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Perceived Justice, Community Support, Community Identity and Residents’ Quality of Life: Testing an Integrative Model

Abstract

This study tested an integrative model to investigate the effect of perceived justice, in its three dimensions (procedural, distributive, and interactional), on destination residents’ quality of life (QOL) with perceived community support and community identification as mediators. Analysis on a sample of 453 Gulangyu Island residents in China shows that procedural and interactional justice positively influenced perceived community support, whilst procedural and distributive justice positively affected community identification; both perceived community support and community identification contributed to resident QOL. This study offers a new perspective on how to improve resident QOL in tourist destinations. Theoretical and marketing implications are discussed.
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Introduction

Tourism development creates various economic, social, and environmental impacts on the destination community, such as economic growth, social progress and environment protection (Su, Huang, & Huang, 2018). For a long time, scholars have mainly focused on how to attract
more visitors to improve the economic performance of a destination (Uysal, Sirgy, Woo, & Kim, 2016). However, with further development of tourism, more research has been paid on the social impacts of tourism (Su et al., 2018). Community residents, as a key stakeholder group, are strongly influenced by tourism development (Andereck et al., 2005; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011). Specifically, tourism influences residents’ quality of life (QOL) (Uysal et al., 2016); local residents’ QOL becomes concern for destination manager and community leaders (Uysal, Perdue, & Sirgy, 2012; Uysal, Sirgy, & Perdue et al., 2012; Uysal, Woo, & Signal, 2012), and tourism development has transitioned from emphasizing economic performance to enhancing resident QOL (Liang & Hui, 2016; Peters & Schuckert, 2014; Su et al., 2018). Studying the role of tourism in improving destination residents’ QOL has further distinguished tourism as a field of social sciences (Uysal et al., 2016). In the tourism literature, an increasing number of studies have focused on resident QOL; and most of them have investigated the relationship between tourism impacts and resident QOL (e.g., Adereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Chancellor, Yu, & Cole, 2011; Kim, Uysal, & Sirgy, 2013; Liang & Hui, 2016; Su et al., 2018; Wheeler & Laing, 2008; Woo, Kim, & Uysal, 2015). However, the results of this line of research are not consistent (Sharpley, 2014; Uysal et al., 2016). Uysal et al. (2016) noted more empirical research needs to be conducted to examine the relationship between tourism impact and QOL of community. Thus, it is important to explore the antecedents of quality of life in the tourism context and the effective mechanisms in improving QOL for local residents.

In the extant literature, some studies show that organizational justice plays an important role in employee well-being (Huong, Zheng, & Fujinoto, 2016). Especially, lack of justice has been
found to negatively affect employee well-being and physical health (Elovainio et al., 2001, 2005; Huong et al., 2016; Qin et al., 2014; Tepper, 2001). The concept of perceived organizational justice has been widely acknowledged to include three dimensions: procedural, distributive and interactional justice (e.g., Camerman et al., 2007; Colquitt, 2001; DeConinck, 2010); empirical research indicates that all three dimensions of organizational justice are important in predicting employees’ attitudes and behaviors (Colquitt et al., 2001). To a certain degree, tourist destinations can be seen as a complex organization in the tourism industry (Buhalis, 2003), including all services, goods and infrastructures required by a tourist during his/her visit (Buhalis, 2000). Local residents in the destination are an important group of stakeholders of the destination (Su et al., 2018). As important stakeholders to the destination’s development, residents would naturally have meaningful interactions with the destination in various aspects (Ap, 1992). Perceived justice of the destination as a personally associated entity may be formed among residents in the process of the destination’s development and such a perception may well influence residents’ life quality evaluations. Therefore, it is valuable to explore residents’ perceived justice in the context of destination management and analyze the relationships between all dimensions of residents’ perceived justice and their quality of life.

According to organizational support theory, fair treatment to employees can develop a positive belief among employees concerning organizational support and care toward them, which in turn may improve their perceived QOL (Caesens, Stinglhamber, & Ohana, 2016; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Fair treatment may make a major contribution to perceived organizational support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Thus, it can be inferred that perceived organizational
support may mediate the effect of perceived justice on QOL. However, little is known on the positive effect of perceived organizational support on QOL (Kurtessis et al., 2017). To the best of the authors’ knowledge, very few studies have examined the relationships among perceived justice, perceived organizational support and QOL.

