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ABSTRACT

UNDERSTANDING WORKPLACE DEVIANT BEHAVIOURS BASED ON PERCEIVED GENDER DISCRIMINATION, ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND ORGANIZATIONAL ATTACHMENT: A CASE OF CHINESE HOTEL EMPLOYEES
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University of Guelph, 2017

Advisors:
Professor WooMi Jo
Professor HS Chris Choi

This study examines the relationship among hotel employees’ perceived gender discrimination, organizational justice/injustice and workplace deviant behaviours, as well as the mediating effect of organizational attachment within the Chinese hospitality industry. Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to test the hypotheses. Empirical results show that (a) perceived gender discrimination is negatively related to affective commitment and organizational identification, and positively related to turnover intention and organizational deviance, (b) distributive justice and procedural justice are positively related to affective commitment and organizational identification, and have no impact on turnover intention or organizational deviance, (c) turnover intention is positively related to organizational deviance, while affective commitment and organizational identification do not influence organizational deviance, (d) the impact of perceived gender discrimination on organizational deviance is mediated by organizational identification and turnover intention, whereas affective commitment has no mediating effect. The study findings provide theoretical and practical implications for future research and hotel human resource management practice.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The tertiary industry contributes to over 50 percent of China’s GDP (Li, 2014). As part of the wide range of tertiary businesses, the hospitality industry plays an indispensable role in China’s economic development. By the end of 2014, China had more than half a million lodging enterprises (ranging from family-owned motels to high-end luxury hotels) with five million employees which generated an annual revenue of 490 billion CNY or approximately USD 77.5 billion (Ministry of Commerce of the People’s Republic of China, Department of Trade in Services and Commercial Services, 2015).

Consistent with many other countries, the hospitality industry in China is significantly female-dominated (Purcell, 1996). Even though they are the major labour force, however, female hospitality employees face various forms of discrimination (Gutek, Cohen, & Tsui, 1996). For example, they may experience unjust or prejudicial treatments in regard to their pay, benefits, promotion opportunities and workload schedule regardless of their work experience and education background because of their gender (Cascio, 1995). Gender discrimination against female employees in the workplace is especially pervasive in China due to its culture of male-superiority (Cooke, 2001). Even though the Chinese government developed policies and regulations to protect female employees’ rights and interests (e.g., Wang, 2005), gender discrimination against females in the workplace is still widespread in China (Woodhams, Lupton, & Xian, 2009). However, workplace gender discrimination does not only apply to females. Males feel discriminated because of their gender as well (Hallock, Hendricks, & Broadbent, 1998). Gender stereotype prohibits male employees from enjoying paternity leave, and forces them to adhere to the masculine image in the workplace (Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Rudman, 2010; Rudman & Mescher, 2013).

Gender discrimination has serious implications not just for the employee but also for the workplace as a whole. For example, when hotel employees think their gender limits their career advancement, they might engage in deviant behaviours against the organization as a whole or certain employees specifically, as a form of protest or revenge (Ambrose, Seabright,
& Schminke, 2002; Wright, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1990). These deviant behaviours can include stealing from customers during room cleaning, abusing sick leave during peak seasons, withholding efforts and dawdling over things other than work, all of which threaten the overall well-being of the hotel.

The relationship between hotel employees’ deviant workplace behaviours, and their perception of gender discrimination and unjust treatment might be mediated by employees’ emotional attachment or connection to the hotel where they work (e.g., Fagbohungbe, Akinbode, & Ayodeji, 2012). This connection is also referred to as organizational attachment (Bowlby, 1973). Weak emotional or organizational attachment is characterized by low affective commitment to the hotel the employee works for; weak and vague identification as part of the hotel; and high intentions to leave for external jobs (e.g., Foley, Ngo, & Loi, 2006). Hotel employees with higher perception of gender discrimination and injustice might be less emotionally attached and tend to care less for the hotel’s well-being than their strongly attached counterparts, and are therefore more likely to develop deviant workplace behaviours that violate hotel rules and norms (Fagbohungbe, Akinbode, & Ayodeji, 2012). These deviant behaviours adversely affect the hotel’s profitability by damaging its reputation and the teamwork spirit of employees (Detert, Trevino, Burris, & Andiappan, 2007; Dunlop & Lee, 2004). It is therefore crucial for managers to understand the sources of deviant behaviour in order to prevent those behaviours from happening.

This study investigates how employee perception of workplace gender discrimination and justice/injustice influence emotional attachment and workplace deviant behaviour specifically in China’s hotel industry. The reasons for this focus are described below.

First, perceived gender discrimination and injustice, and their relation to workplace deviance have been extensively studied in the past (e.g., Colquitt et al., 2001), whereas organizational attachment remains controversial in its definition and measurement (Venkataramani, Labianca, & Grosser, 2013). Meanwhile, the researcher has not found any study that examines the relationship among all four constructs: perceived gender
discrimination; perceived organizational justice; organizational attachment and workplace deviance. This study aims to address that gap and lend some insights into the controversy surrounding organizational attachment.

Second, the hotel industry is a people-oriented industry that mainly relies on the power of employees rather than on machines or high technologies to deliver satisfying customer service. This study aims to help hotel managers understand and eliminate the sources of employee deviant behaviours that threaten to undermine this service.

Last, previous studies of employees’ perceived discrimination, injustice and deviant behaviours were mostly conducted in western countries. The causal relationship between employees’ perception and their behaviours in China has somehow been overlooked. Some Chinese studies have examined how hotel employees’ justice perception influences their job satisfaction (e.g., Ding, 2013; Li & Lu, 2013); some have studied how employees’ organizational attachment impacts their citizenship behaviours (e.g., Yan, Fan, & Zhang, 2016); some have summarized previous western studies on workplace deviance (e.g., Wu, Li, & Huang, 2011; Yang & Chen, 2011). All, however, have failed to associate those studies with current issues in China. Gender discrimination in the workplace and employees’ deviant behaviours are like the dark side of the moon to which not much attention has been paid in China. Since China is characterized by its high levels of power inequality in society and organizations (Zhang & Spicer, 2013), it is crucial to draw attention to the issue of gender discrimination and injustice in the workplace.

This study aims at examining the relationships among Chinese hotel employees’ perceived gender discrimination, justice and deviant behaviours at work, and how their emotional attachment to the hotels their work for mediates this relationship. This study may be of interests to both the academia and the industry in that it gives prominence to the less frequently discussed issues of workplace gender discrimination and deviance, and it helps hotel managers maximize the prediction of employees’ workplace deviances in order to reduce the amount of resources and productivity lost.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Gender Discrimination in the Workplace

Gender discrimination (GD) in the workplace can be defined as unjust or prejudicial treatment in employment activities including hiring, pay, benefits, promotion opportunities and performance evaluation to the individuals of a certain gender group (Cascio, 1995). It is evident that employees often perceive GD by socially comparing themselves with the opposite gender group (Foley, Ngo, & Loi, 2006) on salary increase, promotion opportunities and task related monetary and non-monetary benefits (Foley, Hang-Yue, & Wong, 2005; Major, 1994). Therefore, perceived gender discrimination (PGD) comes from comparison.

