Investigating the Effect of the Demographic Characteristics on the Organizational Justice Perceptions in the Egyptian Travel Agents

Mohamed Mahmoud Mostafa [a] **, Sabreen Gaber Abd El- Jalil** [b] **, Hala Ahmed Ali Gomaa** [c] **, Mohamed Ezzat Mohamed** [d]

[a] *Ph.D Researcher , Faculty of Tourism and Hotels, Minia University*

[b] *Professor , Faculty of Tourism and Hotels, Luxor University , Egypt*

[c] *Professor , Faculty of Tourism and Hotels, Helwan University , Egypt*

[d] *Assistant Professor , Faculty of Tourism and Hotels, Minia University , Egypt*

Keywords

Distributive Justice
Informational Justice
Interpersonal Justice
Organizational Justice
Procedural Justice

Abstract

Organizational justice represents people's perceptions about the extent of fair treatment within organizations. It consists of four dimensions; distributive, procedural, informational and interpersonal justice. This study attempts to illustrate the impact of significant differences between demographic Characteristics on employees' perceptions about organizational justice in the Egyptian travel agents. This study applied descriptive methodology which used a cross-sectional design. Questionnaire was designed on a five-point Likert scale and the agreement level ranges from strongly agree to strongly disagree. It was implemented to gather the primary data from the sample of the study from 1st August till 20th September 2020. The study included 329 travel agents who participated with 400 employees, after revising questionnaires, only 358 questionnaires were valid for statistical analysis. Results illustrated that there are significant differences between all categories of demographic variables except gender in organizational justice and organizational excellence in the Egyptian travel agents.

1. Introduction

The business environment is constantly changing and evolving. The challenges which emerged in business environment due to globalization and fierce competition, put a lot of pressure on managers to keep their organizations within the market (Agarwal and Vrat, 2016). In this context, Terouhid and Ries (2016) argued that organizations are considered to be complex systems. These systems change according to different factors. Some of these factors are internal ones such as; human resource management, organizational commitment, financial performance and technology. Moreover, there are external factors such as; regulations, consumer behavior and new competitors.

In addition, organizational justice is considered to be a reciprocal relationship between the organization and its employees (Aryee, Walumbwa, MondeJar, and Chu, 2015). Organizational justice is illustrated by Khan and Habib (2012, p.36) as " the extent to which people perceive that they are treated fairly at work". In this regard, it is pivotal for mangers to create a system which employees perceive as just, transparent and ethical system. Dealing with employees with clear rules which are applied on all members without exceptions, facilitates the workflow and avoids multiple conflicts between employees and management (Tatum and Eberlin, 2008).

Literature divided organizational justice into four categories; distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice and informational justice (Olkkonen and Lipponen, 2006; Jafari, Motlagh, Yarmohammadian and Delavar, 2011; Shan, Ishaq, and Shaheen, 2015; Kaynak, Sert, Sert, and Akyuz, 2015). Distributive justice could be illustrated as the fair distribution of the organizations' outcomes such as rewards and promotion decisions. Procedural justice represents the rules and criteria which are applied to distribute the organizations' outcomes. Interpersonal justice is about the treatment which is received by employees from their management and whether it is the same between all members of the organization or not. The final category which is informational justice is the explanations and justifications of specific procedures related to work (Chou, Chou, Jiang, and Klein, 2013; Nix and Wolfe, 2016; Swalhi, Zgoulli, and Hofaidhllaoui, 2017). The current study aims to reveal and discuss differences of demographic variables between employees and managers in the Egyptian travel agents about organizational justice perceptions.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Organizational Justice Concept

Daft (2008) argued that organizations are something more than buildings, offices and equipment. They consist of people and their social interactions with each other. An organization does not exist without interactions between individuals which enable them to achieve their roles and tasks. The process of interactions among employees is coordinated and organized by managers to achieve the required goals of the organization.

The issue of justice and fair treatment has gained considerable attention among theorists and practitioners. It is believed that the earliest theories of social justice and treatment as clarified; Adams (1965), Huseman (1985) and Rawls (1999) were used to test the idea of justice in general conditions not within organizations particularly (Greenberg, 1990).

Moreover, plenty of researchers such as McDowall and Fletcher (2004), Myhill and Bradford (2013), Cassar and Buttigieg (2015) and Rosenbaum and McCarty (2017) agreed that Greenberg (1987) was the first one to introduce the concept of organizational justice as a variable which could be effectively used to predict the changes which happen to different aspects of organizational issues such as; turnover rate, job satisfaction and conflicts between employees and management. In line with the previous discussion, Organizational justice could be defined as "the fair and ethical treatment of individuals within the organization" (Durrah, 2008, p. 32).