Organizational identification is generally defined as an individual’s perception of belonging to an organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Psychologists have shown extensive interest in organizational identification for its certain positive effect on various work outcomes. Previous organizational studies indicated that perceived organizational justice can enhance organizational identification, which in turn leads to various positive organizational outcomes (e.g., Carmon et al., 2010; Colquitt et al., 2001; Lipponen et al., 2004; Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006; Tyler & Blader, 2002). In the destination context, residents in a destination may form a sense of place identity and this type of identification with the destination is believed to influence residents’ behavioral intentions and evaluations toward the destination (Choo, Park, & Petrick, 2011). Moreover, prior research has found that employees’ organizational identification has a positive association with their well-being and health (Avanzi, van Dick, Fracaroli, & Sarchielli, 2012). Although the literature has indicated that residents’ identification with the destination may play an important role in their interaction with the destination as a living place, the relationship has not been explicitly investigated. As such, it is worthwhile to examine the relationships among residents’ perceived justice, community identification and QOL in the tourism context.
Based on the above critique of the relevant literatures, this study applied organizational justice theory, organizational support theory, and social identity theory to the context of destination residents, and constructed an integrated model deploying residents’ perceived justice (i.e., procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice) as an antecedent to resident QOL, and perceived community support and community identification as mediators between perceived justice and resident QOL. It aims to extend the literature on how to improve residents’ QOL from the perspective of justice, community support and identification. Specifically, the study extends tourism studies on residents’ QOL that mainly focus on the relationship between tourism development/impacts and residents’ QOL. Its contributions lie in three aspects: First, based on organizational justice theory, this study contributes to the understanding of residents’ perceived justice in the destination development context; second, based on organizational support theory, the study extends the knowledge of the role of perceived community support in destination management, by exploring the effect of residents’ perceived justice on perceived community support that in turn influences residents’ QOL. Third, based on social identity theory, this study tests the role of residents’ perceived justice on community identification that in turn impacts residents’ QOL. Accordingly, this study offers practical implications for destinations to develop effective strategies to improve community residents’ QOL.

**Theoretical Foundation and Hypotheses Development**

**Organizational Justice Theory**

Adams (1965) first proposed equity theory, which deals with the relative amount of reward.
According to equity theory, when one perceives the ratio of rewards over investment to be lower than that of others, he/she will feel unfairness. In contrast, when one considers the ratio of rewards over investment equal to or greater than that of others, he/she will feel fairness (Adams, 1965). An individual’s perception of fairness can lead to positive attitude and behavior, while perceived unfairness generates negative attitude and behavior (Adams, 1965).

Equity theory has been applied and confirmed in many disciplines and fields, including organization behavior and service marketing, resulting in organizational justice theory and service fairness theory. Organizational justice theory views the relationship between an organization and its employees as two parties of a social exchange. Employees offer their time and efforts to the organization (input) and in return gain benefits and compensation (outcomes) from the organization. Comparing socially to a reference person or group, employees may perceive either equity or inequity. The literature generally confirms three dimensions of organizational justice: procedural, distributive, and interactional justice. These three dimensions of organizational justice are independent constructs related to employees’ attitudes (Colquitt, 2001).

Procedural justice can be regarded as perceived fairness of the process and procedures through which people make decisions to allocate resources and benefits (Folger & Greenberg, 1985; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). To guarantee procedural justice, it is important to have participants’ input or voice reflected in the outcome (DeConinck, 2010). Distributive justice was derived from equity theory (Adams, 1965), and can be defined as the perceived fairness of outcomes.
as allocated among employees (Colquitt, 2001). Based on the perceived ratio of what an employee gains from his or her job in comparison with other people, equity or inequity can be determined. Interactional justice means the interpersonal treatment or the level of perceived fairness in how people are treated in an organization (Bies & Moag, 1986). It mainly focuses on the interpersonal treatment received by subordinates from management, and refers to how management communicates with subordinates, and the degree of respect and honesty shown. Unlike procedural justice which examines the process of rewards allocation, interactional justice mainly focuses on people’s perception of interpersonal treatment by managers (Elicker, Levy, & Hall, 2006).

Success of sustainable destination development depends on support from residents (Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Su et al., 2018), and whether individuals are treated fairly or not will have a major influence on their attitudes and behavior (Aryee et al., 2002; Camerman et al., 2007; DeConinck, 2010; Roch & Shanock, 2006). Thus, this study tries to explore the dimensions of community residents’ perceived justice, and then examine their effects on other related constructs in the integrated model.

**Organizational Support Theory**

Organizational support theory supposes that employees personify the organization. Perceived organizational support is defined as “the extent to which employees perceived that their contributions are valued by their organization and that the firm cares about their well-being”
Organizational support reflects employee perceptions on how their company is ready to offer assistance and support when employees need (Yang, Li, & Huang, 2017).

Destinations can be regarded as complex organizations within the tourism industry (Buhalis, 2003), and residents in the destination can be seen as the ‘employees’ of destination since they deliver tourism products and services to visitors (Su et al., 2018). Thus, the organizational support theory can be applied to the destination community context. In this context, perceived community support reflects residents’ views on the extent to which the destination care for their needs and value their participation in tourism.