GD in the workplace can be traced back to the mid 20th century. Early evidences can be found in the recruitment advertisements in the 1960s in which occupations with higher pay requested only male applicants while positions open for females were limited and offered less pay (Darity Jr & Mason, 2004). A wage gap between the genders also indicates discrimination against female employees: in the 1980s, women’s annual salaries were generally 30 to 40 percent lower than their male counterparts (Darity Jr & Mason, 2004). Recent studies show that workplace GD still exists around the world (Bobbitt-Zeher, 2011; Jurajda, 2003; Mitra, 2003; Nandy, Bhaskar, & Ghosh, 2014). For instance, females have a lesser chance to be promoted to managerial positions in the US (Mitra, 2003) and make 30 percent less salary than males in the same job positions in Czech Republic (Jurajda, 2003). In India, females only accounted for 20.5 percent of the entire job market, and very few if any of them reach managerial positions (Nandy, Bhaskar, & Ghosh, 2014).

Cooke (2001) stated that “China is a country of traditional values in which the ideology of male superiority still prevails in all aspects of life” (p. 347). The Chinese government has developed various policies and regulations to reduce GD in the workplace: the First Constitution of 1954 advocated equal rights and opportunities for women and men; the Law on Safeguarding the Rights and Interests of Women (1992) further supported equality between genders (Shaffer, Joplin, Bell, Lau, & Oguz, 2000); the 2005 White Paper on Gender
Equality documented rules and regulations to protect the rights and interests of women in the workplace (Wang, 2005). Nonetheless, workplace GD against women has still been pervasive in China. As evidenced by Yang and Li (2009)’s study, more than two thirds of the respondents believe the government did not sufficiently provide equal opportunity protection in the workplace to female employees. Additionally, nearly 40 per cent of recruitment advertisement in China contained gender discriminatory information that limited women’s employment choices to positions that are “feminine” (Woodhams, Lupton, & Xian, 2009).

The hospitality industry features significantly more female employees than male, and the female manpower is sometimes describes as the “essential prop” of the industry (Purcell, 1996). Empirical evidences have demonstrated that females undertake more prejudices and biases, and are the major victims of workplace GD (Gutek et al., 1996). In this regard, GD is a critical managerial challenge for hospitality businesses. Job segregation confines many women to front line positions (e.g. housekeepers, receptionists and restaurants server) that fit stereotypically feminine characteristics (Thrane, 2008) but do not lead to managerial positions (Campos-Soria, Marchante-Mera, & Ropero-García, 2011). In contrast, males tend to work in the key management departments (e.g. Accounting, HR and Sales & Marketing) (Mulvaney, O’neill, Cleveland, & Crouter, 2007) that have higher promotion opportunities (Campos-Soria, Marchante-Mera, & Ropero-García, 2011). Gender wage gap among hotel employees is prevalent around the globe. Female employees earn approximately 10 percent less in Spain (Muñoz-Bullón, 2009), 8.4 percent less in Portugal (Delfin & Varejao, 2007), 20 percent less in the US (Fleming, 2015) than male employees. Surprisingly, even in Norway with the higher gender equity and minimal gender gap standard (The Global Gender Gap Report (GGGP), 2013), female employees earn approximately 80 percent of the average salary of male employees in the hospitality sector (Thrane, 2008).

Nevertheless, workplace PGD does not only occur to women, men can feel discriminated against because of their gender as well. Gender stereotype pressures male employees to adhere to traditional masculine images and take responsibility for the work that is physically demanding (Moss-Racusin et al., 2010). For instance, male hotel employees may be asked
against their wills to help female employees lift heavy machines. In addition, males are not allowed to be family-oriented, or else will be considered as too feminine and not “man” enough (Berdahl, 2007). Consequently, male hotel employees are sometimes not permitted as many family leaves as their female counterparts, and male employees even have to work for extra hours when their female coworkers take family leave and take family responsibilities as mothers and wives (Rudman & Mescher, 2013).

Previous studies suggest that PGD is associated with many job-related variables. For instance, female employees who believe their gender hinders them from achieving higher positions or who hit their head against the “glass ceiling” are more likely to switch to other similar organizations for the purpose of seeking less discrimination, faster promotion and career advancement (Foley et al., 2006). Meanwhile, male employees who believe they are excluded from certain organizational groups (e.g., gender-segregated unions and clubs) would feel abandoned and not as important as female employees (Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Donaldson, 2001). Those distressed employees are less likely to be satisfied with their job positions (Kim, Lee, & Sung, 2013), and have a lower likelihood of engaging in organizational citizenship behaviours such as altruistically helping co-workers with no expectation of rewards (Ensher et al., 2001).

2.2 Organizational Justice

The origin of justice and fairness study can be traced back to Plato and Socrates who discussed the philosophical grounds of these two constructs (Ryan, 1993). However, the beginning of modern justice studies began in the 1960s. Adams (1965) mainly investigated a mono-dimensional aspect of organizational justice (i.e. distributive justice) but over the next two decades organizational justice (OJ) evolved into a multi-dimensional construct as organizational behavior researchers began to include and examine additional dimensions: procedural justice (Thibaut & Walker, 1975), and interactional justice (Bies & Moag, 1986). Since then, this three dimensional concept of organizational justice is generally acknowledged and frequently utilized by researchers. The three dimensions are explained below.
(i) Distributive justice (DJ) is commonly accepted as the fairness of the allocation of a set of outcomes (Clay-Warner, Hegtvedt, & Roman, 2005). On the one hand, employees may perceive higher DJ when they believe their work shift is fairly structured so no one has extra night or holiday shifts. On the other hand, when employees work more hours but receive the same salary as others, they may perceive lower DJ. Other examples of DJ may involve the fairness of hiring, dismissal and employees’ performance evaluation decisions (Hart, Thomson, & Huning, 2016).

(ii) Procedural justice (PJ) indicates the fairness of the procedure or process that leads to the final outcome (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Several key determinants of PJ are whether or not the process is accurate, consistent, unbiased, correctable and transparent (Colquitt et al., 2001). For instance, when an employee is transferred to another department without reasonably acceptable explanation or notification, he or she may perceive lower PJ.

(iii) Interactional justice (IJ) refers to the fairness of one’s received interpersonal treatment from colleagues and supervisors, as well as the information related to any organizational decisions (Bies & Moag, 1986). It is usually measured by the sincerity, respect and politeness of the interpersonal communication and the honesty and punctuality of the information exchange (Tyler & Bies, 1990). Therefore, IJ is sometimes identified as having two sub-dimensions: interpersonal justice and informational justice (Greenberg & Cropanzano, 1993).

