

**WestminsterResearch**

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

**Cultural perceptions of ethical leadership and its effect on  
intention to leave in the independent hotel industry**

**Nazarian, A., Ehsan Zaeri, Pantea Foroudi, Amir Reza Afrouzi and  
Atkinson, P.**

This article is © Emerald and permission has been granted for this version to appear here: <http://westminsterresearch.westminster.ac.uk/>

Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

The final, published version in International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, DOI: 10.1108/IJCHM-05-2021-0643, 2021 is available at:

<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-05-2021-0643>

This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 licence

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

# Cultural perceptions of ethical leadership and its effect on intention to leave in the independent hotel industry

## Abstract

### *Purpose*

Studies have shown that due to the high direct and indirect costs of staff-turnover there is a need for managers to use approaches which engender a feeling that the organisation is fair to its employees and consequently reduce intention-to-leave. However, to understand how to apply research findings and theories from different parts of the world, we need to understand how employees' perceptions of such factors as ethical leadership and organisational justice are affected by national culture. Therefore, we compared the impact of ethical leadership on intention-to-leave through justice, loyalty and satisfaction among employees of independent-hotels from two GLOBE cultural clusters.

### *Design/methodology/approach*

A total of 1561 questionnaires were received from independent hotel employees, which were analysed using SEM. Data were collected in the USA, UK, Italy and Spain whose national cultures fall into two different GLOBE regional clusters.

### *Findings*

Our results show similarities and differences between countries and within and between clusters. No relationship was found between procedural justice and intention to leave in any of the four countries. Ethical leadership had no significant impact on job satisfaction and organisational justice in the UK, which contrasts with results in the other three countries. Our findings also show that distributive justice has a significant relationship with intention to leave in the US and UK (Anglo cluster), whereas no specific relationship was found between these two variables in Italy and Spain (Latin European cluster).

### *Originality/value*

This study contributes to the literature of ethical leadership and its application to the hotel industry in two culturally different GLOBE clusters. This study shows how the relationships between organisational variables are affected by national culture and emphasises the importance for hotel managers of being aware of the specific characteristics of the culture of the country in which they are operating.

**Keywords:** ethical leadership; organisational justice; job satisfaction; intention to leave; GLOBE; national culture; hotel industry; distributive justice

# 1 Introduction

2 This study approaches two problems simultaneously with the intention that each investigation  
3 throws light on the other. The first of these problems is that the hotel industry, and particularly  
4 independent hotels, suffers from a high turnover of staff which has been attributed to a range  
5 of causes including low wages, long working hours, and low incentives (Ferreira *et al.*, 2017).  
6 Inexperienced staff take time to train, and this can have a negative effect on customer service;  
7 additionally, recruitment and training of staff are expensive. Thus, high staff turnover can have  
8 a bad effect on the profitability and viability of the organisation (Cho *et al.*, 2009). The second  
9 problem is a theoretical one. As Hofstede (1993) has pointed out, findings based on data and  
10 theories developed in one part of the world are not always readily applicable in another. This  
11 study investigates whether perceptions of factors known to affect turnover intention vary  
12 between countries.

13 Independent hotels are a vital part of the hospitality industry and in many parts of the world  
14 play a significant part in the economy (Nazarian *et al.*, 2020). Organisations in this sector often  
15 experience a struggle for their survival since they must compete with chain hotels which have  
16 better access to financial and human resources as well as enjoying the advantages of economies  
17 of scale. On the other hand, independent hotels need to be able, firstly, to acquire the right  
18 resources and, secondly, to provide well-designed training and professional development  
19 programs, which require large investment (Nazarian *et al.*, 2019). Any research that helps this  
20 sector is beneficial in a wide range of locations, therefore data for this study were collected in  
21 independent hotels in different geographic locations. Four countries were selected for this study  
22 which all have a well-established independent hotel sector, so that comparison between them  
23 would be less likely to be influenced by extraneous factors.

24 Leadership style is something that managers can affect directly, and it has been shown to  
25 influence intention to turnover in the hospitality industry, with more liberal and consultative  
26 styles having a positive effect (Ausar *et al.*, 2016; Patwardhan *et al.*, 2020). Additionally, it is  
27 a characteristic of the hospitality industry that many employees are customer facing and must  
28 be empowered to make decisions so that they can deliver the best possible customer service.  
29 An autocratic management style is not conducive to this behaviour (Bavik, 2020). An autocratic  
30 management style has also been shown to reduce profitability by encouraging the wrong  
31 approach to customers, as well as by increasing staff turnover, by frustrating the efforts of staff  
32 to be effective in their work (Hight *et al.*, 2019; Tuan, 2018). To keep staff turnover to a

1 minimum, managers of independent hotels need to engender feelings of trust and fairness  
2 among all levels of employees, since it encourages them to value their jobs and consequently  
3 decreases their intention to leave (Bedi *et al.*, 2016). Although there are several liberal  
4 leadership styles that could have been chosen for this study, such as transformational, servant  
5 and authentic, ethical leadership was chosen because it reflects the normative standards of  
6 behaviour that can be influenced by national culture (Brown *et al.*, 2005).

7 Having identified leadership style as being a factor influencing the intention to leave, this study  
8 has also chosen to examine two other factors that might help managers to diagnose problems  
9 among their staff that may lead to their intention to leave. These are, are loyalty to the  
10 organisation and job satisfaction. Additionally, another factor that managers can directly affect,  
11 and which has been shown to influence intention to leave, organisational justice, was also  
12 included.

13 According to Social Exchange Theory, social relationships are based on reciprocity or  
14 perceived norms (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960), which implies that when individuals receive  
15 positive treatment from others they feel an obligation to reciprocate with favourable responses.  
16 Such exchange relationships represent the mutual interactions of leaders and employees in  
17 organisations, which suggest that if the managers of an organisation behave fairly and show  
18 care for their employees, in exchange the employees will offer higher levels of organisational  
19 citizenship behaviour (Teng *et al.*, 2020), and provide their loyalty and support to the  
20 organisation. However, perceptions of fairness, demonstrating care for employees and ethical  
21 behaviour generally are known to be dependent on national culture. To gain insight into the  
22 influence national culture has on the factors measures in this study, data were gathered in four  
23 countries which, though all developed Western countries, fall into two Global Leadership and  
24 Organizational Behaviour Effectiveness (GLOBE) Project regional clusters that have different  
25 characteristics (House *et al.*, 2004).

26 In this study we examine the effect of ethical leadership on intention to leave as well as the  
27 possible relationships with job satisfaction, organisational justice (distributive justice and  
28 procedural justice) and loyalty in independent hotels in four countries: US, UK, Spain and Italy.  
29 Having examined the relationships between these variables in each country independently, we  
30 examined the differences between countries in the light of the findings of the GLOBE Project  
31 (House *et al.*, 2004). In the GLOBE study, these countries are placed in two clusters, with the  
32 US and UK in the Anglo cluster and Spain and Italy in the Latin European cluster (House *et*

1 *al., 2004*). Our findings show more differences than similarities between the patterns of  
2 relationships between the variables between the countries. While the data confirms that there  
3 are similarities between countries in the same cluster, there are also some surprising  
4 differences. Generally, our findings demonstrate the importance of taking national culture into  
5 account when measuring and interpreting organisational variables.

## 6 **2 Theoretical Background and Hypotheses Development**

7 This literature review first examines the literature on each of the variables and the relationships  
8 between them and then, in the last section, examines the literature of how they may be affected  
9 by national culture.

### 10 *2.1 Ethical Leadership*

11 Ethical leadership has been defined as a leadership style that establishes and implements  
12 standard behaviour and rules through suitable personal conduct and interpersonal connections  
13 in an organisation (*Brown et al., 2005*). In fact, ethical leadership theory has been developed  
14 using social cognitive theory where it is assumed that leaders can influence their followers and  
15 promote ethical attitudes through modelling appropriate behaviour (*Bavik, 2020*).

16 Subordinates in organisations not only learn by emulating the behaviours and attitudes of their  
17 legitimate leaders, but also they use their own cultural norms to distinguish between correct  
18 and incorrect actions (*Anderson et al., 2017*). Thus, taking an ethical leadership approach can  
19 have several advantages for leaders, such as credibility, legitimacy and attractiveness, among  
20 their employees (*Brown et al., 2005*). The followers of ethical leaders are more likely to feel  
21 trust and a mutual commitment when they perceive that their leaders act fairly and ethically  
22 (*Walumbwa et al., 2011*). In addition, due to the fact that ethical leadership is engaged with  
23 fairness, honesty, and consideration for others, it results in a positive impact on the employees'  
24 attitudes and positive outcomes such as satisfaction, commitment, organisational citizenship  
25 behaviour, and higher levels of service quality (*Dimitriou and Schwepker, 2019*) for the  
26 organisation (*Freire and Bettencourt, 2020*).

### 27 *2.2 Job Satisfaction*

28 Job satisfaction has been defined as the positive and negative feelings and attitudes of  
29 employees toward their jobs (*Hendrix et al., 1998*). Studies of job satisfaction among hotel  
30 employees have shown that both monetary and non-monetary factors such as good financial  
31 compensation and social events positively contribute to job satisfaction and consequently

1 engender a feeling of attachment and support for the organisation (Ineson *et al.*, 2013; Nadiri  
2 and Tanova, 2010). A lack of job satisfaction usually leads to job-stress (Shehawy, 2021),  
3 absenteeism and intention to turnover (Borgogni *et al.*, 2013; Yang, 2010). Because hotel  
4 industry employees are mostly semi-skilled or unskilled with low wages and income (Nazarian  
5 *et al.*, 2019) they are more likely to respond to extrinsic motivators including payment and  
6 promotion.