2.2. Organizational Justice Dimensions

The business environment today has changed significantly. Nowadays, there is an increasing demand about trends which defend the employees' rights. This change happened because of severe competition and huge spread of information. Therefore, organizations were forced to consider achieving justice internally to face challenges in business environment (Akram, Lei, Haider, Hussain and Puig, 2017). In this context, the development of organizational justice dimensions could be discussed as follows:

2.3. Distributive Justice

The first dimension is distributive justice which appeared in Adams' (1965) theory of inequity. Adams assumed that a person compares his different inputs to work and outcomes with those of other persons within the workplace. Inputs could include what an employee gives to his work such as; time, effort, skills, education,

and experience. On the other side, outcomes consist of salary and promotions.

Distributive justice represents the employees' perceptions about the fairness of distributing the organizational outcomes whether these outcomes were financial or non-financial (George and Wallio, 2017).

Rescher (1966) and Deutsch (1985) highlighted the principles of distributive justice at the following points:

1) Distribution of organizational outcomes should be done at the suitable time which makes employees feel that they are rewarded for their achievement quickly.
2) The distribution process should be done with transparency and integrity because the confidentiality of distribution may raise questions and doubts about the justice of distribution.
3) All individuals should be treated equally at the distribution process.
4) All employees should be treated according to their achievement to the organization. This includes their efforts and sacrifices which they introduce to the work. Moreover, the productivity of the employees which plays an important role in distributing outcomes.

2.4. Procedural Justice

The second dimension is procedural justice which was proposed by Thibault and Walker (1975). Procedural justice represents the perceptions of employees about the fairness of procedures which lead to distribution of outcomes (Thibault and Walker, 1975).

Procedural justice represents the employees' perceptions about the fairness of decisions which are made by management and have a significant impact on determining the employees' outcomes (Fujimoto, Härtel and Azmat, 2013). It is evident that procedural justice has a social aspect as it contains individuals who are affected by decisions of their managers. Perceptions of fair or unfair procedures cause a great impact to individuals. This impact is not only about these procedures, but also about those who are responsible for making decisions. Consequently, procedures are considered to be a major factor that changes the employees' behavior towards the organization (Gonzalez and Tyler, 2007).

Moreover, Konovsky (2000) argued that procedural justice includes two components. The first one is objective procedural justice; it refers to actual justice which should be applied in

workplace. The second component is subjective procedural justice which reflects the perceptions of employees about objective procedures which affect them. Subjective procedural justice is a cognitive component; it is the sum of thoughts and behaviors which are related to the justice experience. Subjective procedural justice helps employees to make comparisons between the objective procedures and the procedures which are really taken. The result of these comparisons affects the behavior and attitudes of employees towards their organization.

2.5. Interpersonal Justice

Avery, Tonidandel, Volpone and Raghuram (2010) assured that interpersonal justice refers to perceptions of employees regarding fair treatment from their managers. Good and powerful relationships between managers and their employees contribute to decreasing the resistance of employees to organizational change. Moreover, employees become more convinced about giving sacrifices to achieve the organizational goals. Thus, it is pivotal for managers to take into their consideration the social interactions which occur between them and their employees because it represents informal ways of connection. These informal channels decrease the stress of work and motivate employees to improve their performance (Bouckenooghe, De Clercq and Deprez, 2014).

In addition, Hayes and Ninemeier (2009) and Bies (2015) asserted that managers should take into their consideration a bundle of factors which contributes to making employees' perceptions about interpersonal justice more positive. **These factors could be demonstrated as follows:**

1) **Honesty**: this about treatment with employees without deception.
2) **Integrity**: it means dealing with employees by doing what is right for them.
3) **Trustworthiness**: it means providing employees with right information which helps them to succeed in their work.
4) **Concern and respect**: this element include paying attention to any impacts which may affect employees after making any decision. Moreover, it is important for managers to avoid any forms of disrespect with their employees whether these forms were words or actions. Furthermore, managers should ensure that privacy of their employees is protected and respected inside workplace.

5) **Accountability**: it is about taking responsibility for decisions which managers make.

2.6. Informational Justice

Informational justice is about providing employees with persuasive explanations to justify the decisions of distributing rewards and promotions. Moreover, it is concerned with justifications of changes which happen at work (Aboul-Ela, 2014; Naidu, Sharif and Poespowidjojo, 2014).

