

Unveiling Equitable Horizons: Exploring the Quantitative Correlation between Authentic Leadership and Organizational Justice in the Hospitality Industry

Kifayat Larik¹

Abstract

This study investigates the relationship between authentic leadership and organizational justice in the hospitality industry. A quantitative approach with a cross-sectional survey explores how perceptions of authentic leadership relate to various aspects of organizational justice among hotel employees. Findings reveal a strong correlation between authentic leadership and perceived fairness, especially procedural fairness. Authentic leadership, grounded in positive psychology and ethical principles, enhances interpersonal dynamics and information sharing, fostering an equitable organizational environment. The study highlights significant implications for leadership and justice theories, suggesting that authentic leadership promotes employee fairness and equity.

Further research is needed to understand how authentic leadership influences different facets of organizational equity. This exploration could provide valuable insights into whether leadership behavior embodies fairness principles. The study's findings have practical implications for hospitality leaders, emphasizing the importance of embracing authentic leadership to promote fairness and address industry challenges. Socially, the research contributes to discussions on social justice by advocating for fairness and equality within organizations. By integrating leadership and justice theories, this study offers valuable insights for hospitality leaders to promote fairness and counteract industry adversities.

Keywords: Organizational Justice, authentic leadership, Human resources, Hotels.

¹ Aror University of Art, Architecture, Design & Heritage Sukkur Sindh
Corresponding: Kifayatilarik@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Pakistan's tourism and hospitality sector boasted an estimated value of nearly \$20 billion. Regrettably, the recent pandemic has inflicted a severe blow to this flourishing industry, disrupting its momentum. The once-thriving tourism sector, which contributed 7.1% to the nation's Gross Domestic Product, now succumbs to the challenges posed by these unprecedented times. The flourishing hospitality sector in Pakistan is a direct result of the mutually reinforcing relationship between tourism and hotels.(Sajjad et al., 2018) It sheds light on the commendable sustainability measures implemented by the hotel industry, highlighting their commitment to responsible development practices. Leading multinational corporations steadfastly implement sustainable development strategies in their day-to-day operations, particularly evident in advanced nations, a pattern that contrasts significantly with emerging economies. Regrettably, sustainability is a mere afterthought in the operational framework of prominent hotels in Pakistan.

The hospitality sector has a highly labor-intensive workforce with various backgrounds and experiences. For instance, hotels offer jobs that require only the most fundamental skills, little education, and highly qualified positions. The hospitality industry offers job opportunities for older populations, immigrants, and other groups who have trouble entering the formal labor market in Pakistan and many other nations. Despite its notable features, the hospitality industry is infamous for its poor working conditions, long hours, low wages, lack of health insurance, and high employee turnover rates (Carbery et al., 2003). Dissatisfaction among hotel employees is primarily influenced by adverse working conditions and constant pressure from management and customers for exceptional service (Megeirhi et al., 2018). According to (Carbery et al., 2003), hotel employees' dissatisfaction leads to high turnover rates and job discomfort. On the other hand, (Fulford, 2008) suggests that hotel employees' job attitudes improve.

Organizational justice is crucial for determining employer-employee relations in the hospitality sector in the twenty-first century. It refers to employees' perception of fairness in workplace policies, agreements, and practices. It is crucial for fostering positive relationships (Berger et al., 1993). Baldwin et al. (2006) defined organizational justice as the perceived fairness of workplace policies, agreements, and practices from the employees' perspective.

Given recent research in the hospitality sector, it is crucial to recognize the significance of employees' perceptions of a good workplace. These perceptions profoundly impact

organizational outcomes, such as employee retention (Gosser et al., 2018) (Luo et al., 2017). Academics have long argued for a shift in leadership research towards a more integrated progressive approach, moving away from a hierarchical focus (Avolio, 2007)(Dinh et al., 2014). According to (Avolio and Gardner, 2005), authentic leadership, which is frequently regarded as the model for all other positive leadership styles, is By adopting a leadership style that fosters the development of positive psychological skills and moral qualities, leaders can enhance their self-confidence and moral judgment. They can also promote the fair use of information and foster effective collaboration between leaders and followers. Ultimately, these actions can contribute to promoting positive self-awareness among all stakeholders. This study aims to clarify how authentic leadership approaches can foster strong fairness perceptions among subordinates, building on the general conceptual argument for leadership as a prerequisite for justice perceptions.

According to (Karam et al., 2019) Claim as much. (1) "Employee-leader relationships are often described as social exchange relationships and differ from other forms of communication because they expect longer-term, interdependent interactions that generate trust, reciprocal behavior, and high-quality relationships," making it crucial to have a deeper understanding of the connection between leadership and a sense of justice. (2) "Leader-centered Justice is frequently concerned with research questions related to (a) examining the distinctive contribution of leader-centered dimensions of justice (i.e., distributive, interpersonal, informational, procedural justice) to how organizational outcomes are impacted, or (b) investigate how leaders' alleged unfair treatment compares to or differs from that of others' alleged unfair treatment. Although the structures of authentic leadership styles and organizational justice are well-established and have a high level of research activity, these research streams are more autonomous. According to research on just and ethical leadership, organizational justice and levels of ethical behavior in the workplace are positively correlated with favorable outcomes for both employers and workers (Avolio et al., 2009)(Kiersch & Byrne, 2015); as a result, there is a pressing need for organizational justice and leadership research to be more closely integrated, this study fills that crucial gap.

