitudes of the employees towards their employers and organizations (Thibaut et al., 1975). Employees pay attention to how they were treated so, their perceptions of fair treatment structure their relationship with their employers. If the employees believe that the decision-making process was unfair, they become less committed to the organization and it may result in lower performance and higher staff turnover (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998).

Employees' perception of fair treatment does not solely depend on procedural justice, which provides fair rules in the work environment (Greenberg, 1990b). Interpersonal relations with the administration are also very important and described as interactional justice which is sub-dimension of organizational justice (Bies and Moag, 1986).

Interactional justice requires managerial skills such as to treat employees respectfully, to prize their value, to listen with interest, to provide explanation for the decisions made, to show empathy and sensitivity to the others (Skarlicki and Folger, 1997). Interaction perceived as fair can influence employees to have more positive attitudes (Mossholder, 1998).

## 2. EMPLOYEES' PROPENSITY TO LEAVE

It is important to ensure lower turnover of the employees as to ensure their efficiency in the organization. The level of stability of the employees reflects the employee turnover rate. Higher employee turnover rate in an organization brings some disadvantages (Türker, 1998; 37).

Employee turnover can be defined in many ways.

Employee turnover is defined as resignation or dismissal of the employee for various reasons (Eren, 1993; 176). As a result of vacant position created by an employee, either voluntary or involuntary, new staff needs to be recruited and this situation is described as “employee turnover” (Woods, 1997; 359).

As understood from definitions stated above, employee turnover is formed by the elements of the employees leaving the job either willingly or unwillingly. In short, employee turnover is described as employees’ leaving their job whatever the reason. Employee turnover is not only about the employees to leave their job voluntarily but at the same time, it includes the termination of employment by the businesses. Eren, 2000, 259).

Propensity to leave can be described as conscious and willing approach to leave the organization (Tettye and Meyer, 1993). Propensity to leave is seen as a most important and determining indicator of quitting a job (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) and seen as a most important factor in employee turnover rate (Bluedorn, 1982; Shore and Martin, 1989).

### *2.1 THE REASONS OF PROPENSITY TO LEAVE*

Business managers should be aware of the importance of employee turnover. Keeping it at the required level will contribute the solutions of potential problems which may occur in the areas of labor productivity, education, labor costs, communication and management. (Tütüncü and Demir, 2002; 47).

The factors may result in dismissal or resignation can be explained in three dimensions:

#### *2.1.1. EXTERNAL FACTORS*

These factors are generally occurring for the reasons which are not connected to the business or employee and also are difficult to control by the business enterprises (Yılmaz and Halıcı, 2008, 95). External factors that develop outside the business can be listed as follows (Carbone, 1995; Abrahamson, 1997; Harris, 2000):

- Economic Situation
- Technological Developments
- Labor Flow
- Seasonal Characteristic of Tourism Sector
- Excess of Alternative Job Opportunities

#### *2.1.2. INTERNAL FACTORS*

These factors caused by the employee or the employer, can be controlled by them, their reasons and time are known. Most important one is the internal problems caused by managerial practices. (Kılıç, 2004; 69-70).

It is possible to examine the internal factors in two main headings; voluntarily resignation of the employee or dismissal by the employer:

According to Baltas (2005), resignations /dismissals of the employees create a significant problem for hotel enterprises. Businesses can face difficulties if a skilled and experienced staff leaves the job and the newly recruited staff encounters adaptation problems with his/her colleagues.

Employees may resign voluntarily for various reasons. It is possible to examine significant issues effecting employee turnover under the following headings:

- Job Satisfaction
- Salary
- Encouraging and Rewarding
- Promotion opportunities
- Stress
- Physical Working Conditions
- Job Security and Social Security
- General Management of the Business
- Impact of Internal Communication
- Vocational Training Opportunities
- Business Ethics of Managers Towards Employees
- Harassment and Mobbing at the Workplace

## ***2.2 RESULTS OF PROPENSITY TO LEAVE***

“Resignation / dismissal of an employee” can cause higher employee turnover and it is important issue in many sectors, as well as hotel management. In this section, results of the propensity to leave will be examined, but it will focus on the negative results in the line with the study.