Moreover, Informational justice has a great importance for organizations because of two reasons. The first reason is that information has a critical role in improving the employees' performance and decreasing their resistance to change. Lack of information sharing makes the employees' perceptions about organizational change negative and creates a gap between employees and their managers. This gap may cause multiple conflicts because employees perceive the absence of information sharing as an intentional action from management to hurt them (De Clercq and Saridakis, 2015). The second reason is that informational justice affects the behavior of employees significantly. Organizations includes a large number of social interactions between managers and their employees on a daily basis. These interactions contain information sharing and exchange which either motivate employees to work and sacrifice harder for their organization, or decrease their efforts and start to cause problems for their managers (Cheung, 2013).

The previous presentation raised a significant question about the possible impact of demographic characteristics of employees on organizational justice perceptions. Therefore, the hypothesis could be as follows:

H1: There are statistical significant differences between the demographic characteristics of the employees in the Egyptian travel agents and their perception of the organizational justice.

3. Research Methodology

The aim of the current study is to investigate the effect of differences demographic characteristics of the employees in the Egyptian travel agents and their perception of the organizational justice.

The design of the current study is a non-experimental research. It is considered to be a cross-sectional study which is applied in social sciences to describe a situation, phenomena, suggest

solutions to a problem or identify attitudes towards specific issue (Kumar, 2011).

Moreover, this study used the descriptive methodology which focuses on presenting an accurate estimation to the real situation of individuals, institutions or societies without manipulation of variables. Results of descriptive studies conclude to explore and analyze possible relationships between variables, frequencies of something in population or detailed description of concepts. Descriptive studies provide researchers with solid evidence to conduct and develop future quantitative, qualitative or mixed studies. (Williams, 2007; Grove, Gray and Burns, 2015).

The field study employed a quantitative method to gather primary data from the study's sample. MacDonald and Headlam (2008) and Daniel (2016) assured that quantitative methods are used to transform data into numbers which could be used make generalizations on a population from sample. Quantitative methods depend significantly on statistical methods and software to generate results which decrease the researcher time and effort.

The current study employed questionnaire as a quantitative instrument. The Questionnaire is an effective measurement for individuals' thoughts, attitudes, and behavior. It has several types telephone questionnaire, mail questionnaire, Email or internet questionnaire, and face to face questionnaires. The current study employed the technique of self-administrated questionnaire which provides respondents with enough time to read the statements and chose the best answers according to their opinions (Gray, Williamson, Karp, and Dalphin, 2007; Vanderstoep and Johnston, 2009; Bhattacherjee, 2012). Justifications of using questionnaire in field study could be summarized as Bhattacherjee (2012) illustrated in the following points:

1. It is an effective instrument to gather and measure unobservable data such as attitudes, traits, and opinions.
2. It is suitable instrument for gathering data from large number of individuals.
3. It is more convenient method for respondents which gives them time to think about answers and read questions carefully.

Accordingly, Questionnaires are distributed on a sample of employees of travel agents in Egypt to identify their opinions towards organizational justice and organizational excellence in their companies. The questionnaire is designed on a five-point Likert scale

and the agreement level ranges from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

The questionnaire is divided into three sections as follows:

1. The first section includes the demographic characteristics of the study's sample which are gender, age, occupation, years of work experience and qualifications.
2. The second section includes the scale of organizational justice which consists of 16 statements.
3. The third section includes one open question.

The population of the current study is composed from Egyptian travel agents category (A). The population of study consists of 2293 company According to the Egyptian travel agents Association (Egyptian Travel Agents Association [ETAA], 2020).

The current study employed the non-probability sampling design which is convenience sampling. This type of sampling design also known as haphazard sampling or accidental sampling. Convenience sampling is characterized by selecting respondents who are easy to reach, have willingness to participate in the study, available at the time of conducting the field study (Etikan, Musa, and Alkassin, 2016).

The study's sample was determined according to Cochran (1977) formula which resulted in 329 travel agents. Furthermore, the study targeted 364 travel agents in Cairo. Thirty-five companies refused to participate in the field study and 329 agreed to participate in the process of gathering data. The Questionnaire was the major instrument to gather primary data from respondents. Number of respondents were 400. After revising the questionnaires, 358 questionnaires were valid for statistical analysis. Then, the questionnaires were coded and entered into the computer to be analyzed by Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS V.21).

Demographic variables include the following categories:

1- Gender: Male and females.
2- Age: less than 29 years, 30-40 years, and more than 41 years.
3- Occupation: employee, department manager, and manager.
4- Work experience: less than 6 years, 7-15 years, and more than 16 years.
5- Qualifications: intermediate degree, upper intermediate degree, Bachelor, Master, and Ph.D.

This study determined the validity of the scale by using the following:

Face validity: the scale was reviewed by four academic reviewers. The comments and observations of them have been considered before implementing the filed study.

