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Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of organizational justice on job satisfaction. The data was collected from (14) five stars hotels located in Amman city by using a questionnaire. The sampling unit and analysis consisted of (348) employees working at the target hotels. Multiple linear regression and Pearson’s correlation coefficients were computed to examine the study hypotheses. The study found a positive and statistically significant relationships between distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, and job satisfaction. Additionally, The study found that organizational justice positively and significantly affects job satisfaction. Based on these findings, the study recommends that managers should strive to enhance the levels of organizational justice in their hotels to foster job satisfaction to promote and increase customer satisfaction and service quality, in addition, managers and supervisors should concern about the interpersonal treatment of employees in their hotels in order to promote interactional justice. Moreover, hotels should develop their human resource policies to provide just distribution of rewards and resources among employees. Finally, managers can use the diagnostic instrument that used in current study to benchmark their hotels and determine their level of organizational justice, identify the managerial practices that need to be implemented or improved, and determine the level of effort and resources that might realistically be required to build a stronger organizational justice.
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Introduction:
Perceived justice by employees in the organization has significant organizational effects (Chegini, 2009). Mostly, justice is used interchangeably with fairness and equity in the literature by scholars (Adams, 1963; Leventhal, 1980; Moorman, 1991). The idea of fairness in organizations is originated from the social-psychological literature on distributive justice (Adams, 1963). Organizational justice has been studied by researchers interested in social psychology, leadership and management studies. In particular, the organizational outcome of perceived justice by employees has been extensively researched (Adams, 1963; Leventhal, 1980; Moorman, 1991; Colquitt et al., 2001; Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001). Fair treatment provides the perception to employees that their work efforts are realized and assessed by their supervisors and encourages them to engage in collaborative behaviors in the organization (Tyler and Blader, 2000). Fairness provides a positive work environment that increases employees’ motivation and satisfaction on the job (Zapata Phelan et al., 2009). Furthermore, fairness gives the feeling to employees that they are treated with integrity, truthfulness and openness in the workplace (Colquitt et al., 2005). Generally speaking, employees’ perceptions of fairness in all organizational processes and practices are assumed to influence their behavior and work outcomes (Suliman, 2013). The majority of researchers tend
to agree on the multifaceted nature of organizational justice construct, and incline to cite three main factors namely distributive, procedural and interactional justice.

However, the empirical evidence on the effects of organizational justice on job satisfaction is mixed; some studies have found a positive relationship between distributive, procedural and interactional justice and job satisfaction (e.g., Abekah-Nkrumah and Atinga, 2012; Al-Zu’bi, 2010; Dundar and Tabancali, 2012; Elamin and Alomaim, 2011; Fatt et al., 2010; Hao et al., 2016; Kashif et al., 2016; Lotfi and Pour, 2013; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992; Paramanandam, 2013; Singh, 2015; Suliman, 2006; Whisenant and Smucker, 2009; Yiğitol and Balaban, 2018; Zainalipour et al., 2010) whereas others found procedural justice does not show any significant relationship with the job satisfaction (e.g., Akbolat et al., 2015; Akram et al., 2016; Firoozi et al., 2017; Iqbal, 2013; Kumar et al., 2009; Lowe and Vodanovich, 1995; Malik and Naeem, 2011; Rahman et al., 2015; Rai, 2013; Sia and Tan, 2016; Usmani and Jamal, 2013).

With these different views and findings, therefore, it is useful to conduct a study that examine potential problems in this domain. Additionally, Jordan relies on hotel sector for its economic growth. It is the largest productive private industry in the country, and the second largest in terms of foreign exchange earnings (Jordan Hotel Association), but the study of organizational justice and its role in providing positive work environment has been neglected in this sector.

Thus, the purpose of this study is to determine whether there is significant empirical evidence of a link between organizational justice and job satisfaction in Jordan hotel sector.