It is disadvantageous for the businesses to have high and persistent employee turnover rate which can causes various problems and brings additional cost. The negative results of the resignation / dismissal of the employees can be classified as below (Geylan, 2000, 41):

- Difficulties faced in recruiting, time-lost and additional cost occurred during the selection process.
- Increase in the cost of training
- Loss of time and additional cost endured during the period new staff gets accustomed to the work and the business.
- The increase in work-related accidents,
- Reduction in quantity or quality of production,
- Decline in the fair salary system
- The decrease of trust and commitment of employee towards employer

According to a study conducted in hotel businesses, the negative effects of resignations on performance and productivity are listed as follows (Birdir, 2000, 143):

- Insufficiency of new recruits,
- The negative effects of the new recruits on the performance of their co-workers
- The low performance of the leaving employee during the period of resignation
- The effect of the employee who is leaving on his close colleagues, causing their low performance
- Work losses occurred during vacant time until a new staff is recruited.

## **3. THE RELATION BETWEEN EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND THEIR PROPENSITY TO LEAVE**

The concept of organizational justice is based on Adams' "Theory of Justice", and many research were carried out circling this theory with an emphasis on the effect

of perception of justice on employees. The focal point of these researches is that the employees structure their actions comparing to the benefits they have gained with the gains of the others, while considering their contributions to the business.

For example, according to Yeniçeri et al., (2009), the employees' loss of meaning and value towards justice of the business can cause negative reactions in their emotional actions. One of the main emotional actions, which are created as a substitution of employee's negative perceptions of organizational justice, is exhaustion.

A study conducted by Özdevecioğlu (2003) aims to determine the effects of perception of organizational justice on aggressive behavior among individuals. In this study, organizational justice and its effects on aggressive behavior has been examined in three dimensions.

The similarities of physical and psychological symptoms resulting from loss of confidence in organizational justice and exhaustion (Balcioğlu, 2008:100-101) reveal the close relationship between these two cases. According to Greenberg (2004), organizational justice is effective in reducing the stress in the workplace. Findings of Kwak's (2006) study also support the same issues. The studies of Wesolowski and Mossholder (1997) on job satisfaction, exhaustion and procedural justice draw attention to the link and relation between these issues.

In another study, Yürür (2000) examines the relation between the structure and functioning of the reward system and organizational justice. In this regard, employees' justice perceptions on rewards and performance procedures and their opinions on salary, management and organization were related. This research, which is consistent with the other researches carried out at legal and political circles, indicates that the justice perception on salary and rewards (praise, appreciation) is mainly about the evaluation of the award itself rather than the evaluation of the management and organization. On the contrary, justice perception of reward distribution is more about being satisfied with management and organizational commitment rather than the reward itself. In other words, employees' perception of justice has an important impact on the success reward systems of the organization. At the same time, employees' justice perceptions are significantly influenced the by the structure of the salary system.

Arnold and Feldman (1986) stated that six main factors effecting employees' job satisfaction; the salary, the work itself, promotion opportunities, management style and working conditions. In this context, perception of organizational justice, which can be described as a reflection of workplace environment, can effect job satisfaction.

Number of researches conducted in the field of organizational behavior shows that there is an important relation between perception of organizational justice and job satisfaction and the high level of perception of justice increase the job satisfaction (Walks, 2008). There are many studies focusing on the relations between these two variables.

For example, the survey conducted by McFarlin and Sweeney (1992), which was participated by 675 bank employees, shows that the perception of procedural and distributive justice and job satisfaction has significant and positive relation. The study also emphasizes that the distributive justice has more effect on job satisfaction than procedural justice.

Martin and Bennett (1996) carried out study at a financial company and had similar results, parallel to the findings of McFarlin and Sweeney; they confirmed that

the distributive justice and procedural justice have a significant and parallel relation with job satisfaction.

The study of Tang and Baldwin (1996) focuses on the impact of distributive and procedural justice on job satisfaction. In this study, it was stated that if managers administrate fair organizational rules and distribute appropriate rewards according to the performances, the employees' perception of distributive and procedural justice will increase and this will bring more job satisfaction and commitment.

Other studies examined in the relevant literature, and noticed that Libby (1999) and Lindquist (1995) studied the concept of organizational justice with the perspective of budgetary contributions. The studies of Siegel, Reinstein and Miller (2001) and Ehlen and Welker (1996), explain the relations between organizational justice and mentoring in accounting companies.

Many other researches conducted in this field; examining the relations between organizational justice and several variables; organizational citizenship, organizational trust, organizational commitment, job satisfaction. However, there are not many studies in the literature focusing on the relation between organizational justice and propensity to leave and therefore, this study gains great importance for its purpose.