**Social Identity Theory**

Based on intergroup theory, social psychologists developed social identity theory to illustrate the impact of group membership on people’s intergroup behavior (Carmon et al., 2010). By categorizing individuals into groups, intergroup theory proposed individuals would favor the groups they belong to, and form a different attitude toward other groups of which they are not a member (Tajfel, 1982). However, categorization may not be the only reason for group favoritism (Turner, 1975). The combination of group categorization and social identity elicits a more comprehensive approach to understand intergroup behavior, which led to development of social identity theory.
Social identity theory supposes that in addition to a single personal identity, an individual may own multiple social identities (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). A person’s social identity may be formed if he or she can identify himself/herself into distinct social categories (Scott, 2007), by seeing the similarities with some social groups (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Through comparing themselves with others in their organizations, individuals develop their social identities (Pratt, 1998). Similarly, community residents may undergo the same process to develop their social identities. With a clear social identity, a person tend to distinguish in-group members who are socially desirable from those out-group members who are not socially desirable (Patel, Budhwar, & Varma, 2012). After individuals have developed their own social identity, they begin to make inter-group comparisons. individuals’ appraisal of their social identities are enabled by inter-group comparisons (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

**Hypotheses Development**

*The Effect of Residents’ Perceived Justice on Perceived Community Support*

Organizational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986) suggests that perceived organizational support is related to fair treatment (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). According to results of a meta-analysis by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) on the antecedents of perceived organization support, fairness of treatment was strongly related to perceived organizational support. Fairness in distribution of organizational resources has a significant effect on perceived organizational support as employees may perceive that the organization cares about their needs for life (Shore
& Shore, 1995). Shore and Shore (1995) also suggested that procedural justice may contribute to perceived organizational support. Moideenkutty et al. (2001) identified that distributive justice is positively related to perceived organizational support. They demonstrate that distributive justice signals the intent or willingness of an organization to reward employees’ extra efforts to satisfy organizational goals, which subsequently leads to employees’ perception that the organization values their contributions.

Some previous literature has proven the positive relationship between organizational justice and perceived organizational support (e.g., DeConinck, 2010; Loi et al., 2006; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Ambrose and Schimke (2003) found interactional justice significantly influences perceived organizational support. DeConinck (2010) examined how organizational justice perceptions affected perceived support and trust among marketing employees, showing that procedural justice and distributive justice positively influenced perceived organizational support, and interactional justice positively impacted perceived supervisor support. Loi et al. (2006) also found that distributive justice is positively related to perceived organizational support. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) identified a high correlation between perceived organizational support and both procedural justice and interactional justice. Therefore, it can be concluded that perceived justice, including procedural, distributive and interactional justice, is significantly related to perceived organizational support. Thus, we develop the following hypotheses:

\textit{H1a: Perceived procedural justice positively impacts perceived community support.}

\textit{H2a: Perceived distributive justice positively impacts perceived community support.}
**H3a: Perceived interactional justice positively impacts perceived community support.**

The Effect of Residents’ Perceived Justice on Community Identification

Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) posits that people identify themselves through their social-group memberships. An individual’s social identity forms part of the person’s self; and this self concept is closed associated with the person’s knowledge and acceptance of membership in the social group he or she belongs to (Tajfel, 1978, p.63). Specifically, identification refers to “a relatively enduring state” a person defines herself or himself as a social group member (Haslam, 2001, p. 383). Organizations that have fair procedures and channels in internal communication and resource allocation can gain their employees’ respect and motivate the employee to identify themselves with the organizations (Blader & Tyler, 2009; Tyler & Blader, 2002).

Some studies have confirmed the association between perceived justice and organizational identification (e.g., Carmon et al., 2010; Lipponen et al., 2004; Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006; Tyler & Blader, 2002). Olkkonen and Lipponen (2006) examined the antecedents and consequences of organizational identification and work-unit identification. Their empirical results showed organization-focused procedural justice and distributive justice positively impacted organizational identification, and supervisor-focused interactional justice positively influenced work-unit identification. Thus, it can be inferred that perceived justice may enhance residents’ community identification. Therefore, the following hypotheses are formulated:
\textit{H1b: Perceived procedural justice positively impacts community identification.} \\
\textit{H2b: Perceived distributive justice positively impacts community identification.} \\
\textit{H3b: Perceived interactional justice positively impacts community identification.}

\textit{The Effect of Perceived Community Support on Residents’ QOL}

According to organizational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986), employees exchange job commitment and effort with their organisation for financial benefits as well as socio-emotional rewards like recognition, approval and esteem (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006). Organizational support theory demonstrates that perceived organizational support has socio-emotional function because it meets employees’ needs for esteem, approval, affiliation, and emotional support (Rhoades & Esenberger, 2002). Perceived organizational support could fulfill the socio-emotional needs of employees’ and/or provide them with the feeling of assurance to get help form the organization if needed, which could finally increase their level of subjective well-being (Caesens et al., 2016). Thus, when people’s socio-emotional needs are satisfied, their perception of quality of life will improve (Kurtessis et al., 2017). Perceived organizational support could contribute to a self-enhancement process among employees that make them experience an enhanced state of subjective well-being (Caesens et al., 2016).