Validity of internal consistency: Results demonstrated that all correlation coefficients of statements are significant at level of significance of ≤ 0.01 which ensures the validity of internal consistency of organizational justice scale.

Regarding the reliability of scale, it was calculated using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. Values of Cronbach's Alpha coefficients are (0.92, 0.87, 0.86, 0.98, 0.95) for distributive, procedural, informational, interactional and organizational justice scales respectively which ensure that the scale of organizational justice has a high degree of reliability.

This study implemented parametric statistical tests to identify significant differences between categories of demographic variables as follows:

1. T-test: it was used to test the differences between two categories within one variable of the study's sample.
2. One-Way ANOVA test: it was used to identify the significant differences between more than two categories within one variable of the study's sample.
3. LSD test: it was used for multiple comparisons.

4. Results and Discussion

Table 1 illustrates that there are not any significant differences between genders in organizational justice. This result came to a disagreement with the study of Gyekye and Haybatollahi (2015) which revealed different perceptions of organizational justice dimensions between females and males.

Regarding age variable, table 2 demonstrates significant differences between age category "30-40 years" with age category "More than 41 years" at the level of significance of 0.0001. Means are 15.8 and 17.6 respectively which means that differences are in favor of age category "More than 41 years".

Table 1: Differences between genders in organizational justice in the Egyptian travel agents

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig.
Distributional justice	Male	325	16.3	3.7	0.11	356	0.9
	Female	33	16.4	3.91			
Procedural justice	Male	325	15.8	3.40	1.1	356	0.9
	Female	33	15.2	4			
Informational justice	Male	325	15.8	3.3	1.2	356	0.2
	Female	33	15	3.1			
Interpersonal justice	Male	325	15.6	3.3	1.1	356	0.3
	Female	33	14.9	3.9			
Total degree of organizational justice	Male	325	63.5	12	.88	356	0.4
	Female	33	61.5	13.3			

The explanation for these differences could be that the older age category benefit from monetary and non-monetary rewards more than age category "30-40 years". Thus, age category "More than 41 years" is more satisfied about distributional justice in the Egyptian travel agents.

Moreover, results exhibit significant differences between age category "30-40 years" with age category "More than 41 years" at the level of significance of 0.001. Means are 15.4 and 16.8 respectively which means that differences are in favor of age category "More than 41 years".

The explanation for these differences could be that the older age category has worked for many years than younger age categories which made them able to be more convinced about procedural justice in the Egyptian travel agents.

In addition, results highlight significant differences between both age categories "Less than 29 years" and "30-40 years" with age category "More than 41 years" at the level of significance of 0.001. Means are 15.1, 15.2 and 16.9 respectively which means that differences are in favor of age category "More than 41 years".

Previous results reflect that age category "More than 41 years" may have important positions in their companies than younger age categories and feel that informational justice exists according to their positions.

Furthermore, results show significant differences between both age categories "Less than 29 years" and "30-40 years" with age

category "More than 41 years" at the level of significance of 0.012. Means are 15.1, 15.2 and 16.4 respectively which means that differences are in favor of age category "More than 41 years".

Table 2: One-Way ANOVA for differences between categories of demographic variables in organizational justice dimensions in the Egyptian travel agents

Demographic Variable	Variance		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Distributional justice	Between Groups	219.563	2	109.781	8.438	.000
		Within Groups	4618.851	355	13.011		
		Total	4838.413	357			
	Procedural Justice	Between Groups	157.154	2	78.577	6.773	.001
		Within Groups	4118.704	355	11.602		
		Total	4275.858	357			
	Informational Justice	Between Groups	230.196	2	115.098	11.544	.000
		Within Groups	3539.503	355	9.970		
		Total	3769.698	357			
	Interpersonal Justice	Between Groups	101.721	2	50.861	4.510	.012
		Within Groups	4003.377	355	11.277		
		Total	4105.098	357			
Occupation	Distributional Justice	Between Groups	933.774	2	466.887	42.448	.000
		Within Groups	3904.639	355	10.999		
		Total	4838.413	357			
	Procedural Justice	Between Groups	732.944	2	366.472	36.720	.000
		Within Groups	3542.914	355	9.980		
		Total	4275.858	357			
Years of work experience	Distributional justice	Between Groups	369.541	2	184.771	14.678	.000
		Within Groups	4468.872	355	12.588		
		Total	4838.413	357			
	Procedural Justice	Between Groups	290.849	2	145.425	12.955	.000
		Within Groups	3985.008	355	11.225		
		Total	4275.858	357			
	Informational Justice	Between Groups	356.835	2	178.417	18.559	.000
		Within Groups	3412.864	355	9.614		
		Total	3769.698	357			