A large number of traditional models, which are aiming to determine the employees' propensity to leave, are focus on the behavior of employees towards their work and organizations (Farrell and Rusbult, 1981; Mobley, 1977; Steers and Mowday, 1981). In many of these models, the recognition of propensity to leave as an option starts with hypothesis of low level of job satisfaction and low level organizational commitment (Hom and Griffeth, 1995). One of the most prominent results of the employees' perceptions of justice is propensity to leave.

Parker and Kohlmeyer III (2005) in their study of the people working in accounting companies, aim to determine the organizational commitment, job satisfaction and propensity to leave, using the distributive justice dimension of organizational justice.

Similarly, Colquitt et al., in 2001, in the meta-analysis of results of organizational justice has stated that both distributive justice and procedural justice have high and negative relations with propensity to leave.

When the relation between organizational justice and propensity to leave were examined, it is possible to say that employees with propensity to leave have higher perception of interactional justice. Interactional justice reflects how and which ways the individuals were informed about decision-making process in the work place. Administration of rewards and penalties are part of the decisions made and therefore it can be considered that the rewards and penalties implemented effect employees' perception of interactional justice (Shapiro et al., 1994).

## METHOD

This study aims to measure the effect of organizational on justice on propensity to leave and seeks answers to the following questions;

I. What are the dimensions of employees' perceptions of organizational justice in their work environment?

1. What is the level of employees' perceptions of interactional justice in hotel business?

2. What is the level of employees' perceptions of procedural justice in hotel business?
3. What is the level of employees' perceptions of distributive justice in hotel business?

II. Is there a relationship between the level of employees' perception of organizational justice and their propensity to leave ?

The scope of the study includes the employees of four and five star hotels (all departments) located in the province of Antalya. The sample was determined with simple random sampling method which is one of the probability sampling methods.

A quantitative survey method has been used during the research; the questions and statements have been prepared as a result of the literature scan. The data were collected to through face to face interviews, "online survey" portal and e-mail communications.

Survey statements were created with a scale which was used in the doctorate thesis of Dilek Dürdane ATALAY (2007) titled "Relation of Perceived Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment with a Perspective of Equivalence Sensitivity". The scale used by this author was adapted from the organizational justice scale developed by Niehoff and Morman (1993). The scale for the propensity to leave was formed with using the scale developed by Arkoubi, Bishop and Scott (2007) in their study titled "The Determinants of Turnover Intention of An analytics Among Drivers".

These two studies examined and a questionnaire was formed in three sections. The first section includes 20 questions of organizational justice scale, the second section includes 3 questions of propensity to leave scale and the last section includes demographic characteristics consist of 9 independent variables.

Survey forms were delivered to the hotel establishments in the province of Antalya using various methods. 225 survey forms were collected, but 45 of them were excluded due to the large number of missing data, and therefore 180 units were subjected to analysis. Data were analyzed with SPSS Programme; Factor Analysis, Anova and T-tests, correlation and regression analyzes were conducted.

## FINDINGS

The survey includes questions about the demographic characteristics of the employees; gender, age, marital status, education level, experience in the sector, the number of companies they work for in the sector, a total number of the companies they worked for, the ownership of the company and their position in the company Furthermore, the findings regarding the effects of organizational justice on propensity to leave is included in this section .

### *DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EMPLOYEES*

Demographic characteristics of the employees participated in this research are shown in Table 1.

In this research, %23 (n=42) of the employees were female and %63,3 (n=114) were male. The distribution of the ages as follows; %26,7 (n=48) aged 25-30, %3,9 (n=7) aged 31-35, %21,1 (n=38) aged 36-40, %30,0 (n=54) aged 41-45, %13,9 (n=25) aged 46-50 and %3,3 (n=6) aged 51 plus. Their marital status distributed as; %18,9



(n=34) are married, %68,9 (n=124) are single. Their graduate levels stated as; %0,6 (n=1) primary school, 3,3 % (n=6) secondary school , 42,2 % (n=76) have two years associate degree, %26,7 (n=48 ) bachelor's degree and %23,3 ( n=42) graduate degree.