Eisenberger and Stinglhamber (2011) argued that high perceived organizational support could provide indications that help will be received when needed, leading employees to anticipate the future with more confidence and thus to lever up their subjective well-being. Besides,
organizational support may develop employees’ global beliefs that their organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Thus, organizational support is related to employees’ QOL. Panaccio and Vandenberghe (2009) indicated that perceived organizational support positively impacts well-being through affective organizational commitment. At the same time, they found perceived organizational support is negatively related to perceived lack of employee alternatives, which in turn negatively affects employee well-being. Caesens et al. (2016) demonstrated that perceived organizational support positively predicts employees’ weekly work engagement, which positively affects employees’ weekly well-being. Besides, some other studies have indicated that perceived social support is a critical factor for improving quality of life (e.g., Kang et al., 2018; Lampinen et al., 2006; Seeman, 2000). As such, based on organizational support theory and previous empirical findings, the following hypothesis is developed:

\[ H4: \text{Perceived community support positively impacts residents’ QOL.} \]

The Effect of Community Identification on Residents’ QOL

It appears little research has examined the relationship between community identification and residents’ QOL in destination community context. However, in organizational literature, some studies have confirmed that employees’ organizational identification is positively related to their well-being (Avanzi et al., 2012). Multiple reasons may hold in explaining why identification could positively influence QOL (Haslam, 2004). Particularly, identification can help satisfy important needs, such as the need for safety, belonging, self-enhancement, and
reducing uncertainty (Ashforth et al., 2008; Avanzi et al., 2012; Hogg & Terry, 2000). Individuals who are highly identified with their group may perceive those who belong to the same group (i.e., in-group members) more positively. As a result, individuals could respond more positively toward their colleagues. Thus, individuals who identify themselves closely with their organizations would have higher well-being than those less identified individuals (Avanzi et al., 2012). Van Dick and Haslam (2012) suggested that organizational identification has direct and indirect positive influence on individuals’ well-being. Using a meta-analysis method, Riketta (2005) also indicated that identification with the organization or subgroups of the organization could improve employees’ well-being.

Based on social identify theory and prior literature, we conjecture that community identification will help residents satisfy their needs, such as safety, belonging, self-enhancement, and certainty, all of which can increase residents’ QOL. Based on the above discussions, we propose the following hypothesis:

\[ H5: \text{Community identification positively impacts residents' QOL.} \]

The theoretical model underlying the effects of perceived justice (procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice) on residents’ QOL via perceived community support and community identification is depicted in Figure 1. Residents’ QOL is designated as an outcome variable in the model. Perceived community support and community identification are proposed as mediators between perceived justice and residents’ QOL.

**Figure 1 here**
Methodology

Questionnaire Design

This study adopted questionnaire survey in its data collection. The measures used in the questionnaire for this study come from previous studies. Based on previous literature, residents’ perceived justice includes procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice. The measurement of each dimension includes four items which were adapted from Colquitt (2001). Considering the context of the present study, the authors revised these items based on Colquitt’s (2001) organizational justice scale. Five items measuring perceived community support were adapted from Eisenberger et al. (1986). For community identification, we adapted the well-established measurement of organizational identification by Mael and Ashforth (1992), which has proven reliability in the context of hotel industry (So et al., 2013). Four relevant items were selected to measure resident identification towards the destination. This scale demonstrated high reliability and validity in Su et al.’s (2017) study in the context of ancient town destination. For all of the above items, respondents were asked to state their level of agreement with the statements using a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

For QOL, there are two measurement approaches: one measuring the general aspects of QOL (e.g., Dagger & Sweeney, 2006) and the other measuring specific domains of QOL (e.g.,
Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011). In this study, QOL perceptions were operationalized using a three-item global QOL scale from the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer’s (EORTC) Quality of life Questionnaire (QLQ; Aaronson, Ahmedzai, and Bergman, 1993). This scale has been extensively applied in different contexts with good reliability and validity (e.g., Aaronson, Ahmedzai, & Bergman, 1993; Dagger & Sweeney, 2006; Fossa, 1994; Ringdal & Ringdal, 1993). Specifically, in an ancient town tourism context, Su et al. (2018) confirmed that this scale has sufficient reliability and validity. Respondents were asked to evaluate the QOL statements on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very poor) to 7 (excellent). Based on the measurement scales, an English questionnaire was developed and then translated into Chinese. Back-translation performed by three independent bi-lingual speakers ensured linguistic equivalence for the research instrument. The authors resolved any discrepancy issues in translations prior to data collection.