Demographic Variable	Variance		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Interpersonal Justice	Between Groups	351.353	2	175.677	16.614	.000
		Within Groups	3753.744	355	10.574		
		Total	4105.098	357			
Qualifications	Distributional Justice	Between Groups	154.592	2	38.648	2.913	.022
		Within Groups	4683.822	355	13.269		
		Total	4838.413	357			
	Procedural Justice	Between Groups	147.774	2	36.943	3.159	.014
		Within Groups	4128.084	355	11.694		
		Total	4275.858	357			
	Informational Justice	Between Groups	115.439	2	28.860	2.788	.026
		Within Groups	3654.260	355	10.352		
		Total	3769.698	357			
	Interpersonal Justice	Between Groups	170.168	2	42.542	3.816	.005
		Within Groups	3934.930	355	11.147		
		Total	4105.098	357			

These results may indicate that members of age category "More than 41 years" feel more appreciated by management because of their age than other age categories.

Previous results came to an agreement with studies of Akbar, Ahmad, Ali, and Naz (2019) and Lambert, Tewksbury, Out, and Elechi (2020) which demonstrated that age variable causes different perceptions about organizational justice.

With respect to occupation variable, results illustrate significant differences between both occupation categories "Employee" and "Department manager" with occupation category "Manager" at the level of significance of 0.0001. Means are 15.4, 19.3 and 18.9 respectively which means that differences are in favor of occupation category "Department manager".

The explanation for these differences could be that department managers are responsible for implementing practices of distributional justice on employees. Thus, they seem to be more convinced of the level of distributional justice because of their critical role connected to it.

Moreover, results highlight significant differences between both occupation categories "Employee" and "Department manager"

with occupation category "Manager" at the level of significance of 0.0001. Means are 14.9, 18.4 and 18.1 respectively which means that differences are in favor of occupation category "Department manager".

Additionally, results reveal that both categories of "Department manager" and "Manager" have a critical difference with category of "Employee". These differences show that employees are not satisfied with procedures which are taken in their organizations. However, it seems logic that both managers and department managers are satisfied with the level of procedural justice because it is related to their responsibilities.

Previous results agreed with the study of Diab (2015) which concluded that job affect individuals' perceptions about organizational justice.

Regarding years of work experience, results exhibit significant differences between both categories of work experience "less than 6 years" and "7-15 years" with category of "More than 16 years" at the level of significance of 0.0001. Means are 15.8, 15.6 and 18 respectively which means that differences are in favor of category "More than 16 years".

The explanation for previous results could be that category of "More than 16 years" may benefit from all kinds of rewards more than other categories which made them more satisfied with practices of distributional justice more than other categories of work experience.

Moreover, demonstrate significant differences between both categories of work experience "less than 6 years" and "7-15 years" with category of "More than 16 years" at the level of significance of 0.0001. Means are (15.3, 15.2 and 17.3 respectively) which means that differences are in favor of category "More than 16 years".

The explanation for previous results could be that members of category of "More than 16 years" may have an experience that contributed to their acceptance and understanding of practices of procedural justice more than other categories.

In addition, results reveal significant differences between both categories of work experience "less than 6 years" and "7-15 years" with category of "More than 16 years" at the level of significance of 0.0001. Means are 15.3, 14.9 and 17.3 respectively which means that differences are in favor of category "More than 16 years".

The above results highlight that organizations tend to provide the more experienced employees with the best practices of informational justice. Thus, both categories of work experience "less

than 6 years" and "7-15 years" seem to have lower agreement level about informational justice than category of "More than 16 years".

Furthermore, results demonstrate significant differences between both categories of work experience "less than 6 years" and "7-15 years" with category of "More than 16 years" at the level of significance of 0.0001. Means are 15.1, 14.8 and 17.2 respectively which means that differences are in favor of category "More than 16 years".

Previous results could be explained that members of category "More than 16 years" may have the most powerful effect on work environment. Therefore, organizations take into consideration to deal with members of category "More than 16 years" with the most suitable way which resulted in their higher agreement than both categories of work experience "less than 6 years" and "7-15 years".

In like manner, study of Monged, Raghab, and Tantawi (2019) illustrated that work experience has a significant effect on organizational justice perceptions.

In terms of qualifications, results illustrate significant differences between category of "Upper intermediate degree" with categories of "Intermediate degree", "Bachelor", "Master" and "PH.D" at the level of significance of 0.022. Means are 14.8, 16.6, 16.4, 18.5 and 18.1 respectively which means differences are in favor of category of "Master".