Employees’ perceived OJ indirectly influences organizational outcomes because it influences their work-related attitudes and behaviours (Colquitt et al., 2001). The three dimensions of OJ affect organizational outcomes differently. According to the DJ-dominant model, DJ is significantly stronger in determining the general level of perceived fairness and justice as well as in influencing outcome-related variables than the other two dimensions (e.g., Hemdi & Nasurdin, 2007; Leventhal, 1980). DJ has significantly positive relationship with organizational citizenship behaviours and job satisfaction (Hemdi & Nasurdin, 2007; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010). For example, when employees believe their pay and performance evaluation outcomes are fair, they tend to perceive the job and organization as “good” and feel satisfied at work. These employees are therefore likely to go beyond the basic job
requirements and voluntarily do extra work that help benefits the organization (Najiani, Arjmandnia, Afroz, & Rajabi, 2012). PJ is closely related to organizational commitment. When an organization regularly holds meetings to help employees comprehend its decision-making process and clarify misunderstandings, employees are likely to feel like indispensable members of the organization, thus strengthening their psychological commitment to the organization (López-Cabarcos, Machado-Lopes-Sampaio-de, & Vázquez-Rodríguez, 2014). IJ, however, is not strongly related to typical work-related variables such as job satisfaction (Masterson & Taylor, 1996) and organizational commitment (López-Cabarcos et al., 2014). Unlike DJ and PJ, IJ is a human related variable which is more influenced by employees’ personal traits and is therefore less within the control of managers (Bies & Moag, 1986). Therefore, this study will adopt only DJ and PJ as the two dimensions of OJ because a practical objective of the current research is to help hotel managers minimize employees’ counterproductive behaviours through enhancing their justice perception.

2.3 Workplace Deviance

Previously used evaluation criteria of employees’ effectiveness in the workplace only included their on-the-job performance, and recently the criteria range expanded and included a new standard -- organizational deviance, or workplace deviant behaviour (WDB) (O’Neill & Hastings, 2011; Vardi & Wiener, 1996). WDB is a series of destructive or counterproductive behaviours toward people or an entire organization (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Typical WDB include employee absenteeism (Goodman & Atkin, 1984), withholding efforts (Kidwell & Bennett, 1993) and workplace stealing (Henry & Mars, 1978). Workplace deviance adversely affects an organization’s overall economic development and the interests of its members (Detert et al., 2007; Dunlop & Lee, 2004). Workplace deviance was originally studied as various behaviours rather than as an individual concept (e.g., Gupta & Jenkins, 1980; Goodman & Atkin, 1984), and later on workplace deviance has been studied as a specific organizational phenomenon by itself (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

WDB is categorized based on the character of different behaviours. WDB is firstly
divided into organizational deviance (OD) and interpersonal deviance (ID) depending on whether the behaviour targets the organizational as a whole or certain employees within the organization (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). However, the correlation between OD and ID was significantly high, which means that the distinction between the two dimensions may not be meaningful (Dalal, 2005). Another way of categorizing WDB includes three dimensions: production deviance, property deviance, and personal aggression (Stewart, Bing, Davison, Woehr, & McIntyre, 2009). Personal aggression is similar to interpersonal deviance (Bennett & Robinson, 2000), while production deviance (harmful to the overall productivity of the organization) and property deviance (harmful to the tangible assets of the organization) represent two more detailed subdivisions of organizational deviance. The two-factor categorization of Bennett and Robinson (2000) is supported by The Big Five. The Big Five stands for the psychological theory which uses five dimensions to explain people’s personalities (Norman, 1963). The Big Five is generally used to examine the relationship between people’s personality and their job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Currently the most commonly used five dimensions are agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, extraversion and openness to experience (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007). The two dimensions suggested by Bennett and Robinson (2000) relate differently to the Big Five variables even though they were confirmed to be highly correlated (Berry et al., 2007). For instance, extraversion is positively related to ID, but negatively related to OD. Moreover, the negative relationship between conscientiousness and OD is significantly stronger than the one between conscientiousness and ID. Therefore, the two-factor organizational and interpersonal deviance categorization by Bennett and Robinson (2000) is supported. This study only measure OD instead of both dimensions of workplace deviance because ID is strongly related to employees’ personal reasons such as personality, values and ethics, as well as mental states (Chen & Zhang, 2009). For instance, if a hotel employee has naturally unfriendly personality and has a confrontation with his colleagues, he is likely to translate his anger into interpersonal deviant behaviours toward those colleagues, regardless of his workplace perceptions and experiences.

Many variables besides the Big Five can be used to predict whether employees develop
appropriate or deviant workplace behaviours. For instance, employees who can recognize different emotions and use the emotions to guide their behaviours tend to better respect and follow the ethical rules of an organization and therefore are less likely to conduct deviant behaviours (Alias, Mohd Rasdi, Ismail, & Abu Samah, 2013; Van Rooy & Viswesvaran, 2004). Other factors such as heavy workload, unsatisfying financial reward, poor relationship with colleagues and low supervisor support are triggers that could lead to workplace deviance. (Biron, 2010; Fagbohungbe et al., 2012; Ferris, Brown, & Heller, 2009).

Employees’ perceptions toward the organization and their working experiences are also associated with their workplace behaviours (Colquitt et al., 2001). When employees face discrimination, whether because of their gender, ethnicity or race, they tend to engage in counterproductive behaviours against the organization they work for as a form of protest (Wright et al., 1990). Female employees who are sexual harassed by male co-workers might experience lower self-esteem. These female employees might therefore emotionally withdraw from their organization thus putting little effort into their work. When a hotel prohibits male employees’ paternity leaves and family leaves because it believes only females should spend more time with their families, the male employees may abuse sick leave and causes shortage of manpower to the organization.

Organizational injustice perception is another main cause of counterproductive behaviours, and the source of their injustice perception will generally be the victim, or target, of their revenge (Ambrose et al., 2002). When employees perceive lower distributive justice, meaning when they believe the outcome they receive is not fair, they may feel unsatisfied and resentful (Adams, 1965). These disagreeable emotions may drive the employees to change their behaviours and attitudes in order to restore equity (Greenberg, 1990). For instance, when hotel employees think they are underpaid, they may intentionally be less productive or deliver lower quality service. Employees may also conduct behaviours that directly harm the interests of the organization where they work such as stealing and revealing confidential information, which is similar to the punishment upon the party that causes their perceptions of injustice (Greenberg, 1990). Previous studies have found that the process that leads to the
final outcome is as important for employees as the actual outcome (Demir, 2011; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999). Therefore procedural justice is likely to have an influence on workplace deviance as well. When hotel employees believe the decision-maker, in most cases the hotel manager, does not make fair decisions, they may feel disrespected and undervalued, and are more likely to violate the norms and regulations of the hotel as means of retaliation (Nasurdin, Ahmad, & Razalli, 2014).

Based on these findings from previous literature, the following two hypotheses are proposed:

**H 1: Perceived gender discrimination is positively related to organizational deviance.**

**H 2a: Distributive justice is negatively related to organizational deviance.**

**H 2b: Procedural justice is negatively related to organizational deviance.**

### 2.4 Organizational Attachment

The original attachment theory comes from psychology and describes the relationship between infants and their mothers (Bowlby, 1973). This enduring and profound emotional tie generated in the early years of one’s life tends to develop in patterns, and the attachment pattern, or style, of an individual is generally stable and is not easily influenced by external factors (Bowlby, 1973). This style will then influence many aspects of people’s later lives including their cognitive, affective and behavioural response patterns (Collins, Guichard, Ford, & Feeney, 2004), as well as their perspectives of the distance between people, such as feeling comfortable with closeness, or preferring to be left alone (Mikulincer, Shaver, & Pereg, 2003).