**Pretest of the Measurements**

Before the formal survey, a pretest of the measurement items was conducted. First, four tourism management professors were asked to provide feedback regarding the layout, wording, and clarity of the measurement items. The questionnaire was then revised based on their feedback. Second, a convenience sample of 40 undergraduate students in a Chinese university were approached with consent to fill in the questionnaire for a pretest. The pretest results showed that Cronbach’s Alpha for each latent variable was larger than .70, representing sufficient reliability (Nunnally, 1978), and the standard factor loading for each item was greater than .50,
and significant at .001 level, suggesting adequate validity (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988).

**Sample and Data Collection**

Data for the current study was collected using a questionnaire survey following a convenience sampling approach. The survey was administered on the residents in Gulangyu Island, Xiamen, in China’s Fujian province. Gulangyu Island is renowned for its delicate natural beauty, its ancient relics and vanes architecture. Due to the enclosed island environment, the local community in the Island can be better defined. As the Island is a mature tourist destination, local residents possess sufficient knowledge and experiences in the Island’s tourism development and have been an active stakeholder group in destination governance (Wang, 2017). In such an Island tourism context, all the constructs included in this study are applicable and valid to reflect the destination development realities. The survey was conducted from March 18 to November 26, 2016. A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed, and 466 were returned (93.20% response rate). 453 surveys were complete and usable responses.

**Results**

**Sample Description**

Table 1 presents respondents’ demographic profiles. The sample had a balanced gender ratio between male (48.8%) and female (51.2%). Over half of the respondents were below 44 years
old. Most respondents had high school/technical school or undergraduate/associate degree education, and 7.9% of them had postgraduate degree. A majority of respondents earned a monthly income between 3000 ¥ and 5999 ¥. Over half of the respondents had lived on the island for more than 10 years.

**Table 1 here**

*Common-method Bias Test*

We used Harman’s single-factor method to test whether common method bias is an issue. Using SPSS 21.0, we included all the measurement items in an exploratory factor analysis. The solution identified six factors. The factor with the largest eigenvalue explains 41.88% of the total variance, which is below 50% and thus suggests the absence of common method bias (Chang, Witteloostuijn, and Eden, 2010).

*Measurement Model Test*

We first conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with all the latent constructs in the model (i.e., procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice, perceived community support, community identification, and quality of life) to test the measurement model. The model was estimated using Maximum Likelihood (ML) method. The fit indices ($\chi^2=556.701$, $df=237$, $p<.001$, $\chi^2 / df =2.349$, RMR=.071, RMSEA=.055, GFI=.906, AGFI=.881, NFI=.930, RFI=.919, IFI=.959, TLI=.952, CFI=.958) indicated an acceptable fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999).
We adopted composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha coefficient to examine reliability of the measurements. As shown in Table 2, the composite reliability of the measurements ranged from .862 to .914, and the Cronbach’s alphas ranged from .861 to .913, all indicating sufficient reliabilities (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Nunnaly, 1978). Subsequently, both convergent validity and discriminant validity were inspected. As shown in Table 2, the item factor loadings ranged from .631 to .912, all significant at .001 level. At the same time, the average variance extracted (AVE) of all constructs ranged from .577 to .780, greater than the threshold value of .500. Therefore, the convergent validity is satisfied. As shown in Table 3, the square root of AVE ranged from .759 to .884, all higher than the correlations among the constructs (ranged from .361 to .624), indicating satisfactory discriminant validity.

**Table 2 here**

**Table 3 here**

**Structural Model Test**

After the measurement model test, we went further to test the structural model and its associated hypotheses. Once again, we applied Maximum Likelihood (ML) as the model estimation method. Model fit indices ($\chi^2=619.615, df=241, p<.001, \chi^2/df =2.571$, RMSEA=.059, GFI=.900, AGFI=.873, NFI=.922, RFI=.911, IFI=.951, TLI=.944, CFI=.951) showed that the model fit the data very well. The results are shown in Table 4 and Figure 2. The path coefficients from perceived procedural justice and perceived interactional justice to perceived community support were .415 and .341, respectively, both significant at .001 level. However, the path coefficient from perceived distributive justice to perceived community support was not
significant. As such, while H1a and H3a were supported, H2a was not supported. On the other hand, while perceived procedural justice (β=.265; p<.001) and distributive justice (β=.374; p<.001) were found to significantly affect community identification, the path coefficient between interactional justice and community identification was not significant. Therefore, H1b and H2b were supported while H3b was not. Finally, perceived community support (β=.322, p<.001) and community identification (β=.282, p<.001) were found to positively influence residents’ QOL, providing support to H4 and H5.