Explanation could be that category of "Upper intermediate degree" may be the most category which suffered from absence of distributional justice followed by both categories "Intermediate degree" and "Bachelor". In contrast, both categories of "Master" and "PH.D" have highest level of agreement about practices of distributional justice.

Moreover, demonstrate significant differences between category of "Upper intermediate degree" with categories of "Bachelor" and "Master" at the level of significance of 0.014. Means are 14.5, 15.8, and 18.5 respectively which means differences are in favor of category of "Master". In addition, there is significant difference between category of "Bachelor" and category of "Master" at the level of significance of 0.014. Means are 15.8 and 18.5 respectively which means that difference is in favor of category of "Master".

The explanation could be that members of category of "Master" are more appreciated and rewarded than members of both categories "Upper intermediate degree" and "Bachelor" which resulted in the previous significant differences.

Likewise, reveal significant difference between category of "Upper intermediate degree" with category of "Master" at the level of significance of 0.026. Means are (15.5 and 18.3 respectively) which means that the difference is in favor of category of "Master". Furthermore, there is significant difference between category of "Bachelor" and category of "Master" at the level of significance of 0.026. Means are 15.6 and 18.3 respectively which means that the difference is in favor of category of "Master".

The explanation could be that members of category of "Master" have more experience to understand procedures behind informational justice more than other categories. Therefore, members of category of "Master" are more convinced with the level of informational justice than categories of "Upper intermediate degree" and "Master".

Finally, results show significant difference between category of "Upper intermediate degree" with category of "Master" at the level of significance of 0.005. Means are 14.3 and 18.3 respectively which means that the difference is in favor of category of "Master".

The explanation could be that members of category of "Master" are more appreciated because of their qualifications more than members of category "Upper intermediate degree" which resulted in higher satisfaction for members of category of "Master" about practices of interpersonal justice.

Based on the previous analysis, H1 is partially accepted and there are statistical significant differences between demographic characteristics except gender in organizational justice perceptions in the Egyptian travel agents.

5. Conclusions

This study divided organizational justice into four dimensions as follows; distributional justice, procedural justice, informational justice and interpersonal justice. The current study aimed to assess significant differences of demographic characteristics about organizational justice perceptions in the Egyptian travel agents.

Results demonstrated that there are not any significant differences gender in their perceptions of organizational justice. There are significant differences between age categories in favor of "More than 41 years". Moreover, there are significant differences between occupation categories in organizational justice perceptions except informational justice and interpersonal justice in favor of category "Department manager". There are statistical significant differences between categories of work experience in organizational

justice perceptions and differences are in favor of category of "More than 16 years". Finally, there are statistical significant differences between qualification categories in organizational justice perceptions and differences are in favor of category of "Master".

7. Practical Implications

According to results of the current study, it is recommended for managers of the Egyptian tourism companies to implement the following practices to manage the differences of demographic characteristics in organizational justice. At first, Continuous development of all practices of organizational justice to maximize its benefits to different aspects within Egyptian tourism companies. Moreover, managers of Egyptian tourism companies should work on increasing awareness among managers of departments in their companies about the critical role of organizational justice in achieving success. Increasing awareness could be done through productive discussions between managers and department managers.

In addition, managers should take into their consideration the effect of age variable on awareness of organizational justice and deal with each age category with suitable level of communication about practices of organizational justice. It requires focus on younger age groups to increase their awareness about dimensions of organizational excellence through training programs.

Furthermore, managers should take into their consideration analyzing practices of organizational justice on a regular basis and identify negative aspects to increase employees' satisfaction about all organizational justice dimensions. In line with this, managers should not deal with different categories of work experience with the same practices because of the significant impact of work experience on perceptions of organizational justice.

Finally, managers should establish a system of work which facilitates transformation of work experience from categories of high levels of work experience to the lowest ones about dimensions of organizational excellence. Likewise, It is important for managers to benefit from qualifications such as Master degree and PH.D to transform their expertise to employees with other qualifications about organizational justice and organizational excellence.

8. Future research recommendations

It is recommended to implement further studies to assess the impact of demographic characteristics on organizational justice perceptions within different organizations such as airlines and hotels. Moreover, it is suggested to implement a study to evaluate the level

of organizational justice in the Egyptian travel agents using mixed methods of quantitative and qualitative instruments.

9. Limitations

The current study has two limitations. The first one is generalizability of results because of implementing the non-probability sampling design. The second limitation is depending only on quantitative methods to gather data from respondents.