There are four dominant attachment styles: securely attached individuals feel comfortable to depend or rely on others; insecurely attached individuals fear being abandoned or having people getting too close; avoidant attached individuals have difficulty trusting or being intimate with others and usually suppress emotions; anxiously/ambivalently attached individuals want to be close to others but fear the desire would frighten others away (Collins & Read, 1990). Studies that combined these adult attachment styles with employees’ workplace behaviours found that workers who are more securely attached to the organization
have higher levels of job satisfaction, and are more convinced that other co-workers will give them positive evaluations (Hazan & Shaver, 1990; Krausz, Bizman, & Braslavsky, 2001). Employees who have anxious attachment style will take themselves as being under-evaluated by colleagues, while employees with avoidant attachment style tend to under-evaluate themselves in respect of work performance. Employees with insecure attachment style tend to have lower organizational commitment, thus resulting in lower levels of pro-social behaviours such as voluntarily doing extra work (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). On the other hand, securely attached employees are found to have higher levels of affective and normative organizational commitment which represents employees’ identification with and loyalty to the organization (Scrima, Rioux, & Lorito, 2014).

Organizational attachment has been viewed with multi dimensions rather than as one single dimension (e.g., Ashforth & Johnson, 2001; Riketta & Van Dick, 2005). Gonzalez and Denisi (2009) claimed that affective commitment, organizational identification and turnover intentions characterize organizational attachment. Affective commitment represents the level of employees’ acceptance of the organization’s goal and value and their willingness to contribute to the well being of the organization (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Meyer & Allen, 1991), which is similar to securely attached employees who perceive more positive attitudes toward the organization and believe working hard will benefit both the organization and themselves (Schmidt, 2016). Organizational identification indicates that employees share values and goals with the organization and they identify themselves as members of the organization(Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Pratt, 1998). It is the psychological bond developed when employees adopt the characteristics of the organization to describe themselves (Brown, 1969), which mirrors the emotional tie of the original attachment theory. Turnover intention represents employees’ assessment of whether to leave the organization or stay (Venkataramani et al., 2013), which resembles employees with avoidant attachment styles who tend to disengage themselves from work and avoid building long-term relationships with colleagues (Richards & Schat, 2011). The above three indicators of organizational attachment interact with each other and share emotional commonalities (Venkataramani et al., 2013). For instance, when employees are affectively committed to the organization, they tend to strongly
embrace the organization’s value, and are more likely to remain in their positions, thus they have higher organizational identification and lower turnover intention (Mowday et al., 1982).

A few studies have tried to investigate the relationship between adult attachment style and workplace attachment following two main measuring streams (e.g., Harms, 2011; Richards & Schat, 2011). One study adopts the prevalent 2-factor secure and insecure model (Neustadt, Chamorro-Premuzic, & Furnham, 2006) and another study uses a new three-factor scale that includes secure, avoidant, preoccupied attachment styles (Scrima et al., 2014). However, there is no validated scale to measure organizational attachment per se (Scrima, Di Stefano, Guarnaccia, & Lorito, 2015). The current study adopts this multi-dimensional approach and includes the three dimensions of organizational attachment—affective commitment, organizational identification and turnover intentions (Gonzalez & Denisi, 2009).

Organizational attachment may play an important mediating role between hotel employees’ perceptions and deviant behaviours at work. Hotel employees’ perception on workplace gender discrimination is associated with the three dimensions of organizational attachment. For instance, female employees who hit their head against the “glass ceiling” or believe their gender limits their promotion opportunities tend to look for external job opportunities in order to seek faster promotion and career advancement (Foley et al., 2006), and these employees have higher turnover intentions. Male employees who feel isolated in the female-dominant organization will feel abandoned, not as important as female counterparts, and less likely to identify themselves as a crucial part of the organization (Ensher et al., 2001). Thus they might end up with weaker organizational identification. Female employees who perceive the work environment as “women-unfriendly” tend to feel inferior because of their gender and have lower self-esteem, thus these employees are less likely to choose the same career if given the choice (Gutek et al., 1996). These distressed employees are less likely to “go the extra mile” for the organization (Sia, Sahoo, & Duari, 2015), which indicates lower affective commitment.
Meanwhile, hotel employees’ perception on organizational justice and injustice is also strongly related to the three dimensions of organizational attachment. A broad range of studies suggested that employees with higher level of distributive and procedural justice perception are more affectively committed to the organization they work for because they feel they are respected and cherished (e.g.: Bakhshi, Kumar, & Rani, 2009; Loi, Hang-Yue, & Foley, 2006). For example, hotel employees who believe their work schedule and pay structure are fair and well-explained are likely to feel more valued and more satisfied with their jobs and the organization than those who believe their work schedule and pay structure are unfair. This positive attitude towards the organization makes employees want to contribute more by working harder; therefore they tend to be more affectively committed to the organization (López-Cabarcos et al., 2014). In contrast, employees who do not receive benefits for doing extra work or whose supervisors make decisions that involve them without asking for their opinions might have higher intentions to look for jobs in organizations they believe will treat them more fairly and where their opinions will count in the business decision process (Hemdi & Nasurdin, 2007). Empirical evidence proves that high justice perception strengthens an employee’s emotional recognition with the organization and leads to strong identification as crucial members of the organization (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006). Therefore, employees who are encourages to ask for more information about, or even challenge, supervisors’ decisions would probably develop higher organizational identification.

Based on the above findings, the following hypotheses are proposed:

**H 3a:** Perceived gender discrimination is negatively related to affective commitment.

**H 3b:** Perceived gender discrimination is negatively related to organizational identification.

**H 3c:** Perceived gender discrimination is positively related to turnover intention.

**H 4a:** Distributive justice is positively related to affective commitment.

**H 4b:** Distributive justice is positively related to organizational identification.

**H 4c:** Distributive justice is negatively related to turnover intention.

**H 4d:** Procedural justice is positively related to affective commitment.
**H 4e:** Procedural justice is positively related to organizational identification.

**H 4f:** Procedural justice is negatively related to turnover intention.

Influenced by hotel employees’ perception of workplace gender discrimination and justice, the three dimensions of organizational attachment are associated with workplace deviant behaviours. Affective commitment, for example, is negatively related to deviant workplace behaviours. Employees with higher affective commitment to an organization would be strongly determined to contribute to the success of the organization. Thus, they are unlikely to threaten the overall wellbeing of the organization (Gill, Meyer, Lee, Shin, & Yoon, 2011). Hotel employees who are passionate about working in the hospitality industry and proud of working in certain hotels are less prone to reduce productivity or steal from hotel rooms. Organizational identification can also influence workplace deviant behaviours negatively (Fagbohungbe et al., 2012). When employees’ personal values are similar to that of the organization they work for and when they identify themselves as members of the organization, they develop higher and stronger organizational identification (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Pratt, 1998). However, when employees have vague and inconsistent organizational identification, they do not feel like part of the organization, and are more likely to violate the rules and norms of the organization (Fagbohungbe et al., 2012). Lastly, employees who are intentionally looking for a new job outside of their current organization might develop various deviant behaviours. For example, they might reveal confidential company information to unauthorized people, thinking any loss (i.e., financial loss) for the company will no long be their concern (Cohen, Panter, & Turan, 2013). Employees understand that when they violate the rules and regulations of the hotel, they may receive disciplinary reprimands such as demotion, reduction of salary, or dismissal (Tepper et al., 2009). Nevertheless, when hotel employees have already decided or planned to leave, they no longer rely on the hotel for monetary compensation or resources, therefore any losses of the hotel as a result of their deviant behaviours would not bother them (Christian & Ellis, 2014).