1.1.Problem Statement

According to (Faldetta et al., 2013), the hospitality sector frequently experiences high turnover. Compared to the manufacturing sector, the global hotel industry has a much higher annual turnover rate of 60% to 300% (Hemdi et al., 2015). According to researchers who

specialize in the hospitality sector, organizational justice and leadership structures hold the key to long-term solutions to turnover issues (Baum, 2013) (Fulford, 2008) (Luo et al., 2017). As per the latest research, it has been found that employees who are actively involved in their work, satisfied with their job and working conditions, and feel that they are treated fairly in the workplace are vital for the success of an organization (López-Cabarcos et al., 2014).

From transactional or authoritarian leadership (Ispas, 2012) to laissez-faire (Uzunsaf et al., 2018) to paternalistic or authoritarian leadership (Tran, 2017) and leader-member exchanges (Garg & Dhar, 2016), studies conducted on various continents have demonstrated that the hospitality sector still relies on these traditional leadership philosophies. Effective leadership from supervisors and managers can offset the negative impact of the hospitality industry on employees. Research has found that by showing appreciation, promoting a respectful work environment, treating employees fairly, and encouraging their personal growth, strong supervisory leadership has the power to mitigate these effects. According to (Meindl, 1989), "The image of managers concerned with justice and fairness to subordinates in the discharge of their duties should be but is often not reflected or taken seriously." According to (Storberg-Walker & Gardiner, 2017), authentic leadership (AL) is viewed as a compelling leadership model that combats destructive leadership styles. Encouraging employees to prioritize justice issues strengthens the impact of justice on their behavior, while diverting their attention from justice-related matters does not harm relationships (Strom et al., 2014). As per social contagion theory, employees who perceive their leaders as genuine, trustworthy, ethical, and consistent show reduced negative attitudes and behaviors over time (Avolio et al., 2004).

1.2.Purpose and Research Question:

The primary aim of this study was to investigate the connection between effective leadership, specifically an authentic leadership style, and how employees perceive fairness within the hospitality industry. The following research inquiries guided the research.

1. How do organizational justice and the perceptions of authentic leadership among hotel employees relate?
2. Do hotel employees' perceptions of various aspects of organizational Justice (I.e., justice that is interactive, distributive, procedural, and informational)?
3. Does the relationship between authentic leadership and hotel employees' opinions of organizational justice depend on their demographics?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Leadership and Organizational Justice

In the social sciences and management, leadership and organizational justice are two of the most frequently studied subjects (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015)(Hiller et al., 2011). According to studies conducted across continents, the hospitality sector continues to rely on traditional leadership philosophies.

These philosophies include transactional or authoritarian leadership (Ispas, 2012), laissez-faire leadership (Uzunsaf et al., 2018), paternalistic leadership (Tran, 2017), and leader-member exchange (Garg & Dhar, 2016)(Luo et al., 2017) found that hotel supervisors or middle managers have the most contact with front-line employees. Their leadership style influences their behavior, attitudes, and productivity. An ideal leader can inspire employees, manage a healthy organization that adds value to all employees, customers, and stakeholders and leads with integrity and values (Pless & Maak, 2012). In addition, society now expects business executives to do more than maximize profits; they must also uphold the highest standards of morality, ethics, and justice in doing so (Hannah et al., 2011) (Kiersch & Byrne, 2015)(Walumbwa et al., 2008). Authentic leadership is an emerging discipline that integrates positive leadership, ethics, positive psychology, and organizational behavior. Scholars are increasingly exploring the positive dimensions of leadership, as supported by academic and professional literature (Avolio et al., 2004) (Walumbwa et al., 2008).

2.2. Authentic Leadership

2.2.1. *Organizational Justice*

The study of hierarchy stems from social norms and how people respond to their violations, which falls under the field of social philosophy in sociology. Ethical philosophy focuses on societal actions and how individuals should heed them (Rupp et al., 2017). Social scientists have long acknowledged the importance of the justice ideal as a necessary condition for both the efficient operation of organizations and the fulfillment of the people who work for them (Greenberg, 1990) because it is linked to many positive employee outcomes, including satisfaction, commitment, engagement, trust, and lower turnover, organizational justice has received a lot of research attention (Martinson et al., 2010). Distributive Justice is regarded as the original idea of organizational justice, which deals with the fairness of outcomes, including pay, rewards, and promotions (Colquitt et al., 2005). Distributive Justice draws on the work of (Homans, 1958) (Adams, 1965). A series of investigations into the fairness of decision-making

procedures (Caldeira et al., 1976) contributed to the growth of procedural justice. The fairness of the procedures followed to arrive at results is thus a concern of procedural justice. According to (Bies, 1986), decision-making events have three dimensions: the decision, the procedure, and the human interactions that carry out the procedure. Due to this, a third dimension, reciprocal justice, which refers to the fairness of interpersonal interactions, was created. According to (Bies, 1986), interactive justice is promoted when relevant authorities share procedural details respectfully and appropriately and rely on accurate information to make wise decisions. Information justice is a fourth dimension that some academics have added to the communication criteria of interaction justice, focusing on the legitimacy and authenticity of communication. This propensity may eventually result in shared viewpoints on assessing justice-triggering events in a group where members interact, observe one another's behavior, and create collective meaning (Naumann & Bennett, 2000). Umphress et al., (2003) stated, "Senses of justice are not formed in isolation, but are rather influenced by the people with whom we interact."

Various studies have linked different concepts of justice with positive outcomes in organizations. One such study (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001) found that individuals with a strong sense of justice tend to exhibit organizational citizenship behavior (i.e., going above and beyond their job requirements) and perform well in their roles. Fairness is linked to individuals' organizational commitment (Colquitt et al., 2001). This commitment is closely associated with positive attitudes such as job satisfaction (Greenberg, 2010) and job burnout, as well as factors like employee turnover and stress (Fox et al., 2001) (Judge & Colquitt, 2004). The significance of organizational fairness in achieving desired outcomes and fostering healthy relationships is evident in the existing literature.