**Table 1. Distribution of Demographic Characteristics of Employees**

		<b>Number</b>	<b>%Percentage</b>
Gender	Female	42	23,3
	Male	114	63,3
	No answer	24	13,3
Age	25-30	48	26,7
	31-35	7	3,9
	36-40	38	21,1
	41-45	54	30,0
	46-50	25	13,9
	51 ve +	6	3,3
	No answer	2	1,1
Marital Status	Married	34	18,9
	Single	124	68,9
	No answer	22	12,2
Education Level	Primary	1	0,6
	Secondary	6	3,3
	Associate Degree	76	42,2
	Undergraduate	48	26,7
	Graduate	42	23,3
	No answer	7	3,9
Work experience	4-7 Year	10	5,6
	8-11 Year	82	45,6
	12 Year +	88	48,9
Number of Companies	1.Company	88	48,9
	2.Company	92	51,1
Ownership of the company	National	88	48,9
	Foreign	92	51,1
Business Type	4 Star	50	27,8
	5 Star	130	72,2
Position Held	Middle Manager	25	13,9
	Worker	155	86,1
<b>Total</b>		<b>180</b>	<b>100</b>

5,6 % (n=10) of the employees have 4-7 years' experience in the sector, 45,6 % (n=82) 8-11 years, 48,9% (n=88) 12 year and over, respectively.

When we examine the number of companies they worked for in the sector, 48,9 % (n=88) of the employees work for one company and %51,1 (n=92) work for two different companies. When we look at the ownership of the companies, it was stated that 48,9% (n=88) of the employees work for the companies with national/local capital, however 51,1% of them (n=92) work for foreign chain companies. When we examine the business type, it was seen that 27,8 % (n=50) of the employees work for 4 star hotels and %72,2 (n=130) work for 5 star hotels. Regarding the positions held it was distributed as %13,9 (n=25) of them hold a middle manager position and %86,1 (155 people) are workers.

**RESULTS OF FACTOR ANALYSIS**

Factors and values obtained from this research shown in the following tables: Results of the Factor Analysis of Organizational Justice are shown in Table 2 and Factor Analysis on Propensity to Leave shown in Table 3.

**Table 2. Factor Analysis of Organizational Justice**

Factors	Factor Loadings	Eigenvalue	% of Total Variance	Alpha
<b>Factor 1: Interactional Justice</b>		<b>4,776</b>	<b>31,837</b>	<b>,808</b>
Managers consider my personal needs during decision-making	,719			
My work responsibilities are fair	,702			
Managers are honest and sincere in their decisions.	,691			
Managers ask the opinions of the employees before decisions were made.	,574			
Managers respect others in their decisions.	,547			
Managers make decisions impartially.	,538			
Managers are kind and considered in their decisions.	,522			
Managers protect my rights in their decisions	,509			
<b>Factor 2: Procedural Justice</b>		<b>1,361</b>	<b>9,077</b>	<b>,697</b>
Managers explain the decisions to the employees and provide additional information.	,776			
Managers make sensible explanations about the decisions.	,671			
Decisions are applied to all the employees.	,619			
Appropriate justifications are made	,607			

Factors	Factor Loadings	Eigenvalue	% of Total Variance	Alpha
for the decisions.				
<b>Factor 3: Distributive Justice</b>		<b>1,255</b>	<b>8,364</b>	<b>,553</b>
My salary is fair.	,798			
My rewards received from the company are fair.	,653			
My work programme is fair.	,601			

Varimax Rotated Principal Components Factor Analysis Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sampling Adequacy = 853; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity:  $p < 0,000$  (Chi-Square 689,317,  $df=105$ ) Toplam Variance : 49,278.

Table .3. Factor Analysis on Propensity to leave

Factors	Factor Loadings	Eigenvalue	% of Total Variance	Alpha
<b>Factor 1: Propensity to Leave</b>		<b>1,732</b>	<b>57,745</b>	<b>,633</b>
I think of leaving the job frequently.	,741			
I have an intention to leave the job.	,730			
I am continously searching for a new job.	,706			

**Notes :** Varimax Rotated Principal Components Factor Analysis Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sampling Adequacy =, 634; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity:  $p < 0,000$  (Chi-Square 66,654,  $df=3$ ) Toplam Variance : 57,745.

Factor analysis consists of three stages. As a result of the first analysis with 20 items KMO, sampling adequacy coefficient was 0.880 and the significance value was  $p < 0.001$ . These values confirm that the data can be subjected to factor analysis. At first factor analysis, 20 items were listed under total of 3 factors with eigenvalues over 1. However, items 8 and 20 were excluded from the factor analysis as they were overlapping to more than one factor and therefore a second factor analysis were conducted with the remaining 18 factors. The KMO Value of second factor analysis was 0.881 and significance value was  $p < 0.001$ . As a result of the second factor analysis, 18 items were grouped under 3 factors with eigenvalues over 1. However items 3, 11 and 17 were excluded from the analysis due to overlapping to more than one factor. As a result of the repeated factor analysis, the factors were titled as respectively, "Interactional Justice", "Procedural Justice" and "Distributive Justice" .