Based on these findings from previous literature, the following three hypotheses are proposed:
\(H \, 5a: \) Affective commitment is negatively related to organizational deviance.

\(H \, 5b: \) Organizational identification is negatively related to organizational deviance.

\(H \, 5c: \) Turnover intention is positively related to organizational deviance.

Based on the above hypotheses, figure 1 is generated as the hypothesized model of this research:

\[\text{Figure 1. Proposed Testing Model}\]
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Sample and Procedure

The participants consist of full-time employees with at least a year of working experience at four and five-star non-state-owned hotels located in first and second-tier cities in China (e.g., Beijing, Shanghai, and Guangzhou). Hotel rating is decided by the CNTA (China National Tourism Administration) based on the hotel’s level of infrastructure, guest facilities, services, management and security (Cui, 2014). Four and five-star hotels are deemed to be “luxury” and “first-class” that provide a wide range of facilities and high-standard services that meet guests’ needs (Cui, 2014). Furthermore, four and five-star hotels pay more attention to service quality and employee behaviours than three-star hotels and lower (Qiu, 2011). Therefore, suggestions to reduce employees’ deviant behaviours may be more useful for managers of four and five-star hotels than for managers of lower star rating hotels.

State-owned hotels are different from non-state-owned hotels in that they generally have higher level of corruption, and employees at state-owned hotels are sometimes hired based on social network and influential relationships rather through formal interviews (Liu, 2015). By focusing on employees of non-state-owned hotels, this study reduces the potential influences of employers’ unethical practices on employees’ perceptions and behaviours (Pelletier, & Bligh, 2008). Full-time employees generally have higher consistency in terms of work content and quality than part-time employees (Giannikis & Mihail, 2011). Having at least a year of working experience at the current hotel makes sure employees are familiar with the working environment enough to give honest opinions on workplace gender discrimination and justice. Consequently, this study only includes full-time employees with at least one year of working experience at the current hotel.

Convenience sampling and snowball sampling were combined to collect data. The researcher first created the questionnaire and generated a link on SoJump (https://www.sojump.com/), an online survey platform based in China. Participants had options to respond the survey from computer, smart phone or tablet. The data collection process contained two steps. In the first step, the friends, families and colleagues of the
researcher who have access to the study population helped distribute the link of the questionnaire, and the participants were asked to help distribute the link to their colleagues who are also within the study population. From the first method, 289 surveys were collected. SoJump was also hired to recruit more participants. SoJump has over 2.6 million panel members in China that cover a broad range of occupations, provinces and demographics. The selecting criteria of participants were provided to SoJump, and the survey link was then distributed to qualified panel members. From the panel data, 231 surveys were collected. The researcher went through the returned surveys and eliminated those whose IP address are not located in first and second-tier cities, those who are not full-time employees, and those who do not have at least a full year of working experience at the current hotel. After eliminating incomplete and invalid answers there are 375 usable surveys, including 185 before using the panel data and 190 from the panel data.

3.2 Measurements

All measures are adapted from previous studies. The questionnaire was firstly translated into Chinese by the researcher, and then back translation was used to make sure the Chinese version of the survey is consistent with the original English version. A pilot test was conducted among a small group of Chinese-speaking Tourism and Hospitality-majored graduate students in order to eliminate errors and ambiguity. Minor emendations were made according to their suggestions. All questions use a 7-point Likert scale that measures participants’ agreeableness except for workplace deviant behaviors, which is measured using a 5-point Likert frequency scale. An additional option N/A was added to each question in case any questions are not applicable for some participants.

Perceived gender discrimination is measured using four items adapted from the study of Sanchez and Brock (1996). The scale was originally developed to measure Hispanic employees’ perceived ethnic discrimination in the workplace and contains 10 items. Many scholars in the field of workplace gender discrimination adopted this scale and selected certain items in their own studies (e.g., Foley et al., 2005; Foley et al., 2006; Herrbach & Mignonac, 2012). This study follows the 4-item method of Foley et al., (2005) because the
items were the best fit the research context. An example item is “My gender has a negative influence on my career advancement”.

Organizational justice is measured by the scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993), with five items measuring distributive justice and six items measuring procedural justice. This scale was selected because it is widely used in the studies of the hospitality industry (e.g., Karatepe & Shahriari, 2014; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010; Simons & Roberson, 2003). An example item for distributive justice is “My work schedule is fair”. An example item for procedural justice is “My manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees”.

Organizational attachment is measured by its three sub-dimensions respectively. Affective commitment is measured using five items developed by Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993). The original scale has 12 items, including six items measuring affective commitment to the occupation, and six items measuring affective commitment to the organization. This study adopts five items including two items measuring affective commitment to the occupation, and three items measuring affective commitment to the organization. The five items have high parameter estimates in the original scale, and fit in the context of this current study. An example item for affective commitment is “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this hotel”. Organizational identification is measured using six items adapted from the studies of Boivie, Lange, McDonald, and Westphal (2011), Mael and Ashforth (1992), and Smidts, Pruyn, and Van Riel (2001). An example item for organizational identification is “This hotel’s successes are my successes”. Turnover intention is measured using three items developed by DeConinck and Stilwell, (2004). An example item for turnover intention is “Within the next year, I intend to leave this hotel”.

Workplace deviant behaviour is measured by the self-reported scale developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000), with five items measuring organizational deviance that are selected out of the 12 items. This scale measures participants’ frequency of conducting each behaviours. The original scale anchors are specific (1= Never; 2= Once a year; 3= Twice a
year etc.) This study uses less specific options that fit more into the current study context ranging from 1=Never to 5=Always. An example item for organizational deviance is “Intentionally work slower than I could have worked”.
CHAPTER 4: RESULT

4.1 Profile of Respondents

Table 1 shows the profile of the respondents (n= 375). Over 60% of the respondents were female, which is consistent with the female-dominant characteristic of the hotel industry (Baum, 2013). In terms of age, nearly all respondents (91.5%) were between 22 and 40 years old, with the youngest being 17 and the oldest being 54 years old. Most of the respondents (87.0%) had two-year college degree or higher, which demonstrates high education level. All but one respondent were full-time employees, including 22.7% front line employees, 44.3% at the supervisory level, 30.7% middle managers and 2.4% top executive managers. Regarding departments, most of the respondents (29.3%) worked in the housekeeping department, followed by food and beverage (13.9%) and front office (13.6%). In respect to job tenure, 31.7% of the respondents had been working in the current hotel for only one to two years, 32.3% for three to four years, 21.1% for five to six years and 14.7% for over seven years. As for working experience in the hotel industry, 32.3% of the respondents had not worked in any hotels before, 40.5% had worked in one other hotel, 23.7% in two to three hotels, and 2.7% had worked in four or more hotels before. Finally, most of the respondents (55.2%) had only been working in the hotel industry for five years or less, 28.8% for six to nine years, and 15.8% for ten years or more. Statistics demonstrate that the majority of the respondents had relatively short experience at the current hotels and in the hotel industry in general.
Table 1 Profile of respondents (n=375)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>High School or lower</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>2 yr. college</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yr. college</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Graduate school</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or older</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front line</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>&gt;=4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>Years with the current hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front office</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>21 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Years with the hotel industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; marketing</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Measurement Model