Statement of the Problem:

Unjust management practices have been linked with negative outcome variables such as increased turnover intention and job stress as well as decreased job performance (Cohen Charash and Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al, 2005). Although many research studies have addressed the issue of organizational justice in organizations, there is no empirical research has been conducted to examine the effect of organizational justice on job satisfaction in the hotel sector in both Arabian and Jordanian context. Thus, understanding organizational justice in hotel sector becomes important in order to promote successful outcomes that incorporate positive work environment. Organizational justice provides the perception to employees that their work efforts are realized and assessed by their supervisors and provides a positive work environment that increases employees’ motivation and satisfaction on the job. However, a high degree of employees’ job satisfaction is a key desired outcome of organizational justice. Because organizations with satisfied, motivated, and committed employees provide the essential impetus in delivering quality service and ensuring customer satisfaction.

Therefore, the current study tries to answer the following questions:

- What is the level of organizational justice in Jordanian hotels?
- What is the level of Jordanian hotels employees’ job satisfaction?
- Is there a relationship between employees’ job satisfaction and organizational justice in Jordan hotel sector?
- Do perceptions of organizational justice predict Jordanian hotels employees' job satisfaction?

Significance of the Study:

Due to the fact that organizational justice has been neglected in Jordan hotel sector, there is a need for research concerning how employees in Jordanian hotels perceive the
characteristics of their organizations. The results of this study will reveal the importance and effects of employees' perceptions of fairness in organizations.

This study will help all levels of managers in Jordanian hotels to understand how to increase employees' job satisfaction within their work environment. In addition, the results of this study will guide managers to make better decisions and understand the importance of supervisory behaviors by giving them information about the relationship between employees' justice perceptions and work-related outcomes. Moreover, the study contributes to the related literature in terms of supporting the notion that perceived organizational justice has a significant effect on job satisfaction.

The Study Objectives:
The current study aims to:
- Identify the level of organizational justice in Jordanian hotels.
- Identify the level of Jordanian hotels employees' job satisfaction.
- Explore the relationship between employees' job satisfaction and organizational justice in Jordan hotel sector.
- Determine the effect of organizational justice on employees' job satisfaction in Jordanian hotels.

Literature review

Organizational Justice:
The term “organizational justice” was coined by Greenberg (1987) to describe individuals' perceptions of fairness in organizations, and what had come to be its widely accepted dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. Organizational justice's origins extend back to Adams' (1965) equity theory, which recognized that individuals examine their inputs and outcomes relative to those of others, and make determinations regarding fairness. Carrell and Dittrich (1978) stated that individuals would conceptualize what is fair, compare their outcomes with those of others, and act on perceived inequities. This perspective laid the groundwork for the focus on the distribution of outcomes such as pay, promotion, etc., and led to the development of the first conceptualization of organizational justice, the dimension of distributive justice.

Distributive justice addresses the fairness of outcomes (Greenberg, 1987). Often focused on pay and other forms of compensation as outcomes, distributive justice also includes examinations of perceptions of fairness with regard to other outcomes, such as office assignment, promotions, job titles, and the like. Distributive justice is often measured by asking respondents, simply, how fair they perceive their outcomes to be. In response to these assessments of distributive justice, individuals are likely to behave in ways that alleviate dissonance (Yiğitöl and Balaban, 2018). In other words, if one perceives that his pay is lower than is fair, he can change his behaviors to “earn” more (altering his outcome), change his behaviors in order to lower his inputs, or change his perceptions with regard to what is fair (Firoozi et al., 2017). Greenberg (1987) provided an interesting study with regard to employee theft as a response to distributive inequity. In it, individuals responded with varying degrees of thievery to announcements of pay cuts. Such a dramatic and potentially harmful reaction to distributive justice highlights its significance to our understanding of behavior.

Thibaut and Walker (1975) introduced the concept of procedural justice. Where
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distributive justice addresses outcomes, procedural justice addresses the processes through
which outcome distributions are made. Like distributive justice, procedural justice can be
explored with regard to referents (Kozlowski and Klein, 2000). One may make determinations
of the fairness of the procedures used to determine one’s outcomes relative to the procedures
used to determine another’s outcomes, if, indeed, these procedures differ (i.e., across
departments or supervisors). Typically, individuals are asked how fair the procedures used to
determine their outcomes (whether specified or in general) are. Leventhal (1980) delineated six
criteria for assessing procedural fairness: freedom from bias, consistency, correct ability,
consideration of group opinion, accuracy of information, and morality/ethicality. Bies and
Moag (1986) developed the concept of interactional justice. Utilizing a framework of accounts
and explanations, they pointed to the fairness of one’s treatment in the context of procedural
determinations and outcome distributions. Interactional justice examines fairness with regard
to treatment that conveys personal respect for, information shared with, and assigned dignity
of, individuals during procedures and outcome distributions.