As a result of the first analysis conducted with item 3 in the scale of propensity to leave, KMO survey adequacy coefficient appeared as 0.634, significance value as  $p < 0.001$ . These values confirm that the data can be subjected to factor analysis. In the

first factor analysis, 3 items were listed under one factor, with eigenvalue over 1 and titled as dimension of “propensity to leave “

*T-TEST FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE FROM THE MEAN VALUE OF 3*

A sample T-test was administrated to examine if dimensions of organizational justice and dimensions of propensity to leave were statistically different from the mean value of 3 in 5- Likert-type scale. Results of the T-test are shown in Table 4.

**Table.4. T-Test for the Difference from the Mean Value of 3 for the Dimensions**

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>IJ</b>	3,51	,75411	9,192	,000
<b>PJ</b>	3,48	,84540	7,626	,000
<b>DJ</b>	3,18	,85673	2,900	,004
<b>PL</b>	3,44	,86425	6,842	,000

*IJ =Interactional Justice, PJ= Procedural Justice, DJ= Distributive Justice, PL = Propensity to Leave*

Accordingly, average of significance level of all the dimensions are  $p < 0.05$  and are higher than the mean value of 3.

Interactional justice has the highest average ( $X = 3,51$ ) within the dimensions of organizational justice. It means, the employees mostly perceive the dimension of interactional justice. Then the employees perceive the dimension of procedural justice ( $X = 3,48$ ). Dimension of distributive justice is perceived at minimum level ( $X = 3,18$ ). Variables of propensity to leave were gathered in one dimension and the average of it is ( $X = 3.44$ ).

**CORRELATION ANALYSIS;**

Correlation values between the factors are shown in Table 5.

**Table.5. Correlation Analysis;**

	<b>Interactional Justice</b>	<b>Procedural Justice</b>	<b>Distributive Justice</b>	<b>Propensity to Leave</b>
<b>IJ</b>	1			
<b>PJ</b>	,556**	1		
<b>DJ</b>	,348**	,308**	1	
<b>PL</b>	,173**	,118**	,016	1

\*\* Correlation has significance value of 0.01 (2-tailed).

Correlation coefficient does not display fully understandable interims, however it indicates the limits can be used frequently during the interpretation: Absolute value of correlation coefficient between 0.70-1.00 shows high level, 0.70-0.30 shows medium level 0:30 to 0:00 shows low level of relation (Buyukozturk, 2006: 32).

When the table was examined, it is seen that dimensions of organization justice have statistically significant relationship with each other. A significant positive relation

is seen at medium level between the interactional justice and procedural justice ( $r = 0.556, p < 0.01$ ); a significant positive relation is seen between interactional justice and distributive justice ( $r = .348, p < 0.01$ ). According to this finding, when interactional justice increases, procedural justice increases as well, or vice versa, when interactional justice decrease, procedural justice decreases. On the other hand, there is a positive relationship between the interactional distributive justices in the businesses. There is a significant and positive relation between procedural justice and distributive justice ( $r = .308, p < 0.01$ ). According to this finding, there is a relation between procedural justice and distributive justice at intermediate level and is an anticipated result.

### Regression Analysis

The dependent variables of the regression model are the dimensions of propensity to leave and the independent variables are the dimensions of organizational justice. Results of the regression analysis are shown in Table 6.

Table.6. Results of Regression Analysis;

	<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>T value</b>	<b>P value</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>F test</b>	<b>VIF</b>
<b>Propensity to Leave</b>	IJ	,173	2,348	,020	,030	5,512	1,000
	PJ	,118	1,579	,116	,014	2,495	1,000
	DJ	,016	,210	,834	,000	,044	1,000

*IJ = Interactional Justice, PJ = Procedural Justice, DJ = Distributive Justice*

The regression model, which specify the dimension of propensity to leave related to interactional justice, is found significant as a whole ( $F = 5.512, p < 0.001$ ). VIF values of independent variables were under 10 and therefore it can be said that there is no high correlation between the variables to affect the analysis. According to the results of regression analysis, dimensions of organizational justice can explain the 5% of the total variance in interactional justice. The significant levels of Beta values show that the propensity to leave affects the interactional justice.

The regression model, which aims to determine the dimension of propensity to leave related to dimension of procedural justice, is found significant as a whole ( $F = 2.495, p < 0.001$ ). VIF values of the independent variables were under 10 and therefore it can be said that there is no high correlation between the variables to affect the analysis. According to the results of regression analysis, the dimensions of organizational justice explain the 2% of the total variance in procedural justice. Significance levels of the Beta values are examined and it was found that propensity to leave does not effect on the procedural justice.