AMOS 22 with maximum likelihood estimation method was adopted to test the hypotheses. Two steps were taken based on modeling instructions (Kline, 1998). First, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to test if the data makes each hypothesized observed variable a good indicator of each unobserved variable, and if the data fits the hypothesized model (Al-Refaie, 2015). CFA also assesses the model fit of the 7-factor measurement model (i.e., perceived gender discrimination, distributive justice, procedural
justice, affective commitment, organizational identification, turnover intention, and organizational deviance) (Byrne, 2001). Four fit indices were adopted to decide the fitness of the measurement model. The ratio of Chi-square to degrees of freedom (DF) is recommended to be below 2-to-1 ratio (Carmines & McIver, 1981); the normed fit index (NFI) indicates acceptable fit when over .90 (Bentler & Bonett, 1980); the comparative fit index (CFI) represents acceptable model fit when over .90 (Hu & Bentler, 1999); the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) demonstrates good model fit when it is less than .05 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). All fit indices of the measurement model demonstrate acceptable model fit (Chi-square= 792.34, DF= 468, p<.01, NFI= .91, CFI= .96, RMSEA= .043). The standardized regression weights of all items range from .67 to .91, with the majority being above .75, meaning that each item is a good indicator of its connected construct (Bentler, 1992). Table 2 shows the result of the CFA analysis of the measurement model.

Table 3 shows the correlations, means, standard deviations, average variance extracted (AVE) and composite reliability for the variables used in this study. One of the organizational identification item (I experience a strong sense of belonging to the hotel I work at) was removed because of high cross-loading with AC. AVE was used to test the convergent validity of the model. The AVE values ranged from .59 to .78, which is above the suggested .50 threshold, indicating good convergent validity (Raines-Eudy, 2000). AVE should be greater than the corresponding squared inter-construct correlations in order to show acceptable discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Results showed that the scale demonstrates good discriminant validity, and seven individual constructs used in the study are distinct from each other. Composite reliability is often used to assess the reliability of structural models during SEM instead of the coefficient alpha (Cronbach’s alpha) (Peterson & Kim, 2013). The composite reliability of all constructs were above the .70 threshold, indicating good reliability (Raines-Eudy, 2000).
Table 2 Confirmatory factor analysis of the measurement model (n=375)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Gender Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel that my gender is a limitation at work.</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My gender has a negative influence on my career advancement.</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many people at work have sex stereotypes and treat me as if they were true.</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that others exclude me from their activities at work because of my gender.</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distributive Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work schedule is fair.</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that my level of pay is fair.</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider my work load to be quite fair.</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my job responsibilities are fair.</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair.</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job decisions are made by the manager in an unbiased manner.</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make job decisions, my manager collects accurate and complete information.</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees.</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All job decisions are applied consistently across all affected employees.</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues and I are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by the manager.</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t regret choose to work at this hotel.</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to be working in this hotel.</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this hotel.</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel as if this hotel's problems are my own.</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like &quot;part of the family&quot; at this hotel where I work.</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone criticizes the hotel I work at, it feels like a personal insult, even if I do not know the person.</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very interested in what people think about the hotel I work at.</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone makes positive remarks about the hotel I work at, it feels like a personal compliment.</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This hotel’s successes are my successes.</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a member of the hotel I work at is a major part of who I am.</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover Intention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the next year, I intend to search for another job.</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the next year, I intend to leave this hotel.</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the next year, I’m thinking about working in another hotel or industry.</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Deviance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take property from work without permission.</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take an additional or longer break than is acceptable at this hotel.</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect to follow my boss’ instructions.</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionally work slower than I could have worked.</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss confidential information of this hotel with an unauthorized person.</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Model fit: Chi-square= 792.34, DF= 468, p<.01, NFI= .91, CFI= .96, RMSEA= .043. **p < .01

AVE = average variance extracted.

Table 3 Correlations, mean, standard deviation, AVE and composite reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PGD</th>
<th>DJ</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>OI</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>OD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PGD</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DJ</strong></td>
<td>-.24**(.06)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PJ</strong></td>
<td>-.15**(.02)</td>
<td>.66**(.44)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AC</strong></td>
<td>-.26**(.07)</td>
<td>.69**(.48)</td>
<td>.72**(.52)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OI</strong></td>
<td>-.20**(.04)</td>
<td>.54**(.30)</td>
<td>.56**(.31)</td>
<td>.77**(.59)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td>.40**(.16)</td>
<td>-.24**(.06)</td>
<td>-.20**(.04)</td>
<td>-.37**(.14)</td>
<td>-.34**(.12)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OD</strong></td>
<td>.36**(.13)</td>
<td>-.11*(.01)</td>
<td>-.11*(.01)</td>
<td>-.19**(.04)</td>
<td>-.21**(.04)</td>
<td>.41**(.17)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.D.</strong></td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVE</strong></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** PGD= Perceived Gender Discrimination, DJ= Distributive Justice, PJ= Procedural Justice, AC= Affective Commitment, OI= Organizational Identification, TI= Turnover Intention, OD= Organizational Deviance, AVE = average variance extracted. Squared correlations are in parentheses. All variables except for OD are measured on a scale of 1 to 7. OD is measured on a scale of 1 to 5.

**4.3 Structural Model**

The structural equation modeling (SEM) was tested next to evaluate the relationships among the unobserved variables (Byrne, 2001). The same fit indices were adopted as in CFA to determine model fit of the structural model. All fit indices indicated acceptable model fit (Chi-square= 789.17, DF= 462, p<.01, NFI= .91, CFI= .96, RMSEA= .044) (Anderson &
Gerbing, 1988).

Figure 2 shows the confirmed structural model with standardized path coefficient. Nine out of the 15 proposed hypotheses are supported by significant path coefficients. Results are shown in Table 4. Perceived gender discrimination significantly influences organizational deviance ($\beta=.30, t=4.21, p<.01$), supporting Hypothesis 1. However, Hypothesis 2a and 2b are not supported because distributive justice and procedural justice are not significantly related to organizational deviance. Hypothesis 3a, 3b and 3c are supported because perceived gender discrimination has a significant relationship with affective commitment ($\beta=-.12, t=-2.93, p<.05$), organizational identification ($\beta=-.10, t=-1.97, p<.05$) and turnover intention ($\beta=.40, t=6.91, p<.01$). Hypothesis 4a, 4b, 4d and 4e are supported because distributive justice significantly impacts affective commitment ($\beta=.38, t=5.94, p<.01$) and organizational identification ($\beta=.31, t=4.20, p<.01$), and procedural justice significantly impacts affective commitment ($\beta=.52, t=8.12, p<.01$) and organizational identification ($\beta=.40, t=5.55, p<.01$).

Hypothesis 4c and 4f are not supported because distributive justice and procedural justice do not significantly influence turnover intention. Hypothesis 5a and 5b are not supported because there is no statistically significant path from affective commitment and organizational identification to...
organizational deviance. Hypothesis 5c is supported because turnover intention has significantly positive relationship with organizational deviance ($\beta=.28, t=4.21, p<.01$).