**Explanation Power of the Model**

According to Cohen (1988), R² values of .01, .09, and .25 could be used as the threshold values to demonstrate small, medium and large effects of the model’s explanation power. The model explained 48.4%, 40.1% and 25.5% of the variances of perceived community support, community identification and residents’ QOL. Therefore, large effects of exogenous variable (i.e., perceived procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice) on the endogenous variables (i.e., perceived community support, community identification and residents’ QOL) were captured in the model, suggesting a strong explanation power of the model.

**Table 4 here**

**Figure 2 here**
Discussion and Conclusions

This study aims to examine how perceived justice in the destination community can improve residents’ QOL through the mediation of perceived community support and community identification, based on the organizational justice theory, organizational support theory and social identity theory. The study results have several important theoretical contributions to the residents’ QOL literature. This study claims its originality in examining resident QOL from the perspectives of community justice, community support and community identification. The study has confirmed the role of perceived justice, perceived community support and identification in improving resident QOL.

Although the dimensions of organizational justice were well-established in organizational behavior literature, to our knowledge, few studies have examined the dimensions of perceived justice from destination community residents’ perspective. This study firstly confirmed the dimensions of residents’ perceived justice in the destination context. The results support the recommendation of previous organization literature (e.g., Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; DeConinck & Johnson, 2009) that separate measurements of organizational justice in its three dimensions should be used. The results suggest that dimensions of residents’ perceived justice were significant and direct predictors of perceived community support and community identification, and indirect predictors of resident QOL. Therefore, our results have contributed theoretically to the justice and quality of life literature by confirming that three dimensions of residents’ perceived justice were associated with
According to organization support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986), perceived organizational justice and organizational support are positively correlated. Some studies reported perceived organizational support is related to procedural justice (e.g., DeConinck, 2010; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), and interactional justice (e.g., Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Although the early research on organizational justice mainly focuses on distributive justice, most studies have ignored distributive justice in models where perceived support has been analyzed (DeConinck, 2010). In their meta-analysis, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) found no studies analyzed the relationship between distributive justice and perceived organizational support. Recently, some studies have found distributive justice is related to perceived organizational support, but the effect was found to be non-significant (e.g., Camerman et al., 2007; Roch & Shanock, 2006).

Camerman et al. (2007) and Roch and Shanock (2006) demonstrate that distributive justice is highly correlated with perceived organizational support, with correlation coefficients to be .67 and .36 respectively. However, distributive justice does not seem to have a significant direct influence on perceived organizational support. The present study also shows that all the three dimensions of justice (procedural, distributive, and interactional) are significantly correlated with perceived community support. However, while procedural justice and interactional justice were found to positively influence perceived community support, distributive justice did not significantly impact perceived community support. These findings are similar to findings of resident QOL.
previous studies. The reason may be that distributive justice mainly focuses on the fairness of outcomes and represents the transactional relationship between an organization and its employees that may be screened out of the perception of organizational support (DeConinck, 2010). On the other hand, procedural justice mainly focuses on the process and procedure of a decision (Folger & Greenberg, 1985; Thibaut & Walker, 1975), and interactional justice involves people’s perception that they are treated with fairness and receive interpersonal esteem in the interactional process with the organization (Bies & Moag, 1986). Compared to distributive justice, both procedural and interactional justice need a high degree of involvement and a long-term engagement with the residents. With a high level of engagement, residents may develop a good sense of community support.

Some organizational literature has proven that perceived justice is positively related to organizational identification (e.g., Carmon et al., 2010; Lipponen et al., 2004; Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006; Tyler & Blader, 2002). Consistent with previous organizational literature, the present study identified that two of the three dimensions of perceived justice, namely, procedural and distributive justice, positively influence community identification in the destination development context. However, the influence of interactional justice on community identification was not significant. In the Chinese context, community members may be more concerned with distribution of benefit in the process of tourism development (Huang & Chen, 2016). Therefore, procedural and distributive justice may better serve their needs in tourism development, thus strengthening their sense of belonging and identification to the community. On the other hand, interactional justice in this study reflects the tourism authority’s approaches
of communicating and interacting with the residents, which may not be perceived as key to enhancing residents’ community identification. In tourism literature, few studies have examined the relationship between perceived justice and community identification. Therefore, further studies are required to test and validate the results in other tourism contexts.