The interactional justice construct has suffered from lack of clarity (Greenberg,1993;
Colquitt & Greenberg, 2003; Colquitt et al, 2001). Although some scholars view interactional
justice as a single construct, others have proposed two dimensions of interactional justice:
informational justice and interpersonal justice. Bies and Moag (1986) present these two
concepts as separate dimensions of organizational justice that comprise interactional justice.
Informational justice speaks to the fairness of information provided during the procedures and
outcome distributions, by asking questions such as, “Was the information accurate?” and “Was
the information provided in a timely manner?” Interpersonal justice addresses the fairness of
person oriented treatment, by asking questions related to the respect with which one has been
meta-analytically derived correlation matrix and found support for three distinct dimensions of
organizational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional), concluding that the
correlations among the three justice conceptualizations are high, and they seem to be multiple
indicators of one underlying construct (Colquitt, 2001).

Job Satisfaction:

Job satisfaction is the cognitive and affective reaction to a job by an individual based
on the comparison of personal needs and perceived job outcomes (Brown and Lam, 2008;
Biggs and Swailes, 2006; Staw and Cohen-Charash, 2005; Udechukwu, 2009). According to
Robbins (2006) Job satisfaction is an attitude toward one’s job, the difference between the
amount of rewards that a worker received and the amount of reward that they believed should
be accepted. Biggs and Swailes (2006) viewed job satisfaction as a person’s attitude about his
or her job. The attitude is reflective of a person’s feelings about the job. Greenberg and Baron
(2005) defined job satisfaction as a feeling that can produce a positive or negative effect
toward one’s roles and responsibilities at work. Maslow (1987) suggested job satisfaction
results as a person receives motivation from the job in fulfilling esteem and self-actualization
needs.

However, job satisfaction is a broad conception which is used in many fields to
describe or measure people’s feeling toward one organization’s turnover, performance, policies
and other factors. It has been recognized that job satisfaction can be impacted by economic,
social and psychological factors (Kwak et al., 2010).
Research shows two definitive ways to look at job satisfaction: as a multi-faceted or aggregate
variable reflective of the facets of a job or as a separate and single view general job satisfaction
Bowling, Hendricks, and Wagner (2008) and Fichter and Cipolla (2010) suggested five job facets of job satisfaction: work itself, compensation, promotional opportunity, coworker interaction, and supervision. Employees evaluate the work itself by assessing opportunities for autonomy, creativity, job enrichment, job complexity, knowledge acquisition, responsibility, and task variety. Employees evaluate actual compensation versus expected compensation, looking for congruency of the two factors. Employees evaluate promotional opportunities from the fairness in policies and administration of promotions within an organization. Employees seek positive relationships with coworkers enhancing individual and group interactions. Employees evaluate supervision using the criteria of employee consideration, employee inclusiveness, and relationship behaviors (Fichter and Cipolla, 2010; Yang, 2009).

The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction

Organizational justice is a reliable and strong predictor of job satisfaction (Al-Zu’bi, 2010; Elamin and Alomaim, 2011; Malik and Naeem, 2011). Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) concluded from their meta-analysis that distributive justice is the most significant predictor of job satisfaction while Colquitt et al.’s (2001) meta-analysis indicates that procedural justice is the most important predictor of job satisfaction. In addition, Masterson et al. (2000) demonstrated that procedural justice is a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than interactional justice, although both had significant independent effects.

However, there has been much literature regarding influences of organizational justice on job satisfaction. Many studies have found a positive relationship between distributive, procedural and interactional justice and job satisfaction. For instance:

Yiğitol and Balaban’s (2018) empirical study has investigated the perception of justice on promotion, performance appraisal, remuneration practices, and the effect of this perception of justice on employee satisfaction. The study was conducted on the employees of a leading company in the dairy sector in Konya province, in Turkey; it was found that there was positive relationship between organizational justice in human resources functions and employee satisfaction.