7 Leadership style has been found to influence job satisfaction with more liberal leadership  
8 styles, such as servant leadership (Mayer *et al.*, 2008) and ethical leadership (Freire and  
9 Bettencourt, 2020), having a positive relationship. Specifically in the hospitality industry, a  
10 study of hotel middle managers showed a positive influence of ethical leadership on job  
11 satisfaction (Kim and Brymer, 2011). Hence, we propose that:

12 *H1. There is a relationship between ethical leadership and job satisfaction.*

### 13 2.3 Organisational Justice

14 Organisational justice refers to the extent of fairness perception among employees in an  
15 organisation (Heffernan and Dundon, 2016). The behaviours of leaders and managers in  
16 organisations produce a reaction in their subordinates, so that when ethical leaders employ  
17 normatively appropriate conduct, it results in their employees displaying a positive attitude  
18 toward the organisation. There are several models of organisational justice; we use one which  
19 classifies it into distributive and procedural types of justice (Xu *et al.*, 2014) which are good  
20 predictors of organisational outcomes, such as job satisfaction (Alexander and Ruderman,  
21 1987) and intention to leave (Olkkonen and Lipponen, 2006).

22 Distributive justice is concerned with the perceived fairness and equity in the distribution of  
23 rewards such as pay, benefit, job evaluation and promotion (Hsu *et al.*, 2019; Lambert *et al.*,  
24 2019; Greenberg, 1982). Leaders should use the equity exchange principle to develop the  
25 subordinates' perceptions of how the organisation treats them and to what extent resources and  
26 rewards are fairly distributed (Khan and Rashid, 2012). Leaders who practice fair and  
27 appropriate conduct provide a better working environment which is necessary to retain staff  
28 especially in the context of the hotel industry, which has long-working hours and low wages  
29 (Li *et al.*, 2014). Fair distribution of rewards among employees not only promotes the  
30 employees' loyalty and faith in their leaders, but also encourages employees to report  
31 wrongdoing in the organisation.

1 On the other hand, procedural justice is defined as employees' perception of a fair decision  
2 making process in an organisation (Brotsky *et al.*, 1978). If employees are allowed to express  
3 their opinions and suggestions in the procedure of decision making, it produces a better  
4 perception of procedural justice (Heffernan and Dundon, 2016). Ethical leadership is positively  
5 related to procedural justice through the mediating effect of trust, which means that employees  
6 who work under ethical leadership are more likely to perceive higher levels of procedural  
7 justice (Xu *et al.*, 2014). Hence, in order to motivate and encourage employees in the work  
8 place, a high level of procedural justice is desirable.

9 Ethical leaders can promote and engender both procedural and distributive justice in the  
10 organisation (Xu *et al.*, 2014). Thus, we propose these hypotheses:

11 *H2.1 Ethical leadership is associated with distributive justice.*

12 *H2.1 Ethical leadership is associated with procedural justice.*

13 According to Karkoulian (2015), organisational justice is the main contributor influencing  
14 employees' positive attitudes and behaviour toward the organisation. When employees  
15 perceive both distributive and procedural justice in processes and events, they are more likely  
16 to hold a favourable opinion of the organisation and higher levels of job satisfaction (Körner  
17 *et al.*, 2015; Lambert *et al.*, 2019; Nadiri and Tanova, 2010). Conversely, when organisational  
18 behaviours and attitudes are not considered fair and appropriate by the employees, they are less  
19 likely to demonstrate positive and effective reciprocal behaviours for the good of the  
20 organisation (Jiang *et al.*, 2017; Kumasey *et al.*, 2019).

21 Distributive justice is associated with job satisfaction through pay, promotion, and performance  
22 appraisal, whereas procedural justice is associated with job satisfaction through supervision,  
23 self-reported performance appraisal, and job involvement (Tang and Sarfield-Baldwin, 1996).  
24 Studies have shown that both distributive and procedural justice have a significant impact on  
25 job satisfaction (Lambert *et al.*, 2019). Hence, we propose that:

26 *H3.1 Distributive justice is associated with job satisfaction.*

27 *H3.2 Procedural justice is associated with job satisfaction.*

## 28 2.4 Employee Loyalty

29 Loyalty is concerned with the extent to which employees hold an emotional attachment to the  
30 organisation (Lee and Whitford, 2008). When employees have higher levels of loyalty, it

1 positively influences their beliefs and attitudes toward the organisations' goals and values and  
2 consequently leads to them exerting more effort in the interests of their organisation (Burris *et*  
3 *al.*, 2008). Therefore, to promote loyalty to the organisation, the impact of both financial and  
4 non-financial factors such as wage increases and social involvement must be considered (Lam  
5 *et al.*, 2001; Yao *et al.*, 2019). Consistent with this, Aksu (2005) suggested that employees'  
6 desire for monetary rewards is to be expected since higher levels of remuneration tends to lead  
7 to more life security (Ineson *et al.*, 2013). Furthermore, due to loyalty being characterised in  
8 this study as a feeling of close affiliation with the organisation, it could be argued that being  
9 satisfied with their jobs leads to higher levels of employees' loyalty to the organisation (Hwang  
10 *et al.*, 2019). Hence, we propose that:

11 *H4. Job Satisfaction is associated with loyalty.*

## 12 2.5 Intention to Leave

13 Intention to leave is defined as the employees' conscious and deliberate decision to leave the  
14 organisation and this is a major issue in the hospitality industry since it imposes direct and  
15 indirect costs on the organisation (Lee and Whitford, 2008). Due to the nature of the work in  
16 the hotel industry, where there is a low incentive with long working hours, lack of career  
17 advancement, work-life conflict, a high level of emotional labour and heavy workloads,  
18 employees' turnover is significantly higher than in many other industries (Nazarian *et al.*,  
19 2020).

20 High intention to leave can be modeled using pull-push mooring theory that sees turnover  
21 intention as an outcome between pull and push factors (Haldorai *et al.*, 2019), and considers  
22 how each of these factors can negatively or positively affect the employees' attitudes toward  
23 their jobs (Mohsin *et al.*, 2013). In this view, both distributive and procedural justice may be  
24 pulling factors that contribute to reducing the employees' intention to leave by providing a fair  
25 organisational environment where resources and rewards are fairly allocated (Rahim *et al.*,  
26 2001). However, according to Cho *et al.* (2009) intention to leave and intention to stay are not  
27 two sides of the same coin. Thus, the pulling factors, such as distributive and procedural justice  
28 that could reduce the intention to leave, do not necessarily decide employees' desire to remain  
29 in the organisation.

30 According to Alexander and Ruderman (1987), in a study of US government employees, both  
31 procedural and distributive justice affect turnover intention; however, distributive justice  
32 makes a far larger contribution. The reason for this could be linked to turnover intention being



1 a specific individual behavior that does not require the involvement of others; however, other  
2 outcomes, such as job satisfaction are more dependent on interpersonal behaviours and  
3 attitudes.

4 Hence, we propose that:

5 *H5.1 Distributive justice is associated with intention to leave.*

6 *H5.2 Procedural justice is associated with intention to leave.*

7 Employees' loyalty to their organisation is positively affected by the satisfaction they receive  
8 from their jobs (Pandey and Rajni, 2012). Hence, if the organisation invests in its employees  
9 to reach both their personal and organisational goals, it can lead to career and personal  
10 advancement that reduces their intention to leave and reduces costs (Burriss et al., 2008).  
11 Furthermore, employees who perceive support from their supervisor feel more obligated to  
12 their job, resulting in lower levels of intention to leave (Gordon et al., 2019). It is useful to  
13 understand this relationship since it is, potentially, something that managers can affect.  
14 Therefore, we propose that:

15 *H6. Loyalty is associated with intention to leave.*

## 16 2.6 The Effect of National Culture

17 The word 'culture' encompasses a complex set of interrelated concepts (Williams, 1976) and  
18 is applied differently according to context. In the field of business and management there are a  
19 number of models that have been popular with researchers to describe national culture.  
20 Probably the most often used of these has been Hofstede's model (Hofstede, 1980), which  
21 measures national culture using six dimensions. Hofstede's model has come in for a lot of  
22 criticism (McSweeney, 2013) for various reasons, not least of which is that it is simplistic.  
23 Critics have claimed that it is not possible to say enough about a nation's culture by only using  
24 six dimensions.

25 The GLOBE Project is a large-scale project for the study of cross-cultural leadership that  
26 gathers data in 170 countries and involves over 500 researchers (GLOBE, nd.). It has been in  
27 continuous operation for over twenty years. In this study we have used the findings on national  
28 culture published by GLOBE in 2004. The GLOBE Project built on Hofstede's work by  
29 adopting two dimensions: power distance – a measure of how much people who have little or  
30 no power are willing to accept that others have more power – and uncertainty avoidance - a

1 measure of how much uncertainty people are willing to tolerate. GLOBE adapts a further two  
2 of Hofstede's dimensions, Individualism and Masculinity by splitting them between two  
3 aspects. Individualism is split into Institutional Collectivism and In-Group Collectivism.  
4 Masculinity is split into performance orientation and gender egalitarianism. Hofstede's  
5 dimension of long-term orientation was modified to become future orientation and a further  
6 two dimensions were added: Humane Orientation and Assertiveness, making nine in all.

7 The GLOBE findings on national culture group countries together into six regional clusters  
8 based on their similarities in GLOBE's dimensions of national culture (GLOBE, nd.).  
9 Countries have been variously clustered based on different aspects, such as geographic  
10 proximity, mass migration and ethnicity, social capital, and religious and linguistic  
11 commonality (Gupta *et al.*, 2002). Generally, these clusters represent significant cultural  
12 differences, which could be better understood using Hofstede's or GLOBE's cultural  
13 dimensions. This study examines two countries from each of the Anglo and Latin European  
14 GLOBE regional clusters.

15 Performance Orientation, which is the most characteristic cultural dimension in the Anglo  
16 cluster, shows that these societies value job/organisational performance more highly when  
17 compared with Latin European clusters (House *et al.*, 2004). The reason for this inherent  
18 tendency of the Anglo cluster can be explained by the Protestant 'work ethic' mentality in these  
19 societies that emphasises individual achievement and success (Ashkanasy, 2002); however, the  
20 same cultural dimension, performance orientation, is comparatively weak in the Latin  
21 European cluster. As a result, it is reasonable to expect less competitiveness and more searching  
22 for harmony in Latin European societies.