10. References

Aboul-Ela, G.M.B. (2014). Analyzing the Relationships between Organization Justice Dimensions and Selected Organizational Outcomes - Empirical Research Study. The Business & Management Review, 5(2), 34-44.

Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in Social Exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (pp. 267-269). New York: Elsevier.

Agarwal, A., and Vrat, P. (2016). A Bio-Inspired Model of Organizational Excellence. Journal of Advances in Management Research, 13(2), 130-153.

Akbar, F., Ahmad, I., Ali, Z., and Naz, A. (2019). Assessing the Effect of Demographic Variables on Organizational Citizenship Behavior & Organizational Justice. Clinical Social Work and Health Intervention, 10(2), 7-18.

Akram, T., Lei, S., Haider, M.J., Hussain, S.T., and Puig, L.C.M. (2017). The Effect of Organizational Justice on Knowledge Sharing: Empirical Evidence from the Chinese Telecommunications Sector. Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 2, 134-145.

Aryee, S., Walumbwa, F.O., MondeJar, R., and Chu, C.W.L. (2015). Accounting for the Influence of Overall Justice on Job Performance: Integrating Self-Determination and Social Exchange Theories. Journal of Management Studies, 52(2), 231-252.

Avery, D.R., Tonidandel, S., Volpone, S.D., and Raghuram, A. (2010). Overworked in America?: How Work Hours, Immigrant Status, and Interpersonal Justice Affect Perceived Work Overload. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25(2), 133-147.

Bhattacherjee, A. (2012). Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, and Practices (2nd ed.). USA: Create Space Independent Publishing Platform.

Bies, R.J. (2015). Interactional Justice: Looking Backward, Looking Forward. In R. Cropanzano and M. Ambrose (Eds.) The Oxford Handbook of Justice in the Workplace (pp. 89-107). Madison Avenue, New York: Oxford University Press.

Bouckenooghe, D., De Clercq, D., and Deprez, J. (2014). Interpersonal Justice, Relational Conflict, and Commitment to Change: The Moderating Role of Social Interaction. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 63(3), 509-540.

Cassar, V., and Buttigieg, S.C. (2015). Psychological Contract Breach, Organizational Justice and Emotional Well-Being. Journal of Personnel Review, 44(2), 217-235.

Cheung, M.F.Y., (2013). The Mediating Role of Perceived Organizational Support in the Effects of Interpersonal and Informational Justice on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 34(6), 551-572.

Chou, T., Chou, S.T., Jiang, J.J., and Klein, G. (2013). The Organizational Citizenship Behavior of IS Personnel: Does Organizational Justice Matter?. Journal of Information and Management, 50, 105-111.

Daft, R.L. (2008). Organization Theory and Design (10th ed.). Australia: South-Western, Cengage Learning.

Daniel, E. (2016). The Usefulness of Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches and Methods in Researching Problem-Solving Ability in Science Education Curriculum. Journal of Education and Practice, 7(15), 91-100.

De Clercq, D., and Saridakis, G. (2015). Informational Injustice with Respect to Change and Negative Workplace Emotions: The Mitigating Roles of Structural and Relational Organizational Features. Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, 2(4), 346-369.

Deutsch, M. (1966). Distributive Justice: A Social-Psychological Perspective. London: Yale University Press.

Diab, S.M. (2015). The Impact of Organizational Justice on the Workers Performance and Job Satisfaction in the Ministry of

Health Hospitals in Amman. International Business Research, 8(2), 187-197.

Durrah, O.M. (2008). Organizational Justice and its relationship to some Contemporary administrative trends. Cairo: Al Radwan.

Egyptian Travel Agents Association. (2020). Companies. Retrieved from https://www.etaa-egypt.org/SitePages/Companies.aspx.

Etikan, I., Musa, S.A., and Alkassim, R.S. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5(1), 1-4.

Fujimoto, Y., Härtel, C.E.J., and Azmat, F. (2013). Towards a Diversity Justice Management Model: Integrating Organizational Justice and Diversity Management. Social Responsibility Journal, 9(1), 148-166.

George, J., and Wallio, S. (2017). Organizational Justice and Millennial Turnover in Public Accounting. Journal of Employee Relations, 39(1), 112-126.

Gonzalez, C.M., and Tyler, T.R. (2007). Why Do People Care about Procedural Fairness? The Importance of Membership Monitoring. In K. Tornblom and R. Vermunt (Eds.) Distributive and Procedural Justice Research and Social Applications (pp. 91-110). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Gray, P.S., Williamson, J.B., Karp, D.A., Dalphin, J.R. (2007). The Research Imagination: An Introduction to Qualitative and Quantitative Methods. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Greenberg, J. (1987). A Taxonomy of Organizational Justice Theories. Academy of Management Review, 12(1), 9-22.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. Journal of Management, 16(2), 399-432.