Precisely, this study is unique in being the first to show that perceived community support can improve resident QOL in the destination setting. In organizational behavior literature, some studies suggest that perceived organizational support is positively related to employees’ subjective well-being (Caesens et al., 2016), job satisfaction (e.g., Caesens & Stinglhamber, 2014), perceived stress (e.g., Caesens et al., 2014), and psychological strains (e.g., Caesens & Stinglhamber, 2014). The results of this study extended these relevant findings into the destination community setting. More importantly, we found that perceived community support is an important mediator between perceived justice and resident QOL. These findings are consistent with organizational justice theory and organizational support theory, and empirically support and extend the views that justice is positively related to QOL (e.g., Elovainio et al., 2001, 2005; Huong et al., 2016; Qin et al., 2014; Tepper, 2001) and perceived organizational support is positively related to QOL (e.g., Caesens et al., 2016; Rhoades & Esenberger, 2002).

Another theoretical contribution of this study lies in the finding that residents’ community identification will improve their QOL. In organizational behavior literature, some studies suggest that employee organizational identification is positively related to employee well-being (e.g., Avanzi et al., 2012; van Dick & Haslam, 2012; Riketta, 2005). The results of this study
extended the link between organizational identification and employee wellbeing in the destination community setting. We also found that community identification is an important mechanism that explains the positive relationship between perceived justice and resident QOL. Our results indicated that perceived justice has a positive influence on community identification, which, in turn enhances resident QOL. These findings are consistent with organizational justice theory and social identity theory, and empirically supported and extended the views that justice is positively related to QOL (e.g., Elovaïnio et al., 2001, 2005; Huong et al., 2016; Qin et al., 2014; Tepper, 2001), and that organizational identification is positively related to QOL (e.g., Avanzi et al., 2012; Riketta, 2005; van Dick & Haslam, 2012). As no prior study has examined the relationship between community identification and resident QOL in destination community context, the positive effect of community identification on resident QOL needs further validation in other destination contexts.

**Practical Implications**

This study has important managerial implications. According to these results, in order to improve QOL for community residents, destination managers should treat residents fairly in the development process of a destination. Managers should reinforce procedural fairness, perceptions of fairness with regards to distribution of resources, and the quality of interactions with local residents. When residents perceive the procedure is unfair, they will direct their actions toward the destination (DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004). Therefore, destination managers need to clearly explain the procedures and make sure the process is clear and fair. Community
should exert consistent and unbiased practices, equitable outcomes and respectful and appropriate interpersonal exchanges. Because voice is a key component of procedural justice, giving participants a voice can mitigate the outcome and alleviate dissatisfaction (Folger, 1977). Thus, managers need to give residents autonomy, and allow them to express their “voice” in the process of destination development. Community managers should engage all community members in the formal decision-making process, which will lead to residents’ perceptions of community support.

Destination managers and community leaders also need to confirm whether residents perceive that they are being rewarded for their input and efforts (distributive justice). The perception of how fair the community has been allocating rewards when residents evaluate their inputs with respect to other residents in their community determines the degree of distributive justice. On the other hand, in order to improve interactional justice, it is important for destination managers and community leaders to share information with residents in an open, honest and timely manner. Thus, open and transparent communication channels, both online and offline, need be in place to promote interactional justice with the aim of enhancing residents’ perceived community support and identification, which in turn improve their QOL.

Managers and leaders of community should also develop and provide more community support to local residents, as ways to effectively leverage resident QOL. Community programs can be put in place to recognize residents’ contributions to the destination, and provide favorable rewards and living conditions for residents. For instance, providing residents with skill training
is a discretionary practice which sends out a signal on the interest to invest on the residents.

The findings show that community identification can improve resident QOL. Thus, destination managers and community leaders should foster community identification among community members. An identification-building strategy could be formulated. Community needs to devise appropriate strategies for sustained, deep, and meaningful resident-community interactions that embed residents in the community and make them feel as insiders and develop a sense of ownership. Such interactions may strengthen the instrumentality that characterizes most resident-community relationships.