2.3.Theoretical Foundation:

The theory of leader justice, also known as the fallback approach to leadership and Justice (De Cremer, 2007), is a well-established framework that explains how people's responses to justice vary depending on the leader's behavior. According to the fairness theory, moral responsibility plays a key role in the development of organizational justice and fair judgments, and perceptions of fairness are primarily based on fundamental moral and ethical presumptions about how to treat others (Folger & Greenberg, 2001) (Folger et al., 2005). According to (May et al., 2003), true leaders are genuine individuals who can make ethical decisions and take appropriate action for their followers. Key considerations involve correctly identifying and

assessing these leaders, including quality concerns. Authentic leadership is a strong predictor of organizational justice because morality is, theoretically, central to authentic leadership and a crucial element of organizational justice. Trust is a necessary component of building organizational justice and effective leadership, and it cannot be developed without exchange relationships (Blau, 1964). According to research, fair treatment of employees boosts their perception of trust in the company. Employees' trust in leaders is correlated with their positive attitudes and behaviors (Avolio et al., 2004) because authentic leaders uphold the highest ethical standards, integrity, and honesty; followers have higher expectations of them and are more willing to cooperate with them for the organization's good.

3. METHOD

Drummond and Murphy-Reyes (2018) investigated using a cross-sectional survey and a descriptive correlational design to analyze the connection between authentic leadership and organizational justice. The study focused on quantitative and non-experimental research methods.

3.1.Study sample and sample selection:

Employees in the Pakistani hospitality industry made up the study's target population. The study's sample selection falls under the general heading of cluster sampling. This study used two methods to find respondents. First, the research participants in the study included graduate and undergraduate hotel management students who were also employed in the industry. Using snowball sampling, eligible study participants were asked to distribute invitations to others who met the target population's criteria (Berg, 2006). Second, representatives from professional/trade organizations in the hospitality sector.

3.2.Instruments for data collection

We gathered data for the study by surveying hotel workers in Pakistan. We used the Copyright Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) to assess perceptions of authentic leadership behavior, which measures self- or other-rated perceptions. Additionally, we employed Colquitt's 20-item scale to measure organizational justice, as it was freely available.

3.3.Validity and reliability of the instruments:

One of the most frequently used statistics for evaluating reliability is Cronbach's alpha, which is used to choose the best survey tool. Previous research using the ALQ found that authentic leadership has a Cronbach's alpha of roughly 0.90 (Kiersch & Byrne, 2015)(Rego et

al., 2012)(Walumbwa et al., 2008), indicating an excellent to high-reliability range. Similar to these studies, earlier research (Kiersch & Byrne, 2015)(Nadiri & Tanova, 2010)(Ambrose & Schminke, 2009) consistently reported Cronbach's values for the four dimensions of organizational justice in the range of 0.85 to 0.93.

In order to gather data for this study, a survey was carried out among hotel workers in Pakistan. The Copyrighted Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) was utilized to evaluate individuals' perceptions of authentic leadership behavior. Additionally, the 20-item Colquitt Organizational Fairness Scale (Colquitt et al., 2001), which was readily accessible, was employed to assess organizational fairness.(Folger & Greenberg, 2001). Both of the instruments combined in this study had already undergone independent validation. As a result, it is advisable to cross-validate the tool using exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to consider any potential changes to the structure itself. EFA was deemed appropriate for this study because it uses parts of previously validated tools in brand-new settings that have not been investigated together before.

3.4.Data Collection Procedure

One hundred ninety-two people sent the survey, and 164 of the study subjects who were contacted returned the survey. Data from survey responses from workers in the hospitality sector who were asked about their opinions of their immediate supervisor's leadership style and organizational justice were used to test the study's conceptual model. Research has shown that immediate supervisors can influence an employee's behavior more than higher-level organizational leaders because they interact with employees more frequently and directly impact their work experiences (DeConinck, 2010) (Pillai et al., 1999). Therefore, immediate supervisors were selected as the study's leaders. Using the 16-item ALQ (Avolio, 2007), respondents evaluated their direct supervisors based on how authentically they were perceived to lead.

The survey was completed at an 85.41% rate (n=164). There were 151 men and 13 women in the sample, making up 92.07% of the men and 7.93% of the women. The age range with the most participants was 18-34 (n=121, 73.78%), followed by 35-50 (n=43, 26.22%).

4. RESULTS

To assess how different items in this study relate to each other, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted. The validity and reliability of the instruments used in this study were

already determined through the sphericity test of Bartlett and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sampling adequacy score, confirming that the sample data fulfills the requirements for factor analysis. As stated by (Hutcheson & Sofroniou, 1999), a score ranging from 0.5 to 0.7 is considered average, while a score between 0.7 and 0.8 is classified as good. A score between 0.8 and 0.9 is considered significant, and any score above 0.9 indicates exceptional performance. In this study, the factor analysis of the results revealed a KMO value of 0.961, signifying a high level of validity.

Furthermore, Bartlett's test of significance revealed that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix. This implies that there may be additional relationships between variables to consider in the analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). The data are suitable for factor analysis as indicated by the significant result of the Bartlett test ($p < 0.5$).

We looked at commonness to see how well the solution (i.e., the extracted construct) explained the variance of each item. Columns designated for extraction that share characteristics do so because there are frequent structural differences. Since the commonality is greater than the minimum standard value of 0.30 (Warner, 2013), the factorial solution has effectively captured each item's variance. For the 36-item surveys, EFA used principal component analysis with variance maximum rotation to produce five structures, each with an eigenvalue of at least 1. The first five components account for the majority (77.07%). However, as shown in Table 2, the rotation improves the arrangement of the factors, and it can be inferred from the data that the relative weights of the five factors are evenly distributed.