Grove, S.K., Gray, J.R., and Burns, N. (2015). Understanding Nursing Research Building an Evidence-Based Practice (6th ed). St. Louis, Missouri: Elsevier.

Gyekye, S.A., and Haybatollahi, M. (2015). Organizational Justice: Antecedents and Consequences of Ghanaian Industrial Workers. International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior, 18 (2), 177-205.

Hayes, D.K., and Ninemeier, J.D. (2009). Human Resources Management in the Hospitality Industry. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Huseman, R.C., Hatfield, J.D., and Miles, E.W. (1985). Test For Individual Perceptions of Job Equity: Some Preliminary Findings. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 61, 1055-1064.

Jafari, p., Motlagh, F.S., Yarmohammadian, M.H., and Delavar, A. (2011). Designing an Adjusted Model of Organizational Justice for Educational System in Esfahan City (Iran). Journal of Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 100, 1696-1704.

Kaynak, R., Sert, T., Sert, G., Akyuz, B. (2015). Supply Chain Unethical Behaviors and Continuity of Relationship: Using the PLS Approach for Testing Moderation Effects of Inter-Organizational Justice. International Journal of Production Economics, 162, 83-91.

Khan, S., and Habib, U. (2012). Procedural Justice and Organizational Performance. Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences, 4(1), 36-51.

Konovsky, M.A. (2000). Understanding Procedural Justice and Its Impact on Business Organizations. Journal of Management, 26(3), 489-511.

Kumar, R. (2011). Research Methodology: A Step-By-Step Guide for Beginners (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Lambert, E.G., Tewksbury, R., Out, S.E., Elechi, O.O. (2020). The Association of Organizational Justice with Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among Nigerian Correctional Staff. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 1-25.

MacDonald, S., and Headlam, N. (2008). Research Methods Handbook: Introductory guide to research methods for social research. Manchester: Centre for Local Economic Strategies.

McDowall, A., and Fletcher, C. (2004). Employee Development: An Organizational Justice Perspective. Journal of Personnel Review, 33(1), 8-29.

Monged, T.M., Raghab, M.A., and Tantawi, P. (2019). The Effect of Demographic Factors on Organizational Justice and Intention to Leave in the Private Higher Education Sector in Egypt. Open Access Library Journal, 6, 1-29.

Myhill, A., and Bradford, B. (2013). Overcoming Cop Culture? Organizational Justice and Police Officers' Attitudes toward the Public. Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 36(2), 338-356.

Naidu, P., Sharif, M.Y., and Poespowidjojo, D.A. (2014). Informational Justice in Performance Appraisal and Its Influence on Organizational Commitment of UUM Lecturers. In. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. International Conference on Business Management (ICBM) 2014 (pp. 1-6). Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Nix, J., and Wolfe, S.E. (2016). Sensitivity to the Ferguson Effect: The Role of Managerial Organizational Justice. Journal of criminal Justice, 47, 12-20.

Olkkonen, M., and Lipponen, J. (2006). Relationships between organizational justice, identification with organization and work unit, and group-related outcomes. Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 100, 202-215.

Rawls. J. (1999). A Theory of Justice. United States of America: Harvard University Press.

Rescher, N. (1985). Distributive Justice: A Constructive Critique Utilitarian Theory of Distribution. New York, Kansas City: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

Rosenbaum, D.P., and McCarty, W.P. (2017). Organizational justice and officer "buy in" in American policing. An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 40(1), 71-85.

Shan, S., Ishaq, H.M., Shaheen, M.A. (2015). Impact of Organizational Justice on Job Performance in Libraries: Mediating Role of Leader-Member Exchange Relationship. Journal of Library Management, 36(1/2), 86-98.

Swalhi, A., Zgoulli, S., and Hofaidhllaoui, M. (2017). The Influence of Organizational Justice on Job Performance: The Mediating Effect of Affective Commitment. Journal of Management Development, 36(4), 542-559.

Tatum, B.C., and Eberlin, R.J. (2008). The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Conflict Style. Business Strategy Series Journal, 9(6), 297-305.

Terouhid, S.A., and Ries, R. (2016). Organizational Sustainability Excellence of Construction Firms – A Framework. Journal of Modelling in Management, 11(4), 911-931.

Thibault, J., and Walker, L. (1975). Procedural justice: A psychological analysis. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Vanderstoep, S.W., and Johnston, D.D. (2009). Research Methods for Everyday Life: Blending Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Williams, C. (2007). Research Methods. Journal of Business & Economic Research, 5(3), 65-72.