23 In-Group and Institutional Collectivism, and power distance which are GLOBE cultural  
24 dimensions based on Hofstede's model are associated with loyalty, organisational justice and  
25 job satisfaction in our study. The Anglo cluster with its relatively low power distance and high  
26 level of individualism, the opposite of the Latin European cluster, strongly endorses  
27 participative behaviour in both managers and employees and information sharing within their  
28 organisations (Hofstede, 2001). In the Anglo countries there is a different perception of  
29 established hierarchy in organisations due to the lower level of power distance in their societies.  
30 Managers in the Anglo cluster countries tend to adapt hierarchy within their organisations to  
31 increase the level of convenience both for themselves and for their employees (Hofstede, 1980;  
32 House *et al.*, 2004). However, managers in the Latin European cluster favour strong

1 hierarchical structures and centralised decision making, which could be due to the high score  
2 of power distance their societies (Hofstede, 2001; Laurent, 1983). Thus, according to (House  
3 et al., 2004), countries in the Latin European Cluster are in need of reducing the level of power  
4 distance since it is an impediment to equality and justice in organisations. However, In-Group  
5 Collectivism in Latin European countries creates more loyalty toward organisations compared  
6 to Anglo cluster countries, where In-Group Collectivism is lower than in all the other clusters.

7 There is a need to consider cultural differences among countries to gain a better understanding  
8 of the relationship among the organisational outcomes being tested in different countries and  
9 cultures. Thus, it is useful to know that both procedural and distributive justice have a  
10 substantial equal impact on the job satisfaction among employees in Australia, Colombia,  
11 India, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and the United States (Pillai et al., 1999). Taking a cultural  
12 perspective, Park and Min (2020) in a meta-analytic study in the context of hospitality, found  
13 that both individualism and collectivism (Hofstede, 2001) influence the turnover intention in  
14 organisations. This means that hospitality employees in individualistic countries tend to  
15 evaluate their working conditions and organisational circumstances based on their self-interest,  
16 which leads to a greater impact on turnover intention. However, in collectivist countries,  
17 employees are more inclined to follow in-group and organisational interests.

18 Ethical leaders ensure that their behaviours and attitudes are in harmony with the culture of  
19 their employees so they can motivate and inspire them to achieve better organisational results.  
20 Thus, national culture is a determinant of leadership style (Gerstner and Day, 1997). For  
21 example, in a national culture where the workforce scores highly on GLOBE's Future  
22 Orientation dimension, organisational leaders can spur their employees into more effective  
23 action by informing them of long-term strategy and making future-oriented decisions (Javidan  
24 and Dastmalchian, 2009).

25 There have been many studies that have examined the influence of culture when investigating  
26 job satisfaction as an organisational outcome. For example, power distance plays an important  
27 role in employees' perception of job satisfaction so that employees having a low power distance  
28 culture are less likely to tolerate arbitrary behaviors and attitudes, or they may consider loud  
29 and angry behaviour from their supervisor as an abusive attitude in the workplace (Yu et al.,  
30 2020). Hence they experience a higher level of job satisfaction only if they have input into the  
31 organisational decisions that affect them, so procedural justice makes a larger contribution to  
32 job satisfaction among these employees (Lam et al., 2002). Assertiveness as a cultural

1 dimension positively impacts job satisfaction because assertive individuals have a propensity  
2 for leadership and possess leadership styles that could help them gain more extrinsic success,  
3 such as higher salaries (Jeanine *et al.*, 2012). High levels of Masculinity and Uncertainty  
4 Avoidance in a society has been shown to result in low levels of job satisfaction (Eskildsen *et*  
5 *al.*, 2010).

6

7

<<Please Insert Figure 1 Here>>

8

## 9 **3 Method**

### 10 *3.1 Sampling and Procedures*

11 We employed a procedure and sampling method based on previous studies (Churchill, 1979;  
12 Foroudi, 2019, 2020; Jr *et al.*, 2018) by using four samples of hotel employees from the USA,  
13 UK, Italy, and Spain. We collected data from these countries because they all have an  
14 established tourism and hospitality industry with a large number of independents hotels while  
15 they belong to two different GLOBE regional clusters. By virtue of the fact that these countries  
16 are all developed, Western countries, it might be expected that they would possess similar  
17 organisational values and attitudes whereas, by taking the GLOBE study's cultural findings  
18 into account, similarities and differences have been made apparent.

19 A convenience sampling method was employed. A list of hotels was compiled based on the  
20 countries' government tourism and hospitality websites and these hotels were contacted. A  
21 total of 2500 questionnaires were distributed to the person who was delegated to be our contact  
22 by the hotels and this person circulated the questionnaire among their employees either in paper  
23 form or in the form of a link to a website. The survey was conducted from June 2019 to  
24 December 2019 and we received 1561 completed questionnaires via online and hard copies  
25 (USA: 429; UK, 401; Italy, 312; Spain, 419). We used specific filtering criteria to ensure that  
26 the data met our study's criteria: (1) a hotel that was not a part of a chain; (2) the hotel must be  
27 a family business or owned by an individual; (3) the hotel should have a minimum of 10  
28 employees (less than 10 were excluded as it was considered as micro) and (4) and we asked  
29 them to send the link or hard copy only to those employees who were from the host countries  
30 and not to send the survey to their international employees.

1 Table 1 shows that the majority of the Anglo group were female (USA: 55%; UK: 58.1%) and  
2 of the Latin-European participants, 66% of the participants were male in Italy and 51.6% were  
3 female in Spain. The majority of the participants in three countries were aged between 25 and  
4 34 (USA; 55.7%; Italy: 45.2%; Spain: 36%) and 18-24 in the other (UK: 58.9%). In three  
5 countries the majority held postgraduate certificates (UK: 52.4; Italy: 36.9; Spain: 53.7). and  
6 in the other the highest level of education was undergraduate (USA: 45.7). The level of  
7 management of the largest number of participants was middle manager in two countries (USA:  
8 23.8; Spain: 42.5), junior manager in one (UK: 32.7), and senior manager in the fourth country  
9 (28.5%). In all four countries the majority of participants worked in large hotels (USA: 53.1%;  
10 UK: 35.7; Italy: 56.4; Spain: 55.4).

11

12 <<Please Insert Table 1 Here>>

### 13 3.2 Measures

14 We employed validated item measurements from previous studies and lightly modified them  
15 based on the research's contexts. distributive justice (3 items) and procedural justice (3 items)  
16 were adopted from [Nadiri and Tanova \(2010\)](#) to examine organisational justice. We adapted  
17 the job satisfaction measure using four scales developed by previous studies ([MacIntyre et al.,](#)  
18 [1997](#); [Nazarian, 2013](#); [Nazarian et al., 2021](#)). Loyalty was tested using four items suggested by  
19 [Foroudi \(2019\)](#). Finally, five Intention to leave items were borrowed from [Cerdin and Le](#)  
20 [Pargneux \(2014\)](#) (Table 2).

21 Five academics who were experts in the field reviewed the items for content and face validity  
22 and some items were adapted. Based on a suggestion by [Harpaz et al. \(2002\)](#), we employed  
23 non-mechanical techniques and procedures for the translation-back-translation of the items and  
24 discussed them in detail with a small group of academics who were fluent in both languages  
25 until "agreement was reached" (p. 236). Participants' answers were measured on a 7-point  
26 Likert-type scale, ranging from '1 = strongly disagree' to "7 = strongly agree".

27

28 <<Please Insert Table 2 Here>>

29

## 1 4 Data Analysis

2 We used SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) to examine the descriptive statistics for  
3 the entire research sample (Tables 1.1 and 1.2). The construct reliability was examined via  
4 Cronbach's alpha (USA: .787 and .941; UK: .839 and .891; Italy: .865 and .944; Spain: .827  
5 and .961) and the results show high scale validity based on the recommendations of previous  
6 scholars (Churchill, 1979; Foroudi, 2020). We assessed common method variance by  
7 employing Harman's one-factor examination based on the recommendation by Lindell and  
8 Whitney (2001), Malhotra and Kim (2006), and Podsakoff et al. (2003). We used the chi-square  
9 difference between the original and fully constrained model for all four data sets and the results  
10 show that the models share a variance and are dissimilar. In addition, four classification sources  
11 of common method variance were used following Podsakoff et al. (2003). Possible non-  
12 response bias was tested between the first 50 and last 50 participants by employing the Mann-  
13 Whitney U test and the results show the significant value for the variables were 0.5 or less than  
14 the probability value, which is insignificant and no differences were found. Therefore, non-  
15 response bias was not a concern. Then, we measured the models without any consideration of  
16 method biases, and confirmatory factor analysis was recommended.

17 For measurement model validation, we employed AMOS (Analysis of Moment Structures) to  
18 inspect the discriminant validity and determine the quality of the measurement model. To  
19 assess reliability and convergent validity, we examined CR (composite reliability) and AVE  
20 (average variance extracted). The AVE for each construct ranged from USA: .501 to .844; UK:  
21 .599 to .754; Italy: .683 to .812; Spain: .627 to .843 >.5 which indicates adequate convergent  
22 validity (Appendix 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4). The composite reliability for all constructs was above  
23 .7 and the respondents had clearly differentiated between the constructs in the research. After  
24 excluding the overlapping constructs, the confirmatory factor analysis results demonstrated a  
25 good-fit model: root mean square error of approximation residual (RMSEA) USA: .037, UK:  
26 .053, Italy: .058, Spain: .07; comparative fit index (CFI) USA: .978, UK: .962, Italy: .969,  
27 Spain: .946; Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) USA: .973, UK: .953, Italy: .962, Spain: .9340; normed  
28 fit index (NFI) USA: .942, UK: .931, Italy: .941, Spain: .926; incremental fit index (IFI) USA:  
29 .978, UK: .962, Italy: .969, Spain: .946 and relative fit index (RFI) USA: .929, UK: .915, Italy:  
30 .928, Spain: .909 (Jr et al., 2018).