Prior to the rotation, component one had 60.95, significantly more variance than the other four (7.67, 4.39, 4.21, and 3.84), but following the rotation, component one only contributed 26.47% of the variance (19.41, 19.00, 12.34, 11.38%). In this study, all components were considered to be "significant" and to define a practical dimension when their observed eigenvalues were greater than their corresponding random eigenvalues.

Table. 1 KMO & Bartlett's Test of Sphericity

Kaisar-mayer-olkin measure sampling adequacy		0.961
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	13669.157
	Df	496
	Sig.	.000

Table. 2 Total Variance Expected

Component	Initial eigenvalue				Extraction sums of square loadings				Rotation sums of square loadings			
	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %		Total	% of variance	Cumulative %		Total	% of variance	Cumulative %	
1	20.18	60.95	60.95		20.18	60.95	60.95		9.15	26.47	26.47	
2	3.14	7.67	67.63		3.14	7.67	67.63		6.89	19.41	44.89	
3	2.09	4.39	71.02		2.09	4.39	71.02		6.76	19.00	62.89	
4	2.03	4.21	74.23		2.03	4.21	74.23		4.63	12.34	74.23	
5	1.91	3.84	77.07		1.91	3.84	77.07		4.74	11.38	76.22	

A different approach was taken with the factor matrix, using five-factor assignments instead of having a distinct factor structure. Interestingly, some survey items showed visible loading, although the reason for this is unknown. While cross-loading was observed for a few items, there was no significant loading, and the factor loading values remained below 0.45. The two structures initially suggested by the rotation were confirmed, but the organizational justice dimension's items did not load into each structure as expected. Based on interpretation analysis, the researchers concluded that these items indicate a negative measure of organizational health. After conducting an EFA and analyzing the constructs of organizational quality and authentic leadership, they kept the 36 items. The authentic leadership scale showed high internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha 0.962. Strong correlations between authentic leadership and organizational justice were found ($r=0.843^{**}$), indicating that people who thought highly of their supervisors' authentic leadership also thought highly of organizational justice.

Given that work experience grows with age, It is not surprising that there is a strong link between age and work experience($r=0.914^{**}$). However, the relationships between other factors such as education level and age, work experience, education level, and actual leadership are all relatively weak. Furthermore, when it comes to distributive justice and authentic leadership, there is a relatively positive correlation, with a confidence interval of 95% and statistical significance. $p < 0.01$. Higher perceptions of authentic leadership influence only mild

perceptions of distributive justice. Authentic leadership has the weakest correlation with distributive justice compared to other aspects of organizational justice. A high positive correlation of 0.73 with a 95% confidence interval and a statistical significance of $p < 0.01$ was found between procedural justice and authentic leadership. Therefore, people who perceive authentic leadership more highly tend to perceive procedural justice in organizations as strong. A 95 percent confidence interval and a statistical significance level of $p < 0.01$ were found for the relationship between informational impartiality and authentic leadership, which showed a high positive correlation of 0.77.

The bond between fairness in information distribution and genuine leadership is the most powerful compared to the other aspects of fairness. We examined the following assumptions prior to conducting the regression analysis. Regression models require the independent and dependent variables to have a linear relationship; thus, meeting the linearity assumption is crucial. The scatterplot clearly shows a direct relationship between organizational justice, the outcome variable, and authentic leadership, the predictor variable. To accurately predict the outcome in this model, it is important to ensure minimal multicollinearity among the predictor variables. This means that the predictor variables should not be strongly correlated with each other. We can see from the correlation matrix in Table 2 that the correlation between the predictor variables is not very high. Moreover, the multicollinearity assumption is also refuted by the variance inflation factor (VIF) value of 1 and the tolerance value of 1.

Finally, the homoscedasticity assumption must be met, which requires that the variability of the residuals be constant across all potential predictors of the dependent variable. The residuals are dispersed randomly because there are no patterns or outliers in the scatterplot. Regression analyses were conducted to examine differences in the relationship between authentic leadership and various organizational justice dimensions viewed separately. According to Table 3, authentic leadership only explains 25.4% of the variance in distributive justice (adjusted R-square: 0.377), but it accounts for 59.2% of the variance in informational justice (adjusted R-square: 0.715). As can be inferred from Table 3, hotel employees believed that authentic leaders demonstrated higher levels of distributive and procedural justice (organization-centered) than informational and interpersonal justice (person-centered).

It was determined using hierarchical regression whether demographic and independent variables explained the dependent variable's statistically significant variance. Two steps were

used to complete the hierarchical multiple regression. First, enter the demographic information, including age, gender, race, education, work history, and functional area. Organizational justice is covered in the following phase. Table 4 presents the model summary. A multiple regression model (Model 2) with all seven predictors included generated adjusted $R^2=0.692$ and a significance level of $p<0.001$. However, model 1's adjusted $R^2=0.146$ results with only demographic variables were not statistically significant at $p<0.05$, respectively. The model makes it clear that demographic factors do not statistically significantly affect the prediction of organizational justice.