Table 4 Results for the structural model (n=375)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>PGD $\rightarrow$ OD</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>4.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>DJ $\rightarrow$ OD</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>PJ $\rightarrow$ OD</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>PGD $\rightarrow$ AC</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-2.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>PGD $\rightarrow$ OI</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-1.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3c</td>
<td>PGD $\rightarrow$ TI</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>6.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a</td>
<td>DJ $\rightarrow$ AC</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>5.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b</td>
<td>DJ $\rightarrow$ OI</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>4.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4c</td>
<td>DJ $\rightarrow$ TI</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4d</td>
<td>PJ $\rightarrow$ AC</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>8.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4e</td>
<td>PJ $\rightarrow$ OI</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>5.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4f</td>
<td>PJ $\rightarrow$ TI</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a</td>
<td>AC $\rightarrow$ OD</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b</td>
<td>OI $\rightarrow$ OD</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5c</td>
<td>TI $\rightarrow$ OD</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>4.21**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PGD= Perceived Gender Discrimination, DJ= Distributive Justice, PJ= Procedural Justice, AC= Affective Commitment, OI= Organizational Identification, TI= Turnover Intention, OD= Organizational Deviance; **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$

4.4 Mediation Effects of Organizational Attachment

Bootstrap estimation approach with 2000 samples and BC confidence level at 90 in AMOS22 was used to test the mediating effect of organizational attachment. Since only perceived gender discrimination is significantly related to organizational deviance, and neither distributive justice nor procedural justice is significantly related to organizational deviance, this study only tests the mediating effect of the three dimensions of organizational attachment individually on the relationship between perceived gender discrimination and organizational deviance. As demonstrated in table 5, perceived gender discrimination does not have a significant indirect relationship with organizational deviance through affective commitment, meaning affective commitment does not mediate the relationship between perceived gender discrimination and organizational deviance. Meanwhile, perceived gender
discrimination has a significant direct effect on organizational deviance, and has a significant indirect effect on organizational deviance through organizational identification and turnover intention. The results indicate both organizational identification and turnover intention partially mediate the effect of perceived gender discrimination on organizational deviance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGD→AC→OD</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>No Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGD→OI→OD</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>Partial Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGD→TI→OD</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>Partial Mediation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** **p < .01, *p < .05**
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

This study sought to test a perception-behaviour model within China’s hotel industry. More specifically, the study investigates the relationship between perceived workplace gender discrimination and justice/injustice and workplace deviant behaviours, as well as the potential mediation effect of organizational attachment between these variables among Chinese hotel employees.

Perceived gender discrimination (PGD) significantly influences the three dimensions of organizational attachment (OA). The results are consistent with the conclusions of many previous studies (e.g., Ensher et al., 2001; Foley et al., 2006) which found negative relationships between PGD, AC and OI, and a positive relationship between PGD and TI. The negative relationship between PGD and affective commitment (AC) implies that when hotel employees believe they experience gender discrimination, they may be less likely to commit to their organizations and less willing to contribute to the wellbeing of the hotel. PGD is negatively related to organizational identification (OI), indicating that when hotel employees perceive the glass ceiling of their gender specific obstacles in their career progression, they do not identify themselves as part of the hotel, and they do not relate to the values and goals of the hotel. PGD is found to be positively related to turnover intention (TI), which means female employees who hit the “glass ceiling” and male employees whose capability is restrained in a female-dominant department are likely to quit their job and continue their career in other hotels or industries. PGD is also positively related with organizational deviance (OD). This result shows that when hotel employees are placed in a position only because it stereotypically fits the “masculine” or “feminine” characteristics, they are more likely to intentionally procrastinate during working hours as a form of protest (Wright et al., 1990).

Both distributive justice (DJ) and procedural justice (PJ) are positively related to AC. The study result implies that if hotel employees perceive the compensations they receive and the decisions made by managers in the hotel are relatively fair, they are more likely to affectively commit to the hotel (Meyer & Allen, 1991). This result is congruent with previous
studies (e.g., Wu & Wang, 2008) that proposed a positive relationship between justice perception and organizational commitment. Both DJ and PJ have a positive relationship with OI, which is in line with previous findings (e.g., Soenen & Melkonian, 2016) that found organizational justice positively influence organizational identification. The results suggest that hotel employees who perceive that the hotel provides them with fair treatment may be more likely to identify themselves as crucial members of the hotel, and take the accomplishments of the hotel as their own. Path coefficients show that PJ has a stronger relationship with AC and OI than DJ does (see Figure 2), suggesting that hotel employees’ perceived fairness of the hotel procedures has more influence on their emotional attachment with the hotel than their perceived fairness of salary and work schedule.

Nevertheless, neither DJ nor PJ significantly impacts TI. The results are opposed to previous studies which proposed a negative relationship between organizational justice perception and TI (Colquitt et al., 2001; Hemdi & Nasurdin, 2007). One explanation of the insignificant path is that the majority of participants in this study are in supervisory and middle management positions (see Table 1), and supervisory and managerial level employees generally have lower TI than entry-level employees (Carbery, Garavan, O’Brien, & McDonnell, 2003). As opposed to entry-level employees, employees at higher levels are more dedicated to their jobs and do not usually take their current jobs as a stepping stone for another career (Lu, Lu, Gursoy, & Neale, 2016).

No significant path is found from DJ, PJ, AC and OI to OD. The results are not consistent with previous findings which proposed a negative relationship between the two dimensions of organizational justice and OD, between AC and OD, and between OI and OD (Fagbohungbe et al., 2012; Gill et al., 2011; Nasurdin et al., 2014). This result can be justified by participants’ short tenure. Over 80 percent of participants in this study have been working in the current hotel for six years or less, suggesting short tenures (see Table 1). Longer tenure is associated with more deviant behaviours because when employees have been working in the same organizational for a long time they feel like “a fixture” of the organization and perceive more power and freedom to not follow the rules and regulations of the organization.
(Lovett & Cole, 2003; Ng & Feldman, 2010). Meanwhile, participants with short tenure might did not have enough time to build strong AC and OI. As employees’ tenure increases, they develop a stronger emotion attachment with the organization, and therefore have stronger AC and OI (Ng, & Feldman, 2011). Having short tenure may have significantly influenced the effects from DJ, PJ, AC and OI to OD.

TI is positively related to OD, which confirms results of previous studies (Christian & Ellis, 2014; Cohen et al., 2013) that suggest employees’ TI may lead to counterproductive behaviours. The result implies that when hotel employees have the intention to quit their job within a short period, they are more likely to conduct deviant behaviours toward the hotel such as procrastinating at work and exposing confidential information to irrelevant outsiders.

Both OI and TI partially mediate the relationship between PGD and OD, and AC does not have mediating effect. The results suggest that when hotel employees perceive gender discrimination at work, if they strongly identify themselves as crucial parts of the hotel, they are less likely to conduct deviant behaviours, whereas when they intend to find another job outside of the current hotel, they are more likely to conduct deviant behaviours toward the hotel. Meanwhile, employees’ willingness to contribute to the wellbeing of the hotel does not influence their likelihood of conducting deviant behaviours.