Ali (2017) empirical study has investigated the perceived justice (distributive, procedural, and Interactional) by the Arab American University employees and analyze the relationship between the perceived justice and job satisfaction. The study was conducted in the Palestinian environment. Data were collected through a questionnaire distributed to a stratified randomly selected sample out of 500 employees at the Arab American University. The results indicated a strong positive relationship between the perceived justice and job satisfaction.

Firoozi et al. (2017) empirical study has investigated the relationship between organizational justice and the dimensions of job satisfaction of physical education teachers. The Sample included 162 physical education teachers in Iran. The results indicated that there is a positive and meaningful correlation between the components of organizational justice and dimensions of job satisfaction. Regression analysis showed that out of the components of organizational justice, distributive justice has the capability of predicting all dimensions of job satisfaction. Moreover, procedural justice has the capability to predict satisfaction with coworkers and their supervisors. Finally, interactive justice does not contribute to the dimensions of job satisfaction.
The Effect of Organizational Job Satisfaction

Kashif et al. (2016) empirical study has investigated the relationship between organizational justice encompassed by three components: (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) and job satisfaction as perceived by employees in banking sector of Pakistan. The data was collected through distribution of well structured questionnaires amongst 291 employees of these banks. The study findings confirmed existence of a positive relationship with all dimensions of organizational justice with job satisfaction.

Sia and Tan’s (2016) empirical study has investigated the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction of managers, supervisors, and staff in a hotel setting situated in Philippines. Specifically, it looked into the influence of the three dimensions of organizational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional) on the hotel employees’ level of job satisfaction with regards to fairness of manager/supervisor to staff relationships, pay, and schedule (among others). A Likert scale survey instrument was administered to select respondents from 13 departments of nine hotels. The results revealed that distributive and interactional justice positively affects employees’ job satisfaction, while procedural justice does not have a significant impact.

Altahayneh et al. (2014) empirical study has investigated the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction as perceived by Jordanian physical education teachers. Participants consisted of 166 physical education teachers selected from public schools in Jordan. The findings showed a positive and significant relationship between all dimensions of organizational justice and teachers’ job satisfaction.

Al-Zu’bi (2010) empirical study has investigated the relationship between organizational justice encompassed by three components: (distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) and job satisfaction. The study investigated the relationship of these justice measures in the Jordanian environment. The data was collected through the distribution of questionnaires among 229 employees of number Electrical Industrial Companies selected through a stratified random sampling. The study findings confirmed existence of a positive relationship with all dimensions of organizational justice with job satisfaction.

Study Hypotheses:
On the basis of the above, the study hypotheses are expressed as follows:

H01: There is no relationship between distributive justice and employees’ job satisfaction in Jordanian hotels at (α ≤ 0.05).
H02: There is no relationship between procedural justice and employees’ job satisfaction in Jordanian hotels at (α ≤ 0.05).
H03: There is no relationship between interactional justice and employees’ job satisfaction in Jordanian hotels at (α ≤ 0.05).
H04: There is no effect for organizational justice on employees’ job satisfaction in Jordanian hotels at (α ≤ 0.05).

Research Method and Design:
A descriptive and quantitative method was chosen for this study. Specifically the survey design, data were collected using a questionnaire. Data analysis was conducted using...
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both the correlation and the multiple regression through SPSS.

**Population and Sample:**

The study population consisted of the five stars hotels that located in Amman city. The study sample included (14) hotels chosen on the random basis. The sampling unit and analysis consisted of (348) employees working at the target hotels.

**Measures:**

All scales adopted the 5-point Likert-type response format. The researcher asked respondents to choose an answer that best represented their beliefs and attitudes.

- Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice Scale. The researcher used the 20-item scale developed by (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993) to measure the perceptions of employees toward organizational justice (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree). A distributive justice subscale (five items) describes the extent to which an employee believes that his or her work outcomes, such as rewards and recognition, are fair. The outcomes include pay level, work schedule, workload, and job responsibilities. A procedural justice subscale (six items) describes the extent to which formal procedures exist, and whether these procedures are implemented in a way that takes employees' needs into consideration. The formal procedures involve job decisions that are based on complete and unbiased information and opportunities to ask questions and challenge decisions. An interactional justice subscale (nine items) covers the extent to which employees perceive that their needs are taken into account in making job decisions and the extent to which employees are provided with adequate explanations when decisions are finalized.

- Job Satisfaction. The researcher used the 6-item scale developed by (Schriesheim and Tsui, 1980) to measure the perceptions of employees toward the overall job satisfaction (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree). The scale includes single questions to assess the degree of employee satisfaction with the work itself, supervision, coworkers, pay, promotion opportunities, and the job in general.

- Demographic Variables: The researcher used 4 demographic questions regarding respondents (Gender, Age, Experience, and Education).

**Respondent Demographic profile:**

As indicated in Table (1), the demographic profile of the respondents for this study showed that they are typically males, about 67.53 percent of them hold bachelor degrees, and about 42 percent of them have experience from 5 to 10 years.

**Table1. The characteristics of study sample (Respondents)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>69.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>30.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>Less than (5) years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From (5) to less than (10) years</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>42.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From (10) to less than (15) years</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>27.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>From (15) to less than (20) years</th>
<th>(20) years and above</th>
<th>Less than Bachelor</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>67.53</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Less than (30) years</th>
<th>From (30) to less than (35) years</th>
<th>From (35) to less than (40) years</th>
<th>(41) years and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>45.69</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total              | 348                              |                                  |                                  |                     |
|                    | 100%                             |                                  |                                  |                     |

Instrument Validity and Reliability:

The reliability of the survey instruments that were utilized in this study was tested based on Cronbach’s alpha. It is held that an instrument which confirms a reliability score of .60 and above is generally considered adequate. However, a coefficient alpha of .70 at the minimum is generally acceptable for hypotheses testing (Sekaran, 2003). Table (2) represents the results of Cronbach’s alpha for the independent and dependent variables. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of all the tested variables are above 0.70, which suggest that the composite measure is reliable. In addition, the items selected to measure the independent and dependent variables were validated and reused from previous researches. Therefore, the researcher relied upon in enhancing the validity of the scale was to benefit from a pre-used scale that is developed from other researchers. Also, the questionnaire items were reviewed by four instructors of the business faculty at the Jordanian universities. The feedback from the chosen group for the pre-test contributed to enhanced content validity of the instrument. Furthermore, to enhance the content validity of the instrument, 10 employees at Jordanian hotels were asked to give their feedback about the questionnaire, thus confirming that the content of each question was relevant to the studied topic.

Table 2. Reliability of Survey Instrument(n=348)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument as a whole</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Analysis
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Descriptive Statistics:

To describe the responses and thus the attitude of the respondents toward each question, they were asked in the survey, the mean and the standard deviation were estimated. While the mean shows the central tendency of the data, the standard deviation measures the dispersion which offers an index of the spread or variability in the data (Sekaran, 2003). In other words, a small standard deviation for a set of values reveals that these values are clustered closely about the mean or located close to it; a large standard deviation indicates the opposite. The level of each item was determined by the following formula: (highest point in Likert scale-lowest point in Likert scale) / the number of the levels used = (5 - 1) / 3 = 1.33, where 1-2.33 reflected “low”, 2.34-3.67 reflected “moderate” and 3.68-5 reflected “high”. Table (3) show the results.