Table 3. Regression Model

Model	R	R-Square	Adjusted R square	std. error of the estimate
Distributive Justice	0.63	0.381	0.377	1.09047
Procedural Justice	0.73	0.491	0.487	0.95834
Informational Justice	0.89	0.718	0.715	0.8325
Interactional Justice	0.77	0.545	0.541	0.94347

Table 4. Hierarchical multiple regression model and coefficient

Model	R	R	Adjusted R square		Std. error of the estimate	
		square				
1	0.365	0.181	0.146		1.05509	
		B	Std. error	Beta	T	Sig
	(Constant)	4.563	0.498		11.973	0
	Age category	0.214	0.304	0.187	0.629	0.736
	Gender	0.409	0.263	0.284	2.157	0.167
	Educational level	0.137	0.211	0.136	0.286	0.993
	Work experience	0.172	0.244	0.174	0.529	0.808
2	0.877	0.692	0.673		0.75548	
	(Constant)	2.088	0.435		6.421	
	Age category	0.273	0.247	0.229	1.334	0.351
	Gender	0.266	0.219	0.203	1.61	0.262
	Educational level	0.204	0.183	0.199	1.484	0.298
	Work experience	0.422	0.207	0.435	3.684	0.000
	Authentic leadership	0.902	0.18	0.864	13.809	0.000

However, adding Authentic Leadership as a predictor variable (Model 2) accounted for 55% of the variation in hotel employees' perceptions of organizational justice (adjusted R-squared=0.673). The outcome of the hierarchical regression analysis indicated that all the independent variables in this study explained approximately 55% of the variation in perceptions of fairness within the organization among hotel employees. Upon examining the coefficients presented in Table 4, it was found that only one demographic variable, gender, exhibited statistical significance in Model 1 ($\beta = 0.284$, $t = 2.157$, $p = 0.167$). However, the coefficient table for Model 2 revealed the statistical significance of two demographic variables: work experience ($\beta = 0.435$, $t = 3.684$, $p = 0.000$). Based on the coefficient table, we can see that authentic leadership has a significant impact on organizational Justice in Model 2 ($\beta = 0.864$, $t = 13.809$, $p = 0.000$). So, if an individual's perception of organizational justice increases, their perception of leadership will also increase by 0.78, assuming all other variables in the model stay the same. This demonstrates the strong relationship between these two factors. Similarly, perceiving one standard deviation of authentic leadership corresponds to perceiving 0.86 (0.864) standard deviations of organizational justice. According to Table 4, authentic leadership holds significant predictive power, implying that when hotel employees view their leader as genuine, they can anticipate a higher level of perceived organizational justice.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study demonstrate that how employees form their perceptions of fairness and justice in their employing organizations depends on their relationship with their supervisors. For most organizational outcomes, it is crucial to maintain supervisory affiliations that foster a productive work environment. Determining the best leadership style in a given environment and the behaviors that result in better outcomes, such as employee perceptions of a fair workplace, is challenging for many organizations. The findings show a clear and positive correlation between authentic leadership and hotel employees. The findings reveal a significant and positive correlation between genuine leadership and hotel employees' perception of fairness within the organization. Employees who believe their leaders are authentic tend to be more content with their work, such as compensation, performance, and promotion. This is not surprising considering that the strongest bond a worker can create within a company is with their leader (Hui et al., 2004), and this connection frequently affects how employees view organizational Justice (Colquitt et al., 2013). The correlation between authentic leadership and workers' opinions of fairness in tasks and processes was significant and exhibited weak to strong positive correlations. Distributive justice and authentic leadership have the weakest

correlations with organizational justice dimensions, while procedural justice and authentic leadership have the strongest correlations. The findings thus confirm earlier research that found employees believed the organization, not their supervisors, set and controlled resource allocation policies and procedural guidelines.

On the other hand, positive correlations and significance imply that hotel staff perceive their managers as impacting organization-centered justice (distributive and procedure). The findings of this study confirm that leaders are seen as organizational agents for upholding and advancing fairness (Demirtas, 2015), and workers may anticipate that their actions will significantly impact organizational procedures and results. The consistent adherence to organizational policies and practices that authentic leadership emphasizes can influence how employees view the fairness of organizational processes. Therefore, it can be concluded from the results of this study that employees perceive their organizational processes and results more favorably when authentic individuals lead them. The relationship between authentic leadership and perceived fairness in the distribution of information was found to be highly significant in the study. This was followed by the relationship between authentic leadership and perceived fairness in the distribution of information among individuals. Previous studies have examined (Byrne et al., 2012) (Neubert et al., 2009), focusing on specific interactions between leaders and their subordinates, such as negotiations and information-sharing requests. According to correlation and regression analyses, authentic leadership and justice in interactive forms (information and interaction) have a strong correlation, which supported earlier research. This could be a result of the fact that daily interactions and information sharing are how managers are most likely to impact their staff.

Furthermore, prior studies have indicated that higher levels of interactional and personal justice and informational justice have been linked to lower levels of distributive and procedural Justice (Cropanzano et al., 2007)(Greenberg, 2006). This, in turn, enhances the influence of the direct supervisor in terms of interactions and information fairness. The study's findings, which demonstrate that distributive and procedural justice have a weaker relationship than organizational justice, support this theory. The findings of this study suggest that the stronger relationship between authentic leadership and interpersonal and informational justice makes up for the moderate relationship on the distributive and procedural dimensions.

The findings demonstrate that employees' perceptions of their supervisor's authentic leadership significantly predict their perception of organizational justice after adjusting for

demographic factors. Previous studies (Strom et al., 2014) may influence how much attention staff members pay to or pay attention to organizational justice issues. The findings back up (Folger & Greenberg, 2001) suggestions to promote organizational justice in the workplace by giving workers adequate pay, allowing them to speak up and be heard, being transparent when implementing and enforcing fair procedures, and informing decision-making of Ways to uphold individual dignity and respect and instill in workers the meaning of fairness through training, case studies, and exercises to sense. (Kiersch & Byrne, 2015) reported that the study is consistent with previous research conducted. These findings provide further evidence of the impact of climate change on species diversity.