31 Structural equation modelling (SEM) was used to measure the causal relationships among the  
32 study's constructs by using AMOS (Analysis of Moment Structures). The hypothesised model

1 yielded an excellent fit value: RMSEA - USA: .054, UK: .062, Italy: .071, Spain: .081; TLI -  
2 USA: .973, UK: .926, Italy: .942, Spain: .923; CFA -USA: .95, UK: .937, Italy: .951, Spain:  
3 .936; NFI - USA: .942, UK: .9, Italy: .922, Spain: .915; IFI - USA: .978, UK: .937, Italy: .951,  
4 Spain: .936 and RFI - USA: .929, UK: .884, Italy: .909, Spain: .898 (Tables 3a and 3b). Based  
5 on the results of the standardized estimates (Appendix 3.1 and 3.2), the result of testing  
6 hypothesis 1 suggests there is a relationship between ethical leadership and job satisfaction.  
7 This point of view is supported by the majority of participants: USA:  $\beta = 0.113$ ,  $t = 2.206$ ;  
8 Italy:  $\beta = .192$ ,  $t = 2.691$ ; Spain:  $\beta = .421$ ,  $t = 9.335$ , except UK respondents ( $\beta = .187$ ,  $t =$   
9  $1.290$ ,  $p .197$ ) where the result was significantly different from 0 at the .05 significance level.  
10 Hypothesis 2.1 which argues that ethical leadership is associated with distributive justice was  
11 found to be significant (USA:  $\beta = 0.272$ ,  $t = 5.365$ ; UK:  $\beta=.621$ ,  $t=3.358$ ; Italy:  $\beta = .473$ ,  $t =$   
12  $7.649$ ; Spain:  $\beta =.366$ ,  $t = 8.418$ ). The results show the effects of ethical leadership on  
13 procedural justice (USA:  $\beta = 0.112$ ,  $t = 2.454$ ; UK:  $\beta = 1.090$ ,  $t = 5.448$ ; Italy:  $\beta = .531$ ,  $t =$   
14  $8.698$ ; Spain:  $\beta =.447$ ,  $t =10.563$ ). Thus, hypothesis 2.2 was accepted. The results show a  
15 significant interaction effect of distributive justice on job satisfaction from USA ( $\beta=0.202$ ,  $t$   
16  $=3.937$ ), UK ( $\beta = .099$ ,  $t = 2.282$ ) and Italy ( $\beta = .310$ ,  $t = 4.804$ ); however, the Spanish data  
17 showed insignificant association ( $\beta = -.007$ ,  $t = -.155$ ,  $p .877$ ). H3.2, which proposes that  
18 procedural justice is positively associated with job satisfaction was found to be significant from  
19 British ( $\beta = .355$ ,  $t = 6.770$ ) and Spanish ( $\beta =.355$ ,  $t = 6.770$ ) participants; however, the  
20 hypothesis was rejected from American ( $\beta = 0.006$ ,  $t = 0.101$ ,  $p .919$ ) and Italian ( $\beta = .089$ ,  $t =$   
21  $1.512$ ,  $p .131$ ) respondents. The results show significant impacts of job satisfaction on loyalty  
22 (USA:  $\beta = 0.227$ ,  $t = 3.538$ ; UK:  $\beta = .372$ ,  $t = 7.320$ ; Italy:  $\beta = .179$ ,  $t = 3.271$ ; Spain:  $\beta = .423$ ,  
23  $t = 7.315$ ); thus, hypothesis 4 was fully accepted. The hypothesized model shows a positive  
24 effect of distributive justice on intention to leave (H5.1) from the perception of the Anglo group  
25 (USA:  $\beta = -0.121$ ,  $t = -2.6$ ; UK:  $\beta =$ ,  $t = 2.191$ ). However, the results from Latin European  
26 respondents were found insignificant (Italy:  $\beta = -.085$ ,  $t = -1.876$ ,  $p .061$ ; Spain:  $\beta = -.093$ ,  $t =$   
27  $-1.904$ ,  $p .057$ ). The results showed an insignificant effect of procedural justice on intention-  
28 to-leave (USA:  $\beta = -.034$ ,  $t = -.629$ ,  $p .529$ ; UK:  $\beta = .012$ ,  $t = .315$ ,  $p .753$ ; Italy:  $\beta = -.043$ ,  $t =$   
29  $-1.040$ ,  $p .298$ ; Spain:  $\beta = -.041$ ,  $t = -.910$ ,  $p .298$ ). As table 3.1 and 3.2 show, most of the  
30 samples showed an association between loyalty and intention to leave (USA:  $\beta = -0.228$ ,  $t = -$   
31  $4.851$ ; UK:  $\beta = -.229$ ,  $t = -4.259$ ; Spain:  $\beta = -.099$ ,  $t = -2.206$ ) except the data from Italy ( $\beta = -$   
32  $.041$ ,  $t = -.865$ ,  $p .387$ ).

33

1 <<Please Insert Table 3.1 and 3.2 Here>>

2

## 3 **5 Conclusion and implications**

### 4 *5.1 Conclusion*

5 The main aim of this study was to examine the impact of ethical leadership on intention to  
6 leave through variables such as organisational justice, loyalty, and job satisfaction in the  
7 context of independent hotels. The second aim was to compare these relationships in four  
8 countries, US, UK, Spain and Italy, of which, GLOBE places the US and UK in the Anglo  
9 cluster, and Italy and Spain in the Latin European cluster. The pattern of relationships between  
10 the variables were not necessarily the same in all four countries thus contradicting the implicit  
11 assumption of much previous research that they would be.

12 Of the nine hypotheses tested, four showed the same results for all four countries. Our results  
13 show that ethical leadership has a positive relationship with both types of organisational justice,  
14 both procedural and descriptive, in the four countries. Additionally, job satisfaction  
15 demonstrated a significant positive relationship with loyalty in all four countries. The  
16 remaining common result was that procedural justice had no relationship with intention to leave  
17 in any of the countries, which is not consistent with previous studies (Nadiri and Tanova, 2010).  
18 In the hotel industry semi-skilled workers are not involved in the decision-making process and  
19 are not encouraged to express their ideas or suggestions, which would be essential for  
20 procedural justice (Heffernan and Dundon, 2016). However, all these are developed countries  
21 and a part of Western culture so further research in non-Western countries would have to be  
22 conducted before generalising this finding to the status of a universal principle.

23 Beyond these, the patterns of similarity within the two GLOBE regional clusters are apparent  
24 with seven of the nine hypotheses showing the same result between the UK and USA in the  
25 Anglo cluster and six of the nine showing the same result between Italy and Spain in the Latin  
26 European cluster.

27 However, in the cases of three hypotheses that showed a similarity within the cluster there was  
28 also a similarity with one of the countries in the other cluster. First, there was a positive  
29 relationship between ethical leadership and job satisfaction in Italy, Spain and the US which is  
30 in accordance with the previous studies (Freire and Bettencourt, 2020; Kim and Brymer, 2011;



1 [Mayer et al., 2008](#)) but no significant relationship in the UK. On the other hand, distributive  
2 justice was found to have a positive relationship with job satisfaction in the UK, US and Italy,  
3 which is consistent with earlier studies ([Heffernan and Dundon, 2016](#); [Nadiri and Tanova,](#)  
4 [2010](#)) whereas, surprisingly, the same relationship cannot be seen in Spain. This could be due  
5 to the fact that Spain scores lower in the Masculinity dimension of Hofstede's study as  
6 compared to the three other countries examined in this research. In fact, the lower score in the  
7 Masculinity dimension in Spain may result in a search for harmony and equality as opposed to  
8 competition and individual success ([House et al., 1999](#)). Indeed, distributive justice  
9 concentrates more on economic aspects such as pay and promotion in the working environment  
10 ([Lambert et al., 2019](#)) and is usually based on competition among employees. This may explain  
11 why the results show no significant relationship between distributive justice and job  
12 satisfaction for Spain. Third, Loyalty showed a negative relationship with intention to leave in  
13 the UK, US and Spain which is consistent with previous studies ([Burriss et al., 2008](#); [Ineson et](#)  
14 [al., 2013](#)) but no significant relationship in Italy. As [Ponzo and Scoppa \(2010\)](#) argue, in Italy  
15 individuals who possess informal networks especially in low-skilled jobs that do not require a  
16 high level of education are preferred to be hired by managers. Moreover, as the GLOBE studies  
17 show, Italy has the lowest ranking in institutional collectivism, which indicates that in Italy  
18 individuals have a high propensity to be loyal toward their leaders instead of their  
19 organisations; hence, this may be the reason for the insignificant relationship between  
20 organisational loyalty and intention to leave among Italian hotel employees.

21 The results show that distributive justice has a significant relationship with intention to leave  
22 in the Anglo cluster, UK and US, which is in accordance with previous studies ([Rahim et al.,](#)  
23 [2001](#)) whereas no specific relationship could be seen between these two variables in the Latin  
24 European cluster, Italy and Spain. Due to the fact that distributive justice is financially focused  
25 and individuals in the UK and US are possibly more sensitive to financial factors which are  
26 gained through higher payment and promotion, it is possible that higher levels of distributive  
27 justice result in job satisfaction. On the other hand, individuals in Spain and Italy enjoy the  
28 benefits of social-political systems where the government is more protective towards  
29 employees, for example with higher rates of minimum wages and labour legislation. Hence,  
30 employees in these countries could be less sensitive to the monetary effects of distributive  
31 justice and, therefore, the relationship between distributive justice and intention to leave is not  
32 significant.

1 Finally, the ninth hypothesis produced a surprising result which should be investigated in future  
2 studies. Procedural justice showed a positive relationship with job satisfaction in the UK and  
3 Spain but no significant relationship in the US and Italy, which is not consistent with past  
4 studies (Lambert *et al.*, 2019; Schappe, 1998). Although these four countries are all developed  
5 Western countries with somewhat similar cultures (House *et al.*, 1999) which might be  
6 expected to show similar attitudes, this study shows that the impact of procedural justice on  
7 job satisfaction varies in different contexts, which requires further investigation. However,  
8 according to Tang and Sarfield-Baldwin (1996) due to the fact that procedural justice is related  
9 to job satisfaction, high-level managers could positively influence their employees' satisfaction  
10 by recognising their desires and needs, as well as by establishing appropriate mutual  
11 relationships and communications with them thereby increasing employees' job involvement,  
12 innovation and motivation (Kumasey *et al.*, 2019).