Table 3. The means and standard deviations for the respondent’s answers on the questionnaire items related to the organizational justice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My work schedule is fair.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I think that my level of pay is fair</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I consider my workload to be quite fair</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel that my job responsibilities are fair</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general mean of distributive justice</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job decisions are made by the manager / supervisor in an unbiased manner</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My manager / supervisor makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To make formal job decisions, my manager / supervisor collects accurate and complete information</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My manager / supervisor clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. All job decisions are applied consistently across all affected employees</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by the manager/ supervisor</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general mean of procedural justice</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. When decisions are made about my job, the manager / supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. When decisions are made about my job, the manager / supervisor treats me with respect and dignity</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>When decisions are made about my job, the manager / supervisor is sensitive to my personal needs</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>When decisions are made about my job, the manager / supervisor deals with me in a truthful manner</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>When decisions are made about my job, the manager / supervisor shows concern for my rights as an employee</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Concerning decisions about my job, the manager / supervisor discusses the implications of the decisions with me</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The manager / supervisor offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>When making decisions about my job, the manager / supervisor offers explanations that make sense to me</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>My manager / supervisor explains very clearly any decision made about my job</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The general mean of interactional justice</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The general mean of organizational justice</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the nature of the work you perform?</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the person who supervises you— your organizational supervisor?</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with your relations with others in the organization with whom you work—your coworkers or peers?</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the pay you receive for your job?</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the opportunities which exist in this organization for advancement or promotion?</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your current job situation</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The general mean of job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from table (3) indicates an indicator of the importance of organizational justice, and such high level of presentation denotes a positive attitude regarding the organizational justice. However, employees’ job satisfaction found to be moderate. This advocates that Jordanian hotels are currently applying organizational justice practices and
focus on employees’ job satisfaction to maintain a positive work environment.

Test of Hypotheses

Pearson Correlation:

Pearson correlation was used to test the study hypotheses (H01, H02, H03). The results from table (4) show that distributive justice was both positively and significantly correlated (r = .621, p < .01) with the perceived job satisfaction of the respondents. Thus, H01 was rejected. Additionally, the results of the correlation indicate that procedural justice was both positively and significantly correlated with perceived job satisfaction of the respondents (r= .584, p < .01). Thus, H02 was rejected. Finally, the results show that interactional justice was both positively and significantly correlated (r = .562, p < .01) with perceived job satisfaction of the respondents. Thus, H03 was rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Pearson’s Correlation (n=348)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Distributive Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Procedural Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Interactional Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Analysis:

Before conducting the regression analysis in order to test the study hypothesis H04, the following tests were conducted: Variance Inflation Factory (VIF) Test in order to ensure there is no Multicollinearity between variables, and Skewness Test to ensure that the data follow the normal distribution. Table (5) presents the results of these tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. The Results of Variance Inflation Factory (VIF) Test, and Skewness test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be figured out from Table (5) the Skewness values were within the normal values (-1.0 to 1.0), suggesting that the data of the independent variables is normal. The VIF values were less than the critical value (10) which is most common among most studies, suggesting no Multicollinearity problem among the independent variables.

To test the hypothesis H04 developed for this study, the multiple regression technique was used. Further, the level of significance (α -level) was chosen to be 0.05 and the probability value (p-value) obtained from the statistical hypothesis test is considered to be the decision rule for rejecting the null hypotheses. If the p-value is less than or equal to the α level, the null hypothesis will be rejected and the alternative hypothesis will be supported. However, if the p-value is greater than the α level, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected and the alternative hypothesis will not be supported. The results of testing H04 are demonstrated in Table 6.
Table 6 indicates that there is a positive correlation between organizational justice and job satisfaction in Jordanian hotels ($r = 0.813$), which means that the independent variables and dependent variable change in the same direction. The value of $R^2$ reflects the proportion of variation in job satisfaction variable that could be referred to (or explained) by the three components of organizational justice. This is to say that 66 percent of the variability of job satisfaction has been explained by the variables of organizational justice. $F$-ratio for the data was $147.311$, which is significant at $p < 0.05$ (sig = 0.000). Therefore, there was a statistically significant impact for organizational justice on job satisfaction, and thus the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Specifically, the $t$ value for distributive justice was (3.72) with a level of significance of (0.000), (3.88) with a level of significance of (0.000) for procedural justice, and a value of (4.91) with a level of significance of (0.000) for interactional justice. Also, the value of $\beta$ was 0.443, 0.369, and 0.282, respectively, indicating that distributive justice is the strongest predictor for job satisfaction at the studied Jordanian hotels, followed by procedural justice and interactional justice.