5.1.Theoretical Implications:

This study addresses the research guidelines offered by (Karam et al., 2019). Given the connection between leaders' morally relevant judgments and organizational justice perceptions, future researchers must explore the potential impact of moral/ethical leadership behaviors on perceptions of fairness and how these factors combined influence organizational outcomes. More research is required to determine which characteristics of authentic leadership are linked to particular organizational justice dimensions and whether there is a connection between various characteristics of authentic leadership and organizational justice. Differences in the strength of the relationship between when the strength of the relationship between authentic leadership and hierarchical justice (distribution and procedure) varies impact both equity theory and leadership. Similarly, the relationship between true leaders and forms of judicial interaction (interpersonal and information) also plays a role in these implications. The findings imply that authentic leader behavior fosters a climate of fairness, a climate of interpersonal and informational fairness that encourages various types of individual justice among followers.

Further study is needed to determine whether leaders who exhibit respect and consideration for their workforce through strong interpersonal skills and information-sharing abilities raise levels of perceived organizational justice. Hence, further examination is required to ascertain if genuine leadership and individual elements of the four facets of fairness (information sharing and interpersonal behavior) can yield fresh insights into behavioral discrepancies. In essence, the argument can be made that while the leadership literature focuses on authentic leadership as an active and values-based approach, ultimately, one could contend that authentic leadership, despite its emphasis on specific elements like values, beliefs, morals, and ethics, maybe a reflection of the organizational environment in which it exists. This viewpoint is justifiable.

Consequently, effective leadership depends more on how the organizational context is perceived and the leader's consistent and predictable behavior rather than solely favorable opinions of the leader's character or principles.

5.2. Practical Implications:

Extensive research supports the idea that authentic leadership leads to fairness in all aspects of a company. Also, the findings indicate that hotel employees value fairness in personal interactions and information access more than in distribution and procedures. This study of all justice aspects provides empirical evidence supporting the theory that effective leadership raises people's perceptions of justice. Additionally, the results demonstrate that hotel employees value interpersonal and informational fairness more highly than distributive and procedural fairness. When employees feel that rewards are distributed fairly, they will compare their contributions to how other employees have been compensated and the distribution of rewards. Leaders in the hospitality sector must work to ensure that rewards are given to people equally. The same goes for decision-making processes; hotel managers should ensure that they are fair and that staff members are informed of them before awarding rewards.

The survey findings indicate a strong connection between employees' perception of genuine leadership and fairness within the organization. HRD professionals should consider these findings when performing their roles (Cottrill et al., 2014). Authentic leadership can contribute to a more inclusive work environment, leading to higher employee self-esteem and motivation. This work has successfully enhanced these aspects. Therefore, an authentic leadership development program will encourage leaders to adopt actions that show them a high level of respect and mindfulness for their followers and to adopt actions that positively affect the organization's financial performance. The study's findings also highlight the need for organizations to pay more attention to ethics. Organizational justice is connected to self-management, as shown. Authentic leadership is valuable for making ethical decisions because it emphasizes the moral and ethical aspects of leading more than other leadership philosophies. Therefore, HR professionals and organizational leaders must collaborate in establishing policies and procedures that actively support and promote ethics while ensuring fairness within the organization. The same goes for HR professionals, who should implement initiatives to foster a friendly workplace and goodwill among staff members and between staff members and managers.

Overall, the research points to the need for organizations in the hotel and hospitality sector to create leadership practice-focused initiatives that enhance workers' perceptions of organizational justice and, in turn, result in favorable organizational outcomes, such as a decrease in the high cost of employee turnover. Employees must also feel comfortable connecting with and communicating with their managers and supervisors and comprehending company policies and procedures.

5.3.Limitation:

Self-reported data from the study, a reflective recall of individual experiences, was used. Response bias is a phenomenon that has received much attention in behavioral research that uses self-reported data. People may overestimate their self-assessment behavior for various reasons, from misconceptions about what constitutes an appropriate measure to societal expectation bias, which causes respondents to overestimate their self-worth even in anonymous surveys. Any inference of causal relationships between variables was not possible because this was a cross-sectional study carried out in an uncontrolled field environment. The study is carried out in time segments and records responses based on the circumstances that exist at those times; a longitudinal design (with enough time and resources) may better record changes in perception over time. Due to the underrepresentation of Pakistan among respondents, the sample used for this study did not accurately represent all hotel employees. A possible explanation for the survey's low response rate among hotels is its distribution. Quantitative research is a tool with limited application because organizational justice and authentic leadership structures are more complex than scales. Finally, the inability of surveys to be completed on mobile devices may contribute to lower completion rates.

6. Conclusion:

This study explored the connection between how employees perceive fairness and the leadership practiced in hotels. The findings indicated that this study aimed to explore how employees perceive fairness and justice within their organization and how their leaders behave. The results showed a correlation between how employees perceive their organization's fairness and their leaders' authoritative behavior. Furthermore, it was found that employees' perceptions of their leaders can predict how they perceive the overall fairness of the organization. Pakistan has a significant hotel and hospitality sector. However, the hospitality sector is infamous for its hard labor, long hours, and low pay, which ultimately hurt organizational and behavioral outcomes, including high employee turnover. The study also discovered that hotel workers

interact with their managers the most (regarding pay, performance, procedures, etc., and a significant portion of how they perceive organizational justice is shaped by this interaction. According to research, employees who believe their leader is following an authentic leadership paradigm also experience positive emotions. Authentic leadership is a relatively new paradigm emphasizing leadership's ethical and moral aspects. It is based on positive psychology. Organizational justice scale. Authentic leaders have a strong relationship between their leadership style, communication skills, and ability to handle information effectively. The findings also indicate that when employees perceive fairness in actions and outcomes, they attribute control to the organization rather than its leaders. These results suggest that implementing leadership development programs could effectively promote equality and improve labor relations in the hotel industry and other companies.