13 Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960) predicts that successful leadership is  
14 based on commonly accepted standards of fairness and reciprocity. Although the patterns of  
15 similarity in our data analysis suggest this is generally true, our data reminds us that perception  
16 is everything and that we see the world through cultural filters which affect our perceptions of  
17 fairness and appropriate reciprocity.

## 18 5.2 *Theoretical Implications*

19 Our study is disruptive of mainstream organisational theory because it calls into question  
20 assumptions about the generalisability of research findings and problematises currently used  
21 constructs (Sandberg and Alvesson, 2011). Many of the anomalies that we have discovered are  
22 probably due to differences in national culture, but they may also have something to do with  
23 industry sector. Our study suggests that much further investigation will be needed.

24 Although most studies that are conducted in the hotel industry gather data in chain hotels, our  
25 study focuses on independent hotels. We suggest that this is a neglected sector that deserves  
26 more attention because of its economic significance. It is possible that some of the unexpected  
27 results found in our study may arise from this difference in context. This theoretical insight  
28 suggested by our results also suggests new avenues for further research.

29 National culture is largely responsible for determining the fundamental values and norms of  
30 individuals. It is not, therefore, surprising that perceptions of what is fair and what should be  
31 expected in the relationships between managers and employees in the workplace vary between  
32 countries. In our study, cultural perceptions must play a large part in what is perceived in each

1 culture to be ethical leadership and organisational justice. These differences in perception  
2 probably also play a part in the unexpected results of our study and the reasons for this should  
3 also be investigated in future research.

4 We suggest that our study demonstrates the need to abandon the notion, implicitly held for so  
5 long by many organisational scholars, that the constructs they use, and therefore also the  
6 relationships between them, are the same for every country in the world. Blau's version of  
7 Social Exchange Theory allows for exactly this kind of cultural variation (Blau, 1964), and we  
8 suggest that further research is required to find the patterns of interpretation of organisational  
9 constructs can be identified for each culture.

### 10 5.3 *Practical Implications*

11 Independent hotels have more disadvantages compared to chain hotels in terms of acquiring  
12 resources including, human resources, so it is extremely important for them to make good use  
13 of the resources available to them. In many cases the hotel industry, as with the hospitality  
14 industry as a whole, has to make do with a large proportion of employees who are not  
15 committed to a career in the industry (Gebbers *et al.*, 2020). This factor may be expected to  
16 make it difficult to motivate staff. However, our study shows that in three out of the four  
17 countries investigated distributive justice was positively associated with job satisfaction  
18 suggesting that, in these countries at least, if managers ensure that they follow the principles of  
19 distributive fairness, they are likely to have better service from their employees. In all four  
20 countries distributive justice was positively associated with ethical leadership.

21 Unfortunately, our study did not reveal any sure formula for reducing intention to leave in any  
22 of the four countries. Even organisational loyalty was only negatively associated with intention  
23 to leave in three out of four of the countries. However, we can say that distributive justice is  
24 negatively associated with intention to leave in the Anglo cluster which suggests that managers  
25 of independent hotels in this cluster would probably benefit their businesses by using the ethical  
26 leadership with distributive justice combination. However, this study was designed to be  
27 disruptive research and, therefore, likely to lead to further research that will benefit  
28 practitioners in the future with specific recommendations on how to reduce intention to leave  
29 among their staff.

1 5.4 *Limitations and Future Studies*

2 As with all studies of this type, ours has a limitation in the sample. Future studies could include  
3 more countries and regions to provide a more comprehensive understanding and to widen our  
4 knowledge. It is also suggested that future studies consider other variables, such as different  
5 leadership styles and organisational variables, since this may benefit both scholars and  
6 managers of the hotel industry.

7 Our study suggests that further research is required to find the interpretation and patterns of  
8 relationship between organisational constructs in the independent sector of the hotel industry  
9 and also in the contexts of different national cultures.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

## 1   **6   References**

- 2   Aksu, A.A.-(2005), “Job satisfaction of managers in   tourism: Cases in the Antalya region  
3       of Turkey”, *Managerial Auditing Journal*, Vol. 20 No. 5, pp. 479–488.
- 4   Alexander,-S. and Ruderman, M.   (1987), “The Role of Procedural and Distributive Justice  
5       in Organizational Behavior”, *Social Justice Research*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 177–198.
- 6   Anderson, H.J., Baur, J.E., Griffith, J.A. and Buckley, M.R. (2017), “What works for   you  
7       may not work for (Gen)Me: Limitations of present leadership theories for the new  
8       generation”, *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 245–260.
- 9   Ashkanasy, N. (2002), “Leadership in the Asian Century: Lessons from GLOBE”,  
10       *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 150–163.
- 11   Ausar, K., Kang, H.J.A. and Kim, J.S. (2016), “The effects of authentic leadership and  
12       organizational commitment on turnover intention”, *Leadership   &   Organization  
13       Development Journal*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 1–32.
- 14   Bavik, A. (2020), “A systematic review of the servant leadership literature in management  
15       and hospitality”, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol.  
16       32 No. 1, pp. 347–382.
- 17   Bedi, A., Alpaslan, C.M. and Green, S. (2016), “A Meta-analytic Review of Ethical  
18       Leadership Outcomes and Moderators”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 139 No. 3, pp.  
19       517–536.
- 20   Blau, P.M. (1964), “Justice in Social Exchange”, *Sociological Inquiry*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp.  
21       193–206.
- 22   Borgogni, L., Dello Russo, S., Miraglia, M. and Vecchione, M. (2013), “The role of self-  
23       efficacy and job satisfaction on absences from work”, *Revue Europeenne de Psychologie  
24       Appliquee*, Elsevier Masson SAS, Vol. 63 No. 3, pp. 129–136.
- 25   Brodsky, S.L., Thibaut, J. and Walker, L. (1978), “Procedural Justice: A Psychological  
26       Analysis”, *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (1973-)*, available  
27       at:<https://doi.org/10.2307/1142510>.
- 28   Brown, M.E., Treviño, L.K. and Harrison, D.A. (2005), “Ethical leadership: A social  
29       learning perspective for construct development and testing”, *Organizational Behavior  
30       and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 97 No. 2, pp. 117–134.
- 31   Burris, E.R., Detert, J.R. and Chiaburu, D.S. (2008), “Quitting Before Leaving: The  
32       Mediating Effects of Psychological Attachment and Detachment on Voice”, *Journal of  
33       Applied Psychology*, Vol. 93 No. 4, pp. 912–922.
- 34   Cerdin, J.L. and Le Pargneux, M. (2014), “The impact of expatriates’ career characteristics  
35       on career and job satisfaction, and intention to leave: An objective and subjective fit  
36       approach”, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 25 No. 14, pp.  
37       2033–2049.
- 38   Cho, S., Johanson, M.M. and Guchait, P. (2009), “Employees intent to leave: A comparison  
39       of   determinants of intent to leave versus intent to stay”, *International Journal   of  
40       Hospitality Management*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 374–381.

- 1 Churchill, G.A. (1979), “A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing  
2 Constructs”, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 64–73.
- 3 Dimitriou, C.K. and Schwepker, C.H. (2019), “Enhancing the lodging experience through  
4 ethical leadership”, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*,  
5 Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 669–690.
- 6 Eskildsen, J., Kristensen, K. and Antvor, H.G. (2010), “The relationship between job  
7 satisfaction and national culture”, *TQM Journal*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 369–378.
- 8 Ferreira, A.I., Martinez, L.F., Lamelas, J.P. and Rodrigues, R.I. (2017), “Mediation of job  
9 embeddedness and satisfaction in the relationship between task characteristics and  
10 turnover: A multilevel study in Portuguese hotels”, *International Journal of  
11 Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 248–267.
- 12 Foroudi, P. (2019), “Influence of brand signature, brand awareness, brand attitude, brand  
13 reputation on hotel industry’s brand performance”, *International Journal of Hospitality  
14 Management*, Elsevier, Vol. 76, pp. 271–285.
- 15 Foroudi, P. (2020), “Corporate-brand strategy: Drivers and outcomes of hotel industry’s  
16 brand orientation”, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Elsevier, Vol. 88,  
17 pp. 1–14.
- 18 Freire, C. and Bettencourt, C. (2020), “Impact of ethical leadership on job satisfaction: the  
19 mediating effect of work–family conflict”, *Leadership and Organization Development  
20 Journal*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 319–330.
- 21 Gebbels, M., Pantelidis, I.S. and Goss-Turner, S. (2020), “Conceptualising patterns of career  
22 commitment: the leaving process in hospitality”, *International Journal of Contemporary  
23 Hospitality Management*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 126–147.
- 24 Gerstner, C.R. and Day, D. V. (1997), “Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange  
25 theory: Correlates and construct issues”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 82 No. 6,  
26 pp. 827–844.
- 27 Gordon, S., Tang, C.H. (Hugo), Day, J. and Adler, H. (2019), “Supervisor support and  
28 turnover in hotels: Does subjective well-being mediate the relationship?”, *International  
29 Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 496–512.
- 30 Gouldner, A.W. (1960), “The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement”, *American  
31 Sociological Review*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 161–178.
- 32 Greenberg, J. (1982), “Approaching Equity and Avoiding Inequity in Groups and  
33 Organizations”, in Greenberg, J. and Cohen, R.L. (Eds.), *Equity and Justice in Social  
34 Behavior*, ACADEMIC PRESS, INC., pp. 389–435.
- 35 Gupta, V., Hanges, P.J. and Dorfman, P. (2002), “Cultural clusters: Methodology and  
36 findings”, *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 11–15.
- 37 Haldorai, K., Kim, W.G., Pillai, S.G., Park, T. (Eliot) and Balasubramanian, K. (2019),  
38 “Factors affecting hotel employees’ attrition and turnover: Application of pull-push-  
39 mooring framework”, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 83, pp. 46–  
40 55.
- 41 Harpaz, I., Honig, B. and Coetsier, P. (2002), “A cross-cultural longitudinal analysis of the  
42 meaning of work and the socialization process of career starters”, *Journal of World*