### Table 6. Beta and $t$ values for the study hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Significance (f)</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$.</th>
<th>Significance (t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>147.311</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the level of statistical significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

**Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

**Results Discussion:**

One of the major claims made in the organizational behavior literature is that enhancing organizational justice can result in increased job satisfaction. The results of the current study provide empirical evidence supports this claim and show that there is a significant positive relationship between three components of organizational justice namely (procedural, distributive, and interactional justice) and job satisfaction. Additionally, the results show that there is a statistically significant impact for organizational justice on job satisfaction, and that distributive justice is the strongest predictor for job satisfaction at the studied Jordanian hotels, followed by procedural justice and interactional justice. The results of this study support findings which have been held by other theorist and practitioners stating that organizational justice is associated with job satisfaction (e.g., Abekah-Nkrumah and Atinga, 2012; Al-Zu’bi, 2010; Ali, 21017; Dundar and Tabancali, 2012; Elamin and Alomaime, 2011; Fatt et al., 2010; Hao et al., 2016; Kashif et al., 2016; Lotfi and Pour, 2013; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992; Paramanandham, 2013; Singh, 2015; Suliman, 2006; Whisenant and Smucker, 2009; Yiğitol and Balaban, 2018; Zainalipour et al., 2010). These results are in line with the literature on job satisfaction and organizational justice. Moreover, The results of this study suggest that there are positive benefits that can accrue to hotels in applying organizational justice, such as increases in job satisfaction of employees. The literature reported a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. A satisfied employee develops organizational commitment, resulting in longevity with an employer. High organizational commitment and high job satisfaction provide for increased organizational...
The Effect of Organizational Citizenship. Additionally, the literature reported a linkage between job satisfaction, customer satisfaction, and service quality. Satisfied, motivated, and committed employees provide the essential impetus in delivering quality service and ensuring customer satisfaction. Therefore, having organizational justice has positive payoffs for an organization with respect to a level of desired job satisfaction.

Recommendations:

Based on the results the study recommends that:
- Managers should apply organizational justice to foster job satisfaction to promote and increase customer satisfaction and service quality.
- Managers and supervisors should concern about the interpersonal treatment of employees in their hotels in order to promote interactional justice.
- Managers and supervisors should make decisions based on accurate and complete information and clarify decisions and provide additional information when requested by employees in order to promote procedural justice.
- Hotels should develop their human resource policies to provide just distribution of rewards and resources among employees.
- Managers can use the diagnostic instrument that used in current study to assess the hotel’s organizational justice. Managers can use this instrument to benchmark their hotels and determine their level of organizational justice. The instrument can also help managers identify not only the managerial practices that need to be implemented or improved but also the level of effort and resources that might realistically be required to build a stronger organizational justice.

Limitations:

Despite important contributions from this study, several limitations remain. First, the study was conducted in the hotel sector of Jordan. Therefore, the results may not generalize to other sectors. Second, this study focused on the perceptions of members within a limited number of organizations. Third, this study might have self-selection and non-response bias. This occurs when the entities in the sample are given a choice to participate. If a set of members in the sample decides not to participate, it reduces the ability to generalize the results to the entire population.

Future research directions

Although the current study has established that there is a significant relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction, as stated earlier, the issue of causality remains. In the future, researchers may want to address the issue of causality using field experiments. With the large number of validated scales that can be used to assess organizational justice, this is a very feasible research design for pre and post intervention studies on organizational justice and Job satisfaction. If the proper controls are in place, these studies can contribute significantly to theory building and can more clearly address the causal link between organizational justice and job satisfaction.

Another potential area for further research is to explore whether other factors can play an important role in either mediating or moderating the effects of organizational justice on the employees’ job satisfaction.

Lastly, the issue of context can be another potentially productive extension to the body of research reviewed during the conducting of this study. Obviously some of the relationships...
The Effect of Organizational …………………………… Dr. Ahamad Abo Zaid

were stronger in some studies and weaker in others. Further research may want to explore why this may be the case. For example, can the strengths of this relationship be partially explained by context? Is it possible that organizations that are smaller or are in the service industry can benefit more from enhancing an organizational justice than, for example, public sector organizations where job satisfaction is often more difficult to measure and define and is not as crucial to survival? Research that explicitly examines the role of context in this literature can also add significantly to theory building in the field.
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