The regression model which aims to determine the dimension of propensity to leave, related to distributive justice is found significant as a whole ( $F = 044, p < 0.001$ ). VIF values of the independent variables are found to be under 10 and therefore it can be said that, no high correlation exists between variables to affect the analysis. According to the results of regression analysis, the dimension of organizational justice does explain distributive justice in a very low level. Significance of the Beta values shows that propensity to leave, does not have an effect on distributive justice.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study aims to examine the employees' perspectives on justice and its relation with propensity to leave at the hotel establishments. The following conclusions were reached after the acquisition of quantitative data;

- OJ (Organizational Justice) scale was subjected to factor analysis. During the analysis, overlapping loadings were occurred in the statements "Administrators collect accurate and complete information before making business decisions." and "Managers clearly explain every work-related decisions." and "Employees can oppose the decisions of the managers or ask for a review by the top management." and "The managers discuss the possible results of the decisions about my work with me". Therefore, these statements excluded from the analysis and OJ scale was grouped under the three factors, titled as "Interactional Justice", "Procedural Justice" and "Distributive Justice". These titles and the results are consistent with the results of the studies had been conducted in this field.
- During the factor analysis of PL (Propensity to Leave), overlapping loads occurred at the statements and therefore the statement "I think my workload is fair" was excluded from the analysis. And the three remaining statement were titled as "Propensity to Leave". These titles and the results are consistent with the results of the studies had been conducted in this area.
- If we look at the averages of OJ (Organizational Justice) dimensions, we could see that the interactional justice dimension has the highest average. Employees of hotel establishments mostly perceive interactional justice dimension. After that, employees perceive procedural justice and distributive justice dimensions, respectively. The average of dimension of propensity to leave is also high. Employees have tendency to leave the job at high level.
- There is interaction between the dimensions of OJ. The increase in interactional justice, at the same time increases the procedural justice, or vice versa, decrease in interactional justice also decreases the procedural justice at the hotel establishments. In the same way, a positive relation is occurs between interactional justice and distributive justice. To increase or decrease in interactional justice also cause increase of decrease in distributive justice.
- The other result is the positive relation that exists between procedural justice and distributive justice. The increase in procedural justice causes rise in distributive justice. There is a positive relation between procedural justice and propensity to leave but at the low level. The increase in the procedural justice perception increases the propensity to leave.
- The increase in the distributive justice perception increases the interactional justice perception.
- Propensity to leave effects interactional justice but at a low level. It is possible to say that the employees' interactional justice perceptions increase if they have propensity to leave. However, propensity to leave does not have an effect on the dimension of procedural and distributive justice.
- According to the results of the research, when we examine the average size of dimensions OJ, we could see that interactional justice has the highest average.

- Employees at hotel establishments mostly perceive the dimension of interactional justice. After that, employees perceive procedural justice, and distributive justice, respectively.
- The average size of the propensity to leave is also high. Employees have tendency to leave their job at a high level.

As a result of the findings, we could draw attention to the matters mentioned below to improve the effects of organizational justice on propensity to leave.

- In a business enterprise, high employee turnover can cause problems such as high costs, low productivity, loss of trained personnel, stress at management level, not to be able to establish corporate culture, weakness to provide continuity of the business, not be able to administer established systems, loss of reputation in professional organizations. To minimize or eliminate these negative factors can be possible with the removal of factors effecting employee turnover and with taking measures to decrease the employee turnover.
- To keep the employee turnover in an appropriate level, firstly we need to determine the reasons. Personal characteristics of the employee, organizational problems, reason of quitting job, their life preferences, environmental reasons and their relations and interactions should be examined and understood. After identifying the reasons, the problematic fields and problems should be determined and measures should be taken accordingly. It is a fact that the measures can vary from business to business.
- Considering the employee turnover at hotel enterprises in the dimensions of “employees, work & working conditions and organization”, the measures stated below can be useful :
  - A good management system should be established,
  - A good human resources planning should be administered,
  - Business analyses should be conducted,
  - Training and personal development opportunities should be provided,
  - A good wage system should be established,.
- This study aimed to determine the employees’ perceptions of organizational justice and its impact on propensity to leave. To be able to generalize the findings and broaden the scope, further research can be conducted for specific destination or for the hotels in Turkey in general.
- In addition, further research can be conducted in a wider dimension, in all the companies of tourism services, not only in hotel establishments.
- In addition to the comparison of hotel enterprises; businesses such as travel agencies, restaurants etc. can be included and which may provide different results.
- Sample scope can be broadening with another survey application.