This study has theoretical implications for future hotel human resource management research. First, this study contributes to the study of the relationship between employees’ perceptions and deviant behaviours in a Chinese hotel setting. Previous Chinese studies in related topics have either studied the relationships between employees’ perceptions and other job-related variables, or reported the results of western studies of workplace deviant behaviours (Ding, 2013; Li & Lu, 2013; Wu, Li, & Huang, 2011; Yang & Chen, 2011). However, the connection between perceptions and behaviours has been largely ignored. Therefore, this study expands existing research by adding PGD, OJ as well as OA as potential antecedents of WDB in Chinese hotels.
Second, this study adopts the three-dimensional OA construct (Gonzalez & Denisi, 2009) and investigates how the three dimensions individually relate to PGD, DJ, PJ and OD, as well as the mediating effect of the three dimensions on the impact of PGD on OD. OA remains controversial in its definition and measurement (Scrima et al. 2015), and there lacks study to examine how the three-dimension OA construct impacts other workplace-related variables (Gonzalez & Denisi, 2009). OA is different from the more frequently studied variable AC in that OA involves both psychological and behavioural aspects (Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly III, 1992). Therefore, adopting the multidimensional construct allows researchers to view OA in a holistic way (Edwards, 2001). However, TI has no significant relationship with DJ and PJ, and neither AC nor OI significantly impacts OD. Perhaps the three-dimensional construct deserves a closer look to see if the three dimensions AC, OI and TI comprehensively explain OA. This study encourages future researchers to incorporate this multidimensional construct of OA and maybe generate other measuring scales that better explain OA.

The study also has several practical implications for hotels and hotel managers. Firstly, hotels should be dedicated to providing gender equality in the workplace. The Chinese government has policies that aim at providing equal rights for males and females in the workplace, such as the First Constitution of 1954, the Law on Safeguarding the Rights and Interests of Women (1992) and White Paper on Gender Equality (Wang, 2005). However, the policies have not been implemented effectively (Yang & Li, 2009). Hotel managers should not let gender or gender stereotype influence their decisions when distributing pay and benefits, making job arrangements, writing recruitment advertisements, or designing hotel activities. For instance, there should be no wage or benefit package difference between genders when employees are on the same position level and doing work of comparable value. Recruitment advertisements should not specifically require male or female applicants except for positions that indeed demand certain irreplaceable gender characteristics such as women’s locker room attendant position, which may only require female employees in order to protect female customers’ rights. Meanwhile, hotels should make family-friendly policies accessible for both genders. Flexible working hours and parenthood leave should not only be female employees’ privileges, but rights for both male and female employees (Rudman & Mescher,
2013). Therefore, in addition to giving female employees maternity leave, hotels could create a policy that guarantees male employees’ rights to enjoy paternity leave and take responsibilities as husbands and fathers.

Secondly, hotel managers could empower employees to make decisions and solve problems independently. Empowerment makes employees feel valued by the organization (Kruja, Drishti, & Oelfke, 2016), and gives employees high job satisfaction and therefore high OI and low TI (Guzel, Aydin Tukelturk, & Ozkul, 2008). Front line employees should be encouraged and supported to respond promptly to customers’ needs within their authority and capabilities without consulting supervisors. For instance, hotels could give front line employees a reasonably limited amount of money to improve customers’ experience. In addition, hotels should provide role-play trainings to front line employees on how to cope with potential customer needs, and how to resolve customers’ dissatisfactions.
CHAPTER 6: LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Even though this study sheds light on the relationship between employees’ perceptions and behaviours in the hotel industry of China, there remain several limitations.

First, the participants of this study were limited to full-time employees with at least a year of experience at four and five-star non-state-owned hotels located in first and second-tier cities in China. Hotel employees that do not fit into the criteria of this study might have significant differences in terms of perceptions and behaviours from the participants of the current study. For instance, employees of lower star-rating hotel in rural areas of China may perceive more gender discrimination and injustice because those hotels have less established management systems and training guidelines. Therefore, the study results can only apply to a small portion of hotel employees rather than all employees. Further research can include respondents from a wider background to see if the results are corroborated in wider samples. In addition, further research could compare between the results of employees of major hotel brands versus independent hotels, developed cities versus rural areas, four and five-star hotels versus lower star-rating hotels, state-owned hotels versus non-state-owned hotels and investigate the influence of hotel brand, locations, star-rating, and ownership on study results.

Second, this study did not investigate if demographic factors would lead to different results due to limited time and data. Moreover, the differences between job position levels and departments were not identified. Gender, age, marital status and parenthood have been proven to associate differently with one’s PGD (Güngör & Biernat, 2009). For instance, female employees may perceive more gender discrimination than males because of the traditional male-superiority culture of China (Cooke, 2001). Meanwhile, employees of different job hierarchical levels have different attitudes toward job-related variables (Hunton, Neidermeyer, & Wier, 1996), and employees working in different hotel departments tend to have significant variances in terms of personality and way of thinking (Yıldız, Üngüren, & Polat, 2009). Future research can expand the scope of this study by testing the model on different demographic groups, job hierarchies or departments.
Third, the survey samples of this study came only from mainland China, and the hypotheses of this study are generated based on mostly western studies. Some of the hypotheses are not supported, suggesting that results found in Western countries may not apply to China. Regions that have diverse population, socioeconomic development status, language, custom, culture as well as legal and political system influence peoples’ values, behaviours and perceptions (Shaffer et al., 2000). Therefore the results of studies involving participants’ values, behaviours and perceptions may be influenced by cultural differences. For instance, due to the lack of proper education in gender, gender role and equal rights, many Chinese females do not consider the unequal treatments they receive in the workplace as gender discrimination, but as social norms (Ge & Qin, 2015). Therefore, PGD may be lower in China than in western countries where gender equality is instilled through education (Ge & Qin, 2015). Future researchers are encouraged to test the model in different cultural settings such as Europe and North America in order to further validate the model.

Last, OD was measured completely based on the self-report answers of participants. Even though self-report answer has been proven to be valid in terms of assessing deviant behaviours (Akers, Massey, Clarke, & Lauer, 1983; Lee, 1993), possibilities remain that the participants did not give honest answers because admitting workplace deviant behaviours can be challenging. Participants might fake good answers because they did not want to be judged as unethical, or identified and punished, which could have led to biased study results (Sackett & Harris, 1984). However, since many deviant behaviours cannot be detected by anyone else but the participants themselves, and the participants’ confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed, this study still adopted the self-report measure. The mean value of OD is 1.95 (see Table 3), which means participants generally have low OD. Many previous studies that adopted the self-report measurement scale of OD also have low mean value of OD (e.g., Cohen et al., 2013; Tepper et al., 2009). Additional research can use the non-self-report measure (Stewart et al., 2009) which allows co-workers and supervisors to assess workplace deviant behaviours, and compare the results to see if the non-self-report scale is more effective in measuring workplace deviance.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

The study results demonstrate that employees’ perceived gender discrimination and turnover intentions are the main antecedents of their deviant behaviours toward the hotel. Meanwhile, employees’ organizational identification and turnover intention mediates the relationship between perceived gender discrimination and organizational deviance. Even though employees’ justice perception is not related to their deviant behaviours, it is found to be positively related to affective commitment and organizational identification. This study adopts the multidimensional construct of organizational attachment and investigates the relationship between employees’ perception and behaviours that has been largely ignored in the studies of China’s hotel industry. The findings of this study encourage future research to expand the scope of this study by testing the model on different demographic groups and cultural settings to further validate the model. Meanwhile, this study suggests hotel managers work to convey gender equality throughout the hotel and empower front line employees to make decisions independently.
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