**Limitations and Future Research**

This study has several limitations which offer directions for future research. First, this study was confined in an island destination context and the findings may not be generalizable to other contexts. Future research may test the modelled relationships in other destination contexts. Second, residents may form different perceptions, attitudes and QOL conceptions in different life cycle stages of a destination (Kim, Uysal, & Sirgy, 2013). Future studies may collect data from multiple destinations in different life cycle stages and examine how destination life cycle stage moderates the relationships in the model. Third, like most previous studies, this study only applied a cross-sectional survey design. Future studies may resort to a longitudinal survey design to more effectively test the proposed causal relationships. Lastly, we should acknowledge that although data normality is not extremely violated, our data deviated from a
perfect normal distribution. Given that we have a large enough sample size, this may not be an issue to discredit the findings of the study.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Monthly Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 yrs</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>Less than 3000 ¥</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44 yrs</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>3000 to 3999 ¥</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 yrs</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>4000 to 4999 ¥</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 yrs or over</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>5000 to 5999 ¥</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6000 ¥ or More</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Length of Residency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/Technical School</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate/Associate Degree</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>10 to 15 years</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Degree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Standard Factor Loading</td>
<td>t-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived procedural justice (α=.911)</td>
<td>You have been able to express your views and feelings during relevant tourism policy decision-making processes.</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>24.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived procedural justice</td>
<td>Relevant tourism policies and practice decisions have been built on accurate information in the process of tourism development.</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>24.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant tourism policies and practices have been applied consistently in the process of tourism development.</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.324</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>22.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant tourism policies and practices have upheld ethical and moral standards in the process of tourism development.</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>18.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived distributive justice (α=.905)</td>
<td>Your rewards reflect the efforts that you put into your work in the process of tourism development.</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>21.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your rewards are appropriate for the work that you have completed in the process of tourism development.</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>23.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your rewards reflect what you have contributed to the organization in the process of tourism development.</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>22.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your rewards have justified your performance in the process of tourism development.</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.398</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>19.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived interactional justice</td>
<td>You have been treated with politeness, respect and dignity when you are connecting with tourism administration.</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>18.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The tourism authority has been open, frank, and honest in communicating with you in the process of tourism development.</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>19.346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Perceived community support (α=.870)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Mard.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tourism authority has explained the tourism policies and their process thoroughly.</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>19.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tourism authority has communicated details of tourism policies in a timely manner.</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>18.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulangyu Island is willing to help me when I need a special favor.</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>18.201</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulangyu Island strongly considers my goals and values.</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>20.354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulangyu Island cares for me in all aspects (e.g., family, health, work etc.).</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>14.253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulangyu Island cares about my general satisfaction at life.</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>19.461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulangyu Island tries to make my life as interesting and satisfactory as possible.</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>18.997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very interested in what others think about Gulangyu Island.</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.338</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>19.026</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulangyu Island’s successes are my successes.</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.362</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>22.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone praises Gulangyu Island, it feels like a personal compliment.</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.460</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>23.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone criticizes Gulangyu Island, it feels like a personal insult.</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.402</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>22.162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community identification (α=.911)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Mard.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your overall health?</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>23.239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your overall function (physical, role, cognitive, emotional, and social)?</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>24.529</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate our overall quality of life?</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>22.132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quality of life (α=.913)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Mard.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your overall health?</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>23.239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your overall function (physical, role, cognitive, emotional, and social)?</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>24.529</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate our overall quality of life?</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>22.132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goodness-of-fit Indices

\[ \chi^2 / df = 2.349, \text{RMR} = .071, \text{RMSEA} = .055, \text{GFI} = .906, \text{AGFI} = .881, \text{NFI} = .930, \text{RFI} = .919, \text{IFI} = .959, \text{TLI} = .952, \text{CFI} = .958 \]
Table 3. Inter-construct correlation coefficients and AVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPJ</th>
<th>PDJ</th>
<th>PIJ</th>
<th>PCS</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>QOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived procedural justice (PPJ)</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived distributive justice (PDJ)</td>
<td>.493***</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived interactional justice (PIJ)</td>
<td>.602***</td>
<td>.599***</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived community support (PCS)</td>
<td>.624***</td>
<td>.433***</td>
<td>.599***</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community identification (CI)</td>
<td>.509***</td>
<td>.563***</td>
<td>.487***</td>
<td>.361***</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life (QOL)</td>
<td>.526***</td>
<td>.460***</td>
<td>.519***</td>
<td>.391***</td>
<td>.384***</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: square root of average variance extracted (AVE) values are shown on the diagonal of the matrix; inter-construct correlations are shown off the diagonal; *** means significant at the level of .001.
Table 4. Structural model test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Hypothesis Supported?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>PPJ→ PCS</td>
<td>.415***</td>
<td>7.100</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>PDJ→ PCS</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>PIJ→ PCS</td>
<td>.341***</td>
<td>5.222</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>PPJ→ CI</td>
<td>.265***</td>
<td>4.647</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>PDJ→ CI</td>
<td>.374***</td>
<td>6.363</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>PIJ→ CI</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>1.657</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>PCS→ QOL</td>
<td>.322***</td>
<td>6.010</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>CI→ QOL</td>
<td>.282***</td>
<td>5.423</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PPJ=Perceived Procedural Justice; PDJ=Perceived Distributive Justice; PIJ=Perceived Interactional Justice; PCS=Perceived Community Support; CI=Community Identification; QOL=Residents’ QOL; *** means significant at the level of .001.
Figure 1. Theoretical model
Figure 2. Results of structural model
Notes: *** means significant at the level of .001; ns means not significant at the level of .05.