## REFERENCES

1. Abrahamson, Eric, “The Emergence And Prevalence Of Employee Management Rhetoric: ‘*The Effects Of Long Waves, Labor Unions, And, Turnover, 1875 to 1992*’”, *Academy Of Management Journal*, 40, 3, s.491-533, 1997.
2. Adams, J. S., “Inequity in Social Exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in*

- Experimental Social Psychology*, 2: 267-299. Academy, New York, 1965.
3. Ajzen, I. ve Fishbein, M., *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1980.
  4. Arkoubi, K.A., Bishop, J.W., & Scott, D. (2007). An investigation of the determinants of turnover driver intention among drivers. Retrieved February 5, 2008, from the University of Mississippi Decision Sciences Institute at <http://www.swdsi.org>.
  5. Atalay, D.D., *Denklik Duyarlılığı Açısından Algılanan Örgütsel Adalet - Örgütsel Bağlanma İlişkisi*, Basılmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, SBE, Ankara, 2007.
  6. Balcıoğlu, İ., Memetali S. ve Rozant, R. (2008), "Tükenmişlik Sendromu", *Dirim Tıp Gazetesi*, 83, 99-104.
  7. Baltaş, A., *'Ekip Çalışması Ve Liderlik'*, Remzi Kitabevi, 2005.
  8. Bies, R. J., Moag, J. S. *Interactional justice, communication criteria for fairness. In, M. H. Bazerman, R. Sheppard, & B. Sheppard (Eds.), Research in negotiations in organizations. 1: 43-55, 1986.*
  9. Bluedorn, A.C., "A unified model of turnover from organizations", *Human Relations*, 35, s.135-153, 1982.
  10. Carbone, L., "Less Employee Turnover: The Hidden Key To Profitability", *Nation's Restaurant News*, 29, 12, s:50, Mar 20, 1995.
  11. Colquitt JA, Conlon DE, Wesson MJ, Porter COLH, Ng KY. "Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research". *Journal of Apply Psychology*, Vol. 86(3), s.425- 45, 2001.
  12. Ehlen, C., ve Welker, R. "Procedural fairness in the peer and quality review programs", *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory*, Vol. 15, s. 38-52, 1996.
  13. Eker, G. *Örgütsel Adalet Algısı Boyutları Ve İş Doyumu Üzerindeki Etkileri*. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), İzmir, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2006.
  14. Eren, Erol, *Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi*, Beta Basım Yayın Dağıtım, Yayın No: 402, İstanbul, 2000.
  15. Eren, E., *Yönetim Psikolojisi*, Beta Basım Yayın Dağıtım A.Ş., İstanbul, 428s., 1993.
  16. Farrell, D. ve Rusbult, G. E. "Exchange variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments". *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 28, p.78-95, 1981.
  17. Feldman D.C., Arnold, H., *Organizational Behavior*, McGraw Hill Inc., USA, 1986.
  18. Folger, R., Konovsky, M.A., Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions To Pay Raise Decisions, *Academy of Management Journal*, Sayı: 32, ss.115-130, 1989.
  19. Folger R., *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*, Sage Publications Inc., USA, 1998.
  20. Geylan, Ramazan., *Personel Yönetimi*, Anadolu Üniversitesi Basımevi, Eskişehir, 2000.
  21. Greenberg, J., Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow, *Journal of Management*, Sayı: 16, ss.399-432, 1990b.