Reference:

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity In Social Exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2(C), 267–299. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2)
- Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2009). The Role of Overall Justice Judgments in Organizational Justice Research: A Test of Mediation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 491–500. <https://doi.org/10.1037/A0013203>
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-building. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.25>
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001>
- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: How authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 801–823. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LEAQUA.2004.09.003>
- Avolio, B. J., Reichard, R. J., Hannah, S. T., Walumbwa, F. O., & Chan, A. (2009). A meta-analytic review of leadership impact research: Experimental and quasi-experimental studies. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(5), 764–784. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LEAQUA.2009.06.006>
- Baldwin, S., Building, M., & Justice, O. (2006). *Organizational Justice INSTITUTE FOR EMPLOYMENT STUDIES The Institute for Employment Studies*.
- Baum, T. (2013). International Perspectives on Women and Work in Hotels, Catering and Tourism. *Gender Working Paper, 1/2013*, 1–75.

- Berg, S. (2006). Snowball Sampling—I. *Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences*.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/0471667196.ESS2478.PUB2>
- Berger, F., Fulford, M. D., & Krazmien, M. (1993). Human resources management in the 21st century: Predicting partnerships for profit. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 17(1), 87–102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109634809301700108>
- Bies, R. (1986). *Interactional Justice: Communication criteria of fairness*.
- Caldeira, G. A., Thibaut, J., Walker, L., & Nagel, S. S. (1976). Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 29(4), 654.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/448155>
- Carbery, R., Garavan, T. N., O'Brien, F., & McDonnell, J. (2003). Predicting hotel managers' turnover cognitions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(7–8), 649–679.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940310502377/FULL/XML>
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The Role of Justice in Organizations: A Meta-Analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278–321.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/OBHD.2001.2958>
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. In *Handbook of Organizational Justice* (pp. 3–56). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(2), 199–236.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031757>
- Colquitt, J. A., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., Conlon, D. E., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the Millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Colquitt, J. A., & Zipay, K. P. (2015). Justice, Fairness, and Employee Reactions. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2, 75–99.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111457>
- Cottrill, K., Lopez, P. D., & Hoffman, C. C. (2014). How authentic leadership and inclusion benefit organizations. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, 33(3), 275–292.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-05-2012-0041>
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The Management of Organizational Justice. *Https://Doi.Org/10.5465/Amp.2007.27895338*, 21(4), 34–48.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/AMP.2007.27895338>

- De Cremer, D. (2007). When authorities influence followers' affect: The interactive effect of procedural justice and transformational leadership. *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1080/13594320600627662*, 15(3), 322–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320600627662>
- DeConinck, J. B. (2010). The effect of organizational justice, perceived organizational support, and perceived supervisor support on marketing employees' level of trust. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(12), 1349–1355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.01.003>
- Demirtas, O. (2015). Ethical Leadership Influence at Organizations: Evidence from the Field. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126(2), 273–284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10551-013-1950-5/METRICS>
- Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 36–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LEAQUA.2013.11.005>
- Drummond, K. E., & Murphy-Reyes, A. (2018). *Nutrition Research: Concepts and Applications*. 155–184.
- Faldetta, G., Fasone, V., & Provenzano, C. (2013). Turnover in the hospitality industry: Can reciprocity solve the problem? *PASOS Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 11(4), 583–595. <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2013.11.052>
- Folger, R., Cropanzano, R., & Goldman, B. (2005). What Is the Relationship Between Justice and Morality? In *Handbook of Organizational Justiceorganizational*. (pp. 215–245). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (2001). Fairness theory: Justice as accountability Advances in Organizational Justice edited by. *Advances in Organizational Justice, January 2001*, 3–55.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 291–309. <https://doi.org/10.1006/JVBE.2001.1803>
- Fulford, M. D. (2008). That is Not Fair! *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1300/J171v04n01_06*, 4(1), 73–84. https://doi.org/10.1300/J171V04N01_06
- Garg, S., & Dhar, R. L. (2016). Extra-Role Customer Service: The Roles of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX), Affective Commitment, and Psychological Empowerment. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration*, 17(4), 373–396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2016.1226151>

- Gosser, K., Petrosko, J., Cumberland, D. M., Kerrick, S. A., & Shuck, B. (2018). *Organizational Justice and Socialization in a Franchising Context: Factors Influencing Hourly Workers' Intent to Stay*.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/014920639001600208*, 16(2), 399–432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639001600208>
- Greenberg, J. (2006). Losing sleep over organizational injustice: Attenuating insomniac reactions to underpayment inequity with supervisory training in interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 58–69. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.58>
- Greenberg, J. (2010). Organizational Justice: The dynamics of fairness in the workplace. *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol 3: Maintaining, Expanding, and Contracting the Organization.*, 271–327. <https://doi.org/10.1037/12171-008>
- Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2011). Relationships between Authentic Leadership, Moral Courage, and Ethical and Pro-Social Behaviors. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 21(4), 555–578. <https://doi.org/10.5840/BEQ201121436>
- Hemdi, M. A., Hafiz, M., Mahat, F., & Othman, N. Z. (2015). Organizational citizenship behaviors of hotel employees: The role of discretionary human resource practices and psychological contract. *Theory and Practice in Hospitality and Tourism Research - Proceedings of the 2nd International Hospitality and Tourism Conference 2014, July 2016*, 71–76. <https://doi.org/10.1201/b17390-15>
- Hiller, N. J., DeChurch, L. A., Murase, T., & Doty, D. (2011). Searching for Outcomes of Leadership: A 25-Year Review. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/0149206310393520*, 37(4), 1137–1177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310393520>
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social Behavior as Exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), 597–606. <https://doi.org/10.1086/222355>
- Hui, C., Lee, C., & Rousseau, D. M. (2004). Employment relationships in China: Do workers relate to the organization or people? *Organization Science*, 15(2), 232–240. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1030.0050>
- Hutcheson, G., & Sofroniou, Nick. (1999). *The multivariate social scientist: Introductory statistics using generalized linear models*. 276.
- Ispas, A. (2012). The Perceived Leadership Style and Employee Performance in Hotel Industry—A Dual Approach. *Review of International Comparative Management / Revista de Management Comparat International*, 13(2), 294–304.