- 1        *Business*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 230–244.
- 2        Heffernan, M. and Dundon, T. (2016), “Cross-level effects of high-performance work systems  
3        (HPWS) and employee well-being: The mediating effect of organisational justice”,  
4        *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 211–231.
- 5        Hendrix, W., Robbins, T., Miller, J. and Summers, T. (1998), “Effects of procedural and  
6        distributive justice on factors predictive of turnover”, *Journal of Social Behavior and*  
7        *Personality*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 611–632.
- 8        Hight, S.K., Gajjar, T. and Okumus, F. (2019), “Managers from ‘Hell’ in the hospitality  
9        industry: How do hospitality employees profile bad managers?”, *International Journal of*  
10        *Hospitality Management*, Vol. 77 No. February 2018, pp. 97–107.
- 11       Hofstede, G. (1980), “Culture and Organizations”, *International Studies of Management &*  
12       *Organization*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 15–41.
- 13       Hofstede, G. (1993), “Cultural constraints in management theories.”, *Academy of Management*  
14       *Perspectives*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 81–94.
- 15       Hofstede, G. (2001), “Culture’s Recent Consequences: Using Dimension Scores in Theory and  
16       Research”, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, Vol. 1, pp. 11–30.
- 17       House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W. and Gupta, V. (2004),        *Culture,*  
18        *Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*, 3rd ed., SAGE  
19        Publications, Inc, California.
- 20       House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A., Dorfman, P.W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M.  
21       and Gutpa, V. (1999), “Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project  
22       GLOBE”, *Advances in Global Leadership*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 171–233.
- 23       Hsu, F.S., Liu, Y. an and Tsauro, S.H. (2019), “The impact of workplace bullying on hotel  
24       employees’ well-being: Do organizational justice and friendship matter?”, *International*  
25       *Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 1702–1719.
- 26       Hwang, E., Baloglu, S. and Tanford, S. (2019), “Building loyalty through reward programs:  
27       The influence of perceptions of fairness and brand attachment”, *International Journal of*  
28       *Hospitality Management*, Vol. 76, pp. 19–28.
- 29       Ineson, E.M., Benke, E. and László, J. (2013), “Employee loyalty in Hungarian hotels”,  
30       *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 31–39.
- 31       Javidan, M. and Dastmalchian, A. (2009), “Managerial implications of the GLOBE project: A  
32       study of 62 societies”, *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 47 No. 1, pp. 51–  
33       58.
- 34       Jeanine, W., Pemberton, A.E.. and Lounsbury, J.W.. (2012), “An Investigation of Career and  
35       Job Satisfaction in Relation to Personality Traits of Information Professionals”, *The*  
36       *University of Chicago Press*, Vol. 75` No. 2, pp. 122–141.
- 37       Jiang, Z., Gollan, P.J. and Brooks, G. (2017), “Relationships between organizational justice,  
38       organizational trust and organizational commitment: a cross-cultural study of China,  
39       South Korea and Australia”, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol.  
40       28 No. 7, pp. 973–1004.
- 41       Jr, J.F.H., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E., Black, W.C. and Anderson, R.E. (2018),

- 1        *Multivariate Data Analysis*, available at:<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119409137.ch4>.
- 2        Karkoulian, S. (2015), “The Reign of Leadership & Power in Just Organizations”,  
3        *Contemporary Management Research*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 153–178.
- 4        Khan, S.K. and Rashid, M.Z.A. (2012), “The Mediating Effect of Organizational Commitment  
5        in the Organizational Culture , Leadership and ...”, *International Journal of Business and  
6        Social Science*, Vol. 3 No. 8, pp. 83–91.
- 7        Kim, W.G. and Brymer, R.A. (2011), “The effects of ethical leadership on manager job  
8        satisfaction, commitment, behavioral outcomes, and firm performance”, *International  
9        Journal of Hospitality Management*, Elsevier Ltd, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 1020–1026.
- 10        Körner, M., Wirtz, M.A., Bengel, J. and Göritz, A.S. (2015), “Relationship of organizational  
11        culture, teamwork and job satisfaction in interprofessional teams”, *BMC Health Services  
12        Research*, Vol. 15 No. 1, available at:<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-0888-y>.
- 13        Kumasey, A.S., Delle, E. and Hossain, F. (2019), “Not all justices are equal: the unique effects  
14        of organizational justice on the behaviour and attitude of government workers in Ghana”,  
15        *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 0 No. 0, pp. 1–19.
- 16        Lam, T., Lo, A. and Chan, J. (2002), “New Employees’ Turnover Intentions and  
17        Organizational Commitment in the Hong Kong Hotel Industry”, *Journal of Hospitality  
18        and Tourism Research*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 217–234.
- 19        Lam, T., Zhang, H. and Baum, T. (2001), “An investigation of employees’ job satisfaction:  
20        the case of hotels in Hong Kong”, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 157–165.
- 21        Lambert, E.G., Keena, L.D., Leone, M., May, D. and Haynes, S.H. (2019), “The effects of  
22        distributive and procedural justice on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of  
23        correctional staff”, *Social Science Journal*, Western Social Science Association, available  
24        at:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2019.02.002>.
- 25        Laurent, A. (1983), “The Cultural Diversity of Western Conceptions of Management”,  
26        *International Studies of Management & Organization*, Vol. 13 No. 1–2, pp. 75–96.
- 27        Lee, S.Y. and Whitford, A.B. (2008), “Exit, voice, loyalty, and pay: Evidence from the public  
28        workforce”, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp.  
29        647–671.
- 30        Li, Y., Xu, J., Tu, Y. and Lu, X. (2014), “Ethical Leadership and Subordinates’ Occupational  
31        Well-Being: A Multi-level Examination in China”, *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 116  
32        No. 3, pp. 823–842.
- 33        Lindell, M.K. and Whitney, D.J. (2001), “Accounting for common method variance in cross-  
34        sectional research designs”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86 No. 1, pp. 114–121.
- 35        MacIntyre, P.D., Thivierge, K.A. and MacDonald, J.R. (1997), “The effects of audience  
36        interest, responsiveness, and evaluation on public speaking anxiety and related variables”,  
37        *International Journal of Phytoremediation*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 157–168.
- 38        Mayer, D.M., Bardes, M. and Piccolo, R.F. (2008), “Do servant-leaders help satisfy follower  
39        needs? An organizational justice perspective”, *European Journal of Work and  
40        Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 180–197.
- 41        McSweeney, B. (2013), “Fashion founded on a flaw: The ecological mono-deterministic



- 1 fallacy of Hofstede, GLOBE, and followers”, *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 30  
2 No. 5, pp. 483–504.
- 3 Mohsin, A., Lengler, J. and Kumar, B. (2013), “Exploring the antecedents of intentions to leave  
4 the job: The case of luxury hotel staff”, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*,  
5 Vol. 35, pp. 48–58.
- 6 Nadiri, H. and Tanova, C. (2010), “An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions,  
7 job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in hospitality industry”,  
8 *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 33–41.
- 9 Naresh K. Malhotra, Sung S. Kim, A.P. (2006), “Common Method Variance in IS Research□:  
10 A Comparison of Alternative Approaches and a Reanalysis of Past Research”,  
11 *Management Science*, Vol. 52 No. 12, pp. 1865–1883.
- 12 Nazarian, A. (2013), *The Mediating Influence of Leadership Style and Moderating Impact of*  
13 *National Culture and Organizational Size on the Culture-Effectiveness Relationship: The*  
14 *Case of Iran*.
- 15 Nazarian, A., Atkinson, P., Foroudi, P. and Dennis, K. (2019), “Finding the right management  
16 approach in independent hotels”, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality*  
17 *Management*, Vol. 31 No. 7, pp. 2862–2883.
- 18 Nazarian, A., Atkinson, P., Foroudi, P. and Edirisinghe, D. (2020), “Leaders or organisations?:  
19 A comparison study of factors affecting organisational citizenship behaviour in  
20 independent hotels”, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*,  
21 Vol. 32 No. 6, pp. 2055–2074.
- 22 Nazarian, A., Atkinson, P., Foroudi, P. and Soares, A. (2021), “Working together: Factors  
23 affecting the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction in Iranian HR  
24 departments”, *Journal of General Management*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 229–245.
- 25 Olkkonen, M.E. and Lipponen, J. (2006), “Relationships between organizational justice,  
26 identification with organization and work unit, and group-related outcomes”,  
27 *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 100 No. 2, pp. 202–215.
- 28 Pandey, C. and Rajni, K. (2012), “Impact of Job Satisfaction and Organizational”,  
29 *International Journal of Social Science & Interdisciplinary Research*, Vol. 1 No. 8, pp.  
30 2–41.
- 31 Park, J. and Min, H. (Kelly). (2020), “Turnover intention in the hospitality industry: A meta-  
32 analysis”, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Elsevier, Vol. 90, available  
33 at:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102599>.
- 34 Patwardhan, V., Ribeiro, M.A., Woosnam, K.M., Payini, V. and Mallya, J. (2020), “Visitors’  
35 loyalty to religious tourism destinations: Considering place attachment, emotional  
36 experience and religious affiliation”, *Tourism Management Perspectives*, Elsevier, Vol.  
37 36, pp. 1–13.
- 38 Pillai, R., Scandura, T.A. and Williams, E.A. (1999), “Leadership and Organizational Justice:  
39 Similarities and Differences across Cultures”, *Journal of International Business Studies*,  
40 Vol. 30, pp. 763–779.
- 41 Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.Y. and Podsakoff, N.P. (2003), “Common Method  
42 Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended

- 1 Remedies”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 5, pp. 879–903.
- 2 Ponzo, M. and Scoppa, V. (2010), “The use of informal networks in Italy□: Efficiency or  
3 favoritism□?”, *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 89–99.
- 4 Rahim, M.A., Magner, N.R., Antonioni, D. and Rahman, S. (2001), “Do justice relationships  
5 with organization-directed reactions differ across U.S. and Bangladesh employees?”,  
6 *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 333–349.
- 7 Sandberg, J. and Alvesson, M. (2011), “Ways of constructing research questions: Gap-spotting  
8 or problematization?”, *Organization*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 23–44.
- 9 Schappe, S.P. (1998), “Understanding Employee Job Satisfaction: The Importance of  
10 Procedural and Distributive Justice”, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 12 No. 4,  
11 pp. 493–503.
- 12 Shehawy, Y.M. (2021), “Current workplace issues and behaviours in tourism and hospitality:  
13 moderating role of empowering leadership”, *Current Issues in Tourism*, Taylor & Francis,  
14 Vol. 0 No. 0, pp. 1–22.
- 15 Tang, T.L.-P. and Sarfield-Baldwin, L.J. (1996), “Distributive and procedural justice as related  
16 to satisfaction and commitment”, *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, Vol. 61 No. 3, pp.  
17 1–25.
- 18 Teng, C.C., Lu, A.C.C., Huang, Z.Y. and Fang, C.H. (2020), “Ethical work climate,  
19 organizational identification, leader-member-exchange (LMX) and organizational  
20 citizenship behavior (OCB): A study of three star hotels in Taiwan”, *International Journal  
21 of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 212–229.
- 22 Tuan, L.T. (2018), “Driving employees to serve customers beyond their roles in the Vietnamese  
23 hospitality industry: The roles of paternalistic leadership and discretionary HR practices”,  
24 *Tourism Management*, Elsevier, Vol. 69 No. May, pp. 132–144.
- 25 Walumbwa, F.O., Mayer, D.M., Wang, P., Wang, H., Workman, K. and Christensen, A.L.  
26 (2011), “Linking ethical leadership to employee performance: The roles of leader-member  
27 exchange, self-efficacy, and organizational identification”, *Organizational Behavior and  
28 Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 115 No. 2, pp. 204–213.
- 29 Williams, R. (1976), *Keywords - a Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, Revised ed., OXFORD  
30 UNIVERSITY PRESS, New York, available at:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-  
31 6736\(00\)40431-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(00)40431-9).
- 32 Xu, A.J., Loi, R. and Ngo, H. yue. (2014), “Ethical Leadership Behavior and Employee Justice  
33 Perceptions: The Mediating Role of Trust in Organization”, *Journal of Business Ethics*,  
34 Vol. 136 No. 3, pp. 493–504.
- 35 Yang, J. Te. (2010), “Antecedents and consequences of job satisfaction in the hotel industry”,  
36 *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Elsevier Ltd, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 609–  
37 619.
- 38 Yao, T., Qiu, Q. and Wei, Y. (2019), “Retaining hotel employees as internal customers: Effect  
39 of organizational commitment on attitudinal and behavioral loyalty of employees”,  
40 *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 76, pp. 1–8.
- 41 Yu, Y., Xu, S., Li, G. and Kong, H. (2020), “A systematic review of research on abusive  
42 supervision in hospitality and tourism”, *International Journal of Contemporary*

*Hospitality Management*, Vol. 32 No. 7, pp. 2473–2496.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

1 Table 1: Participants' characteristics

		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
		USA (429)		UK (401)		Italy (312)		Spain (419)	
<b>Gender</b>									
	Female	236	55.0	233	58.1	106	34.0	216	51.6
	Male	193	45.0	168	41.9	206	66.0	203	48.4
<b>Age</b>									
	18-24	49	11.4	236	58.9	28	9.0	357	8.9
	25-34	239	55.7	81	20.2	141	45.2	151	36.0
	35-44	103	24.0	44	11.0	90	28.8	149	35.6
	45-54	31	7.2	38	9.5	30	9.6	76	18.1
	55 and above	7	1.6	2	.5	23	7.4	6	1.4
<b>Education</b>									
	Pre-university	159	37.1	2	.5	52	16.7	1	.2
	Undergraduate	196	45.7	159	39.7	111	35.6	162	38.7
	Postgraduate	69	16.1	210	52.4	115	36.9	225	53.7
	PhD	5	1.2	30	7.5	34	10.9	31	7.4
<b>Position</b>									
	Employee (supervisor)	160	37.3	110	27.4	92	29.5	120	28.6
	Junior Manager	68	15.9	90	22.7	51	16.3	74	17.7
	Middle Manager	101	23.5	80	20.0	58	18.6	93	22.2
	Senior Manager	60	14.0	71	17.7	59	18.9	100	
	CEO	40	9.3	50	12.5	52	16.7	32	7.6
<b>Size of the company</b>									
	Small	109	25.4	142	35.4	90	28.8	58	13.8
	Medium	92	21.4	116	28.9	106	34.0	129	30.8
	Large	228	53.1	143	35.7	116	37.2	232	55.4

2

Table 2: Item measurements and references

Construct	Abbreviation	Item	References	
<b>Ethical-Leadership</b>	EL1	Listens-to-what-employees-have-to-say.	Brown <i>et al.</i> (2005)	
	EL2	Disciplines-employees-who-violate-ethical-standards.		
	EL3	Conducts-his/her-personal-life-in-an-ethical-manner.		
	EL4	Has-the-best-interests-of-employees-in-mind.		
	EL5	Makes-fair-and-balanced-decisions.		
	EL6	Can-be-trusted.		
	EL7	Discusses-business-ethics-or-values-with-employees.		
	EL8	Sets-an-example-of-how-to-do-things-the-right-way-in-terms-of-ethics.		
	EL9	Define success not just by results but also the way that they are obtained		
	EL10	When-making-decisions,-asks-“what-is the-right-thing-to-do?		
<b>Organisational-Justice</b>			Nadiri and Tanova (2010)	
<b>Distributive-justice</b>	DisJus1	Generally,-I-feel-that-my-salary-is-fair.		
	DisJus2	I-feel-that-the-company-gives-fair-rewards-according-to-my-work performance.		
	DisJus3	I-feel-that-the-company-gives-fair-rewards-according-to-my-work-pressure-Trust.		
<b>Procedural-Justice</b>	ProJus1	I-work-with-my-supervisor-to-resolve-all-the-challenges-related-to-my-job.		
	ProJus2	I-work-with-my-supervisor-to-develop-future-plans		
	ProJus3	The-supervisor-asks-my-opinions-on-how-to-improve-firm-performance.		
<b>Job-Satisfaction</b>	JobSat1	I feel I am more satisfied with my job experience as my job complaint is decreasing		MacIntyre <i>et al.</i> (1997); Nazarian (2013); Nazarian <i>et al.</i> (2021)
	JobSat2	I feel I am more satisfied with my job as the number my visits to the consulting centre is decreasing		
	JobSat3	I feel we as co-workers are more satisfied with our jobs and employment		
	JobSat4	I feel I am more satisfied as my absenteeism due to stress is decreasing		
<b>Loyalty</b>	LOY1	I-am-very-loyal-to-this-company.	Foroudi (2019)	
	LOY2	I-will-continue-to-stay-at-this-company.		
	LOY3	As-an-employee-working-in-this-company-I-would-highly-recommend-this-company-to-my-friends-and-family.		
	LOY4	To-me,-the-company’s-brand-is-the-same-as-other-company’s-brands.		
<b>Intention-to-leave</b>	ITL1	I-am-actively-looking-for-a-job-outside-the-hotel-industry.	Cerdin and Le Pargneux, (2014)	
	ITL2	As-soon-as-I-can-find-a-better-job,-I’ll-leave-the-hotel.		
	ITL3	I-am-seriously-thinking-about-quitting-my-job.		
	ITL4	I-often-think-about-quitting-my-job-at-the-hotel.		
	ITL5	I-think-I-will be-working-at-the-hotel-for-five-years-from-now.		

Table 3a: Results of hypothesis examination (USA and UK)

Relationships				USA				UK			
H1	Ethical-Leadership	-->	Job-satisfaction	0.113	0.051	2.206	0.027	.187	.145	1.290	.197
H2.1	Ethical-Leadership	-->	Distributive-justice	0.272	0.051	5.365	***	.621	.185	3.358	***
H2.2	Ethical-Leadership	-->	Procedural-justice	0.112	0.046	2.454	0.014	1.090	.200	5.448	***
H3.1	Distributive-justice	-->	Job-satisfaction	0.202	0.051	3.937	***	.099	.044	2.282	.022
H3.2	Procedural-justice	-->	Job-satisfaction	0.006	0.057	0.101	0.919	.355	.052	6.770	***
H4	Job-satisfaction	-->	Loyalty	0.227	0.064	3.538	***	.372	.051	7.320	***
H5.1	Distributive-justice	-->	Intention-to-leave	-0.121	0.047	-2.6	0.009	.076	.035	2.191	.028
H5.2	Procedural-justice	-->	Intention-to-leave	-0.034	0.054	-0.629	0.529	.012	.038	.315	.753
H6	Loyalty	-->	Intention-to-leave	-0.228	0.047	-4.851	***	-.229	.054	-4.259	***

\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

Notes: Path = Relationship between independent variable on dependent variable;  $\beta$  = Standardised regression coefficient; S.E. = Standard error;  $p$  = Level of significance.