22. Harris, Don H., "The Benefits of Exit Interviews", *Information Systems Management*, 17, 3(Summer), s. 17-20, 2000.
23. Hom, P.W. ve Griffeth, R.W. Employee turnover. *Ohio: South-Western College*, 1995.
24. Jahangır, N., Akbar M. ve Begum, N. "The Role of Social Power, Procedural Justice, Organizational Commitment, and Job Satisfaction to Engender Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *ABAC Journal*, 26(3), 21-36, 2006.
25. Kılıç, Alpaslan, "Örgüt İçi Stres Faktörlerin Çalışanların "Çatışma Ve İşten Ayrılma Eğilimleri" Üzerindeki Etkisi, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2004.
26. Kim, H. S. *Organizational Structure and Internal Communication as Antecedents of Employeeorganization Relationships in the Context of Organizational Justice: A Multilevel Analysis, University of Maryland: Ph.D. Thesis*, 2005.
27. Libby, T., The influence of voice and explanation on performance in a participative budgeting setting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 24, 125-137, 1999.
28. Lindquist, T., Fairness as an antecedent to participative budgeting: examining the effects of distributive justice, procedural justice and referent cognition on satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, 7, 122-147, 1995.
29. Martin C. L., Bennett N., "The Role of Justice Judgments in Explaining the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment", *Group & Organization Management*, Sayı: 21, 1996.
30. McFarlin D.B., Sweeney P.D., "Distributive and Procedural Justice as Predictors of Satisfaction With Personal and Organizational Outcomes", *Academy of Management Journal*, Sayı: 35, 1992.
31. Mobley, W. H. Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(2), 237-240, 1977.
32. Moon, H. ve Kamdar D. "Meor We? The Role of Personality And Justice Other- Centered Antecedents to Innovative Citizenship Behaviors Within Organizations", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 84-94, 2008.
33. Moossholder, M. W., Relationships between bases of power and work reactions: the mediational roe of procedural justice. *Journal of Management*, 1991.
34. Niehoff, B.P., Moorman, R.H., Justice as a Mediator of the Relationship Between Methodsof Monitoring and Organizational Citizenship Behavior, *Academy of Management Journal*, Sayı: 36, ss.527-556, 1993.
35. Özdevecioğlu, M., Algılanan Örgütsel Adaletin Bireylerarası Saldırgan Davranışlar Üzerindeki Etkilerinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma, *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Sayı: 21, ss. 77-96, 2003
36. Parker, Robert J. ve Kohlmeyer III, James M., "Organizational justice and turnover in public accounting firms: a research note", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 30, pp. 357-369, 2005.
37. Scott, A., Gravelle, H., "Job Satisfaction and Quitting Intentions: A Structural Model of British General Practitioners", *British Journal of Industrial*

- Simoens, S., Bojke, C. And Sibbald, B., *Relations*, Vol:44, No:3, ss. 519-540, 2006.
38. Shappiro, D.L., Buttner, E.H., and Barry, B. (Explanations: What factors enhanced their perceived adequacy? *Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 58, 346-368, 1994.
39. Siegel, P., Reinstein, A., ve Miller, C. Mentoring and organizational justice among audit professionals. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance*, 1–25, 2001.
40. Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434–443.
41. Söyük, S., *Örgütsel Adaletin İş Tatmini Üzerine Etkisi Ve İstanbul İlindeki Özel Hastanelerde Çalışan Hemşirelere Yönelik Bir Çalışma*, Doktora Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul, 2007.
42. Tan, Ç., *İlköğretim Okullarında Görev Yapan Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Adalet Konusundaki Algıları (Elazığ İl Örneği)*, Fırat Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elazığ, 2006.
43. Tang, T. L., Sarsfield, B.L., Distributive and Procedural Justice as Related to Satisfaction and Commitment, *Advanced Management Journal*, Sayı: 61, No.3, 1996.
44. Tett, R. P., ve Meyer, J. P., Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analysis based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 259-293, 1993.
45. Thibaut, J. W., Walker, L., *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, 1975.
46. Tütüncü, Ö., Demir M., *Konaklama İşletmelerinde İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Ve İşgücü Hareketlerinin Analizi*, Turhan Kitabevi, Ankara, 2002.
47. Vahtera J., Kivimäki M., Elovainio M., Organizational Justice: Evidence of a New Psychosocial Predictor of Health”, *American Journal of Public Health*, Sayı: 92, 2002.
48. Woods, R.H., *Managing Hospitality Human Resources*, 2nd ed. American Hotel and Motel Association, Lansing, MI, 1997.
49. Yeniçeri, Ö., Demirel, Y., Seçkin Z., *Örgütsel Adalet İle Duygusal Tükenmişlik Arasındaki İlişki: İmalat Sanayi Çalışanları Üzerine Bir Araştırma*, KMU İİBF Dergisi Yıl:11 Sayı:16 Haziran/2009.
50. Yılmaz, B., Halıcı, A., “ İşgücü Devir Hızını Etkileyen Etmenler: Sekreterlik Mesleğinde Bir Araştırma”, *International Journal Of Economic And Administrative Studies Year:2 Volume:2 Number:4, Winter 2010 Issn 1307-9832*.
51. Yürür, S., “Ödüllendirme Sistemleri ile Örgütsel Adalet Arasındaki İlişkilerin Analizi ve Bir Uygulama”, Basılmamış Doktora Tezi, Uludağ Üniversitesi SBE, Bursa, 2008.

Copyright of Young Economists Journal / Revista Tinerilor Economisti is the property of Revista Tinerilor Economisti and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.