- Judge, T. A., & Colquitt, J. A. (2004). Organizational justice and stress: The mediating role of work-family conflict. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 395–404. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.395>
- Karam, E. P., Hu, J., Davison, R. B., Juravich, M., Nahrgang, J. D., Humphrey, S. E., & Scott DeRue, D. (2019). Illuminating the ‘Face’ of Justice: A Meta-Analytic Examination of Leadership and Organizational Justice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 56(1), 134–171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12402>
- Kiersch, C. E., & Byrne, Z. S. (2015). Is Being Authentic Being Fair? Multilevel Examination of Authentic Leadership, Justice, and Employee Outcomes. *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/1548051815570035*, 22(3), 292–303. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051815570035>
- López-Cabarcos, M. Á., Machado-Lopes-Sampaio-de Pinho, A. I., & Vázquez-Rodríguez, P. (2014). The Influence of Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment in Portugal’s Hotel Industry. *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/1938965514545680*, 56(3), 258–272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965514545680>
- Luo, Z., Marnburg, E., & Law, R. (2017). Linking leadership and justice to organizational commitment: The mediating role of collective identity in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(4), 1167–1184. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-08-2015-0423>
- Martinson, B. C., Crain, L. A., De Vries, R., & Anderson, M. S. (2010). The importance of organizational justice in ensuring research integrity. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics : JERHRE*, 5(3), 67–83. <https://doi.org/10.1525/JER.2010.5.3.67>
- May, D. R., Chan, A. Y. L., Hodges, T. D., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Developing the Moral Component of Authentic Leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 32, 247–260. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616\(03\)00032-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(03)00032-9)
- Megeirhi, H. A., Kilic, H., Avci, T., Afsar, B., & Abubakar, A. M. (2018). Does team psychological capital moderate the relationship between authentic leadership and negative outcomes: An investigation in the hospitality industry. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazivanja*, 31(1), 927–945. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2018.1442234>
- Meindl, J. R. (1989). Managing to be Fair: An Exploration of Values, Motives, and Leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34(2), 252. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2989898>
- Nadiri, H., & Tanova, C. (2010). Investigating the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 33–41.

- Naumann, S. E., & Bennett, N. (2000). A case for procedural justice climate: Development and test of a multilevel model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5), 881–889. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1556416>
- Neubert, M. J., Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Roberts, J. A., & Chonko, L. B. (2009). The Virtuous Influence of Ethical Leadership Behavior: Evidence from the Field. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90(2), 157–170. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10551-009-0037-9>
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fairness Perceptions and Trust as Mediators for Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Two-Sample Study. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/014920639902500606*, 25(6), 897–933. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500606>
- Pless, N. M., & Maak, T. (2012). Responsible leadership: Pathways to the future. *Responsible Leadership*, 98(1), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10551-011-1114-4/METRICS>
- Rego, A., Sousa, F., Marques, C., & Cunha, M. P. e. (2012). Authentic leadership promotes employees' psychological capital and creativity. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(3), 429–437. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2011.10.003>
- Rupp, D. E., Shapiro, D. L., Folger, R., Skarlicki, D. P., & Shao, R. (2017). A critical analysis of the conceptualization and measurement of organizational Justice: Is it time for reassessment? *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2), 919–959. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ANNALS.2014.0051>
- Sajjad, A., Jillani, A., & Raziq, M. M. (2018). Sustainability in the Pakistani hotel industry: An empirical study. *Corporate Governance (Bingley)*, 18(4), 714–727. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-12-2017-0292>
- Storberg-Walker, J., & Gardiner, R. A. (2017). Authentic Leadership in HRD—Identity Matters! Critical Explorations on Leading Authentically. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/1523422317728731*, 19(4), 350–361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422317728731>
- Strom, D. L., Sears, K. L., & Kelly, K. M. (2014). Work Engagement: The Roles of Organizational Justice and Leadership Style in Predicting Employee Engagement. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 21(1), 71–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051813485437>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics*. 880.
- Tran, X. (2017). Effects of leadership styles on hotel financial performance. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 23(2), 163–183. <https://doi.org/10.20867/thm.23.2.7>

- Umphress, E. E., Labianca, G., Brass, D. J., Kass, E., & Scholten, L. (2003). The Role of Instrumental and Expressive Social Ties in Employees' Perceptions of Organizational Justice. *https://doi.org/10.1287/Orsc.14.6.738.24865*, 14(6).
<https://doi.org/10.1287/Orsc.14.6.738.24865>
- Uzunsaf Yamak, Ö., & Zihni Eyüpoglu, S. (2018). Leadership Styles of Hotel Managers in Northern Cyprus: Which Style is Dominant? *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 7(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2018.60202>
- Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34(1), 89–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307308913>
- Warner, R. M. (2013). Applied statistics: From bivariate through multivariate techniques, 2nd ed. In *Applied statistics: From bivariate through multivariate techniques, 2nd ed.* Sage Publications, Inc.