Table 3b: Results of hypothesis examination (Italy and Spain)

Relationships				Italy				Spain			
H1	Ethical-Leadership	-->	Job-satisfaction	.192	.071	2.691	.007	.421	.045	9.335	***
H2.1	Ethical-Leadership	-->	Distributive-justice	.473	.062	7.649	***	.366	.044	8.418	***
H2.2	Ethical-Leadership	-->	Procedural-justice	.531	.061	8.698	***	.447	.042	10.563	***
H3.1	Distributive-justice	-->	Job-satisfaction	.310	.064	4.804	***	-.007	.047	-.155	.877
H3.2	Procedural-justice	-->	Job-satisfaction	.089	.059	1.512	.131	.154	.045	3.391	***
H4	Job-satisfaction	-->	Loyalty	.179	.055	3.271	.001	.423	.058	7.315	***
H5.1	Distributive-justice	-->	Intention-to-leave	-.085	.045	-1.876	.061	-.093	.049	-1.904	.057
H5.2	Procedural-justice	-->	Intention-to-leave	-.043	.042	-1.040	.298	-.041	.045	-.910	.363
H6	Loyalty	-->	Intention-to-leave	-.041	.047	-.865	.387	-.099	.045	-2.206	.027

\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

Notes: Path = Relationship between independent variable on dependent variable;  $\beta$  = Standardised regression coefficient; S.E. = Standard error;  $p$  = Level of significance.

Appendix 1.1: Descriptive statistics (USA and UK)

Construct	Abbreviation	Factor loading	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach @	Abbreviation	Factor loading	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach @
	<b>USA</b>					<b>UK</b>				
<b>Ethical-Leadership</b>	@.837					@.860				
	EL2	.757	4.61	1.135		EL2	.827	4.51	1.709	
	EL5	.758	4.63	1.146		EL3	.809	4.49	1.854	
	EL8	.723	4.34	1.244		EL4	.820	4.40	1.788	
	EL9	.822	4.45	1.333		EL5	.800	4.30	1.765	
	EL10	.744	4.41	1.283		EL7	.698	4.86	1.819	
						EL8	.861	5.21	1.698	
				EL9		.680	4.72	1.687		
					EL10	.831	5.23	1.500		
<b>Distributive-justice</b>	@.941					@.886				
	DisJus1	.878	4.23	.859		DisJus1	.908	4.58	1.888	
	DisJus2	.919	4.12	.917		DisJus2	.875	4.58	1.917	
	DisJus3	.919	4.14	.902		DisJus3	.862	4.29	1.893	
<b>Procedural-Justice</b>	@.824					@.891				
	ProJus1	.784	4.95	.987		ProJus1	.789	4.33	1.719	
	ProJus2	.876	4.83	.911		ProJus2	.894	4.50	1.708	
	ProJus3	.886	4.95	.826		ProJus3	.885	4.50	1.654	
<b>Job-Satisfaction</b>	@.820					@.839				
	JS1	.848	4.14	.896		JobSat1	.826	4.42	1.868	
	JS2	.809	4.10	.872		JobSat2	.851	4.60	1.646	
	JS3	.702	4.34	.946		JobSat4	.848	4.81	1.744	
	JS4	.813	4.24	.991						
<b>Loyalty</b>	@.787					@.853				
	Loyal1	.812	4.54	1.161		LOY2	.819	4.91	1.402	
	Loyal2	.859	4.53	1.171		LOY3	.791	4.92	1.484	
	Loyal3	.749	4.67	1.131		LOY4	.831	4.94	1.503	
<b>Intention-to-leave</b>	@.749					@.869				
	ITL1	.766	2.68	1.083		ITL3	.890	2.37	1.210	
	ITL2	.796	2.86	1.069		ITL4	.888	2.34	1.190	
	ITL3	.806	2.69	1.032		ITL5	.865	2.38	1.217	

Appendix 1.2: Descriptive statistics (Italy and Spain)

Construct	Abbreviation	Factor loading	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach @	Abbreviation	Factor loading	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach @
	<b>Italy</b>					<b>Spain</b>				
<b>Ethical-Leadership</b>	@ .944					@.961				
	EL2	.876	5.66	1.296		EL1	.836	6.03	1.192	
	EL3	.862	5.64	1.303		EL2	.865	5.93	1.173	
	EL4	.923	5.69	1.230		EL3	.846	5.95	1.200	
	EL5	.866	5.65	1.270		EL4	.835	5.90	1.254	
				EL5		.875	5.95	1.250		
<b>Distributive-justice</b>	@.883					@.827				
	DisJus1	.835	5.13	1.492		DisJus1	.772	5.97	1.066	
	DisJus2	.839	5.11	1.491		DisJus2	.822	5.85	1.088	
	DisJus3	.800	4.94	1.545		DisJus3	.836	5.56	1.235	
<b>Procedural-Justice</b>	@.907					@.875				
	ProJus1	.751	5.33	1.302		ProJus1	.739	5.88	1.149	
	ProJus2	.880	5.32	1.435		ProJus2	.800	5.41	1.192	
	ProJus3	.868	5.29	1.388		ProJus3	.846	5.60	1.160	
<b>Job-Satisfaction</b>	@.940					@.954				
	JobSat1	.885	5.03	1.356		JobSat1	.836	5.79	1.188	
	JobSat2	.878	5.06	1.289		JobSat2	.891	6.07	1.162	
	JobSat3	.891	5.03	1.376		JobSat3	.879	6.08	1.170	
	JobSat4	.898	5.05	1.314		JobSat4	.865	6.07	1.168	
<b>Loyalty</b>	@.922					@.8886				
	LOY2	.869	5.29	1.349		Loy1	.854	5.35	1.323	
	LOY3	.925	5.42	1.168		Loy2	.859	5.23	1.307	
	LOY4	.934	5.39	1.245		Loy3	.798	5.68	1.152	
						Loy4	.743	5.64	1.129	
<b>Intention-to-leave</b>	@.865					@.838				
	ITL2	.875	2.44	1.044		ITL1	.705	2.08	1.260	
	ITL3	.868	2.42	1.033		ITL3	.917	2.44	1.252	
	ITL4	.897	2.47	1.060		ITL4	.907	2.46	1.279	



**Appendix 2.1: Discriminant validity (USA)**

USA	CR	AVE	MSV	MaxR(H)	Loyalty	Ethical	Procedural	Distributive	Job	Intention
<b>Loyalty</b>	0.803	0.586	0.142	0.865	<b>0.765</b>					
<b>Ethical</b>	0.839	0.512	0.144	0.847	0.377	<b>0.715</b>				
<b>Procedural</b>	0.844	0.650	0.146	0.893	0.142	0.118	<b>0.806</b>			
<b>Distributive</b>	0.942	0.844	0.146	0.954	0.282	0.284	0.382	<b>0.919</b>		
<b>Job</b>	0.817	0.539	0.064	0.876	0.190	0.184	0.095	0.253	<b>0.734</b>	
<b>Intention</b>	0.750	0.501	0.144	0.755	-0.337	-0.380	-0.119	-0.224	-0.248	<b>0.708</b>

**Appendix 2.2: Discriminant validity (UK)**

UK	CR	AVE	MSV	MaxR(H)	Loyalty	Ethical	Distributive	Procedural	satisfaction	Intention
<b>Loyalty</b>	0.856	0.665	0.204	0.868	0.816					
<b>Ethical</b>	0.881	0.599	0.204	0.890	0.452	0.774				
<b>Distributive</b>	0.888	0.726	0.093	0.905	0.305	0.185	0.852			
<b>Procedural</b>	0.900	0.754	0.193	0.947	0.355	0.381	0.230	0.869		
<b>satisfaction</b>	0.843	0.644	0.193	0.863	0.413	0.217	0.208	0.439	0.802	
<b>Intention</b>	0.870	0.690	0.050	0.872	-0.224	-0.198	0.061	-0.040	-0.079	0.831

**Appendix 2.3: Discriminant validity (Italy)**

	CR	AVE	MSV	MaxR(H)	Loyalty	Ethical	Distributive	Procedural	Job	Intention
<b>Loyalty</b>	0.928	0.812	0.113	0.946	0.901					
<b>Ethical</b>	0.944	0.810	0.224	0.950	0.288	0.900				
<b>Distributive</b>	0.886	0.723	0.355	0.904	0.288	0.446	0.850			
<b>Procedural</b>	0.911	0.775	0.355	0.926	0.336	0.473	0.596	0.880		
<b>Job</b>	0.941	0.798	0.199	0.941	0.186	0.366	0.446	0.353	0.894	
<b>Intention</b>	0.866	0.683	0.037	0.872	-0.107	-0.122	-0.170	-0.150	-0.193	0.827

**Appendix 2.4: Discriminant validity (Spain)**

	CR	AVE	MSV	MaxR(H)	Job	Ethical	Distributive	Procedural	Loyalty	Intention
<b>Job</b>	0.955	0.843	0.371	0.974	<b>0.918</b>					
<b>Ethical</b>	0.961	0.832	0.371	0.964	0.609	<b>0.912</b>				
<b>Distributive</b>	0.833	0.627	0.350	0.855	0.314	0.435	<b>0.792</b>			
<b>Procedural</b>	0.879	0.709	0.350	0.890	0.431	0.503	0.592	<b>0.842</b>		
<b>Loyalty</b>	0.886	0.661	0.279	0.895	0.376	0.528	0.373	0.512	<b>0.813</b>	
<b>Intention</b>	0.848	0.653	0.072	0.879	-0.268	-0.227	-0.173	-0.159	-0.179	<b>0.808</b>

**Appendix 3: Good fit model results (CFA/SEM)**

Good fit model	USA	UK	Italy	Spain
<b>RMSEA</b>	0.037/0.054	0.053/0.062	0.058/0.071	0.07/0.081
<b>CFI</b>	0.978/0.95	0.962/0.937	0.969/0.951	0.946/0.936
<b>TLI</b>	0.973/0.973	0.953/0.926	0.962/0.942	0.934/0.923
<b>NFI</b>	0.942/0.942	0.931/0.9	0.941/0.922	0.926/0.915
<b>IFI</b>	0.978/0.978	0.962/0.937	0.969/0.951	0.946/0.936
<b>RFI</b>	0.929/0.929	0.915/0.884	0.928/0.909	0.909/0.898

Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA); Comparative fit index (CFI); Tucker Lewis Index (TLI); Normated fit index (NFI); Incremental Fit Index (IFI); Relative *Fit* Index (*RFI*)

Figure 1: The research Conceptual model

