1. INTRODUCTION

Many managers and researchers are aware that to effectively compete in the market, businesses need to retain their employees. Minimizing employee intention to leave is possible if employees feel committed to the business (Naqvi, 2011). It is important for all kinds of businesses to ensure organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Tourism, which is a labor-intensive service sector, has a high human relationship and values job satisfaction and organizational commitment more than other sectors (Toker, 2007). In accommodation businesses, having an important position in the tourism sector work schedule is notably tiring. Therefore, organizational commitment level is often low, intention to leave is excessive and employee turnover rates can be high (Su, Lee and Fan, 2011; Üngüren, Cengiz and Algür, 2009; Rızaoğlu and Ayyıldız, 2008).

Many factors can affect employee job satisfaction and their feelings regarding organizational commitment. However, one of the most important factors is the leadership behavior of managers (Webb 2011).

Leaders can influence and lead (manage) their employees, but those who are not ethical, honest and reliable have difficulties in keeping their employees (Brown and Mitchell, 2010; Toor and Ofori, 2009; Ulrich, O'Donnell, Taylor, Farrar, Danis and Grady 2007). The studies of Viteel and Singhapakdi (2008) have shown that open (clear) ethical behavior on the part of managers positively affects job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Thus, employees could adhere to their managers and businesses with the help of managers’ ethical behaviors and imposing that to their employees and the confidence occurred due to working in a fair environment (Schwepker, 2001; Deconinck, 2010).

While there has been research carried out on the relationship between ethical leadership, organizational commitment and job satisfaction, this relationship has not sufficiently been examined in terms of hotel businesses, as one of the most important stakeholders of the tourism sector. Therefore, (1) the relationship between ethical leadership, organizational commitment and job satisfaction in hotel industries and (2) the mediator role of organizational commitment.
ment between ethical leadership and job satisfaction were examined in this study. In this regard, the study is important in terms of contributing to the literature and raising the awareness of employees working in the tourism sector. It is also hoped that the findings will inform employees and management about ethical leadership, organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Within this scope, a questionnaire study was conducted and the findings were tested using the LISREL programme.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Ethical Leadership

Today, the term 'ethics' commonly refers to a written or unwritten ethical system that defines what is culturally considered wrong or right, good or bad (Aronson, 2001) and what kinds of components an ethical and virtuous lifestyle contains (April, Locke and Mlambo, 2010). On the other hand, within the field of leadership, researchers have not yet found a common definition for what constitutes ethics. Leadership defined by Davis (1981: 141) as "the capability of convincing people to strive in order to reach the organizational goals." After examining many definitions, Çelik (2012: 6) defined leadership as "a process during which the goals of a business or a group are determined and the group members are led to reach these goals with the help of influence."

In many studies conducted on leadership, the emphasis has been on the leadership process, leader behaviors, relationship with audience and organizational outputs (Gardner et al., 2005; April et al., 2010; Ali-nei, 2006; Powers, 2006; Adeyemi, 2010; Yukl, 2002). However, in recent years, leadership has become associated with current unethical behaviors (see, for example, Enron, WorldCom, Parmalat) in business life, and governments have imposed new regulations enhancing studies in ethical leadership (Brown, Trevino and Harrison, 2005; Resick et al. 2011; Den Hartog and Belschak, 2012). Since the 2000s, many studies (Aronson, 2001; Van den Akker, Heres, Lasthuizen and Six, 2009; April et al., 2010; Mihelic, Lipicnik and Tkavcic, 2010; Kalshoven, Den Hartog, De Hoog, 2011; Elçi, Şener, Aksoy and Alpkân, 2012) have focused on what ethical leadership behavior should be and what its effects are. Resick et al. (2011) stated that most leadership theories and research were created with a Western perspective in mind. However, as they write, ethical leadership studies have also been discussed from a Chinese perspective and have been inspired from Confucian philosophy, adding that most ethical leadership research were examined by paternal leadership researchers.

Aronson (2001) was one of the first researchers who studied ethical perspectives and leadership styles together (Acar et al., 2012; Zhu et al., 2004). Additionally, Brown et al. (2005) were among first researchers to empirically study ethical leadership. According to Brown et al. (2005: 120), ethical leadership is "the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making". Zhu, May and Avolio (2004: 18) defined ethical leaders as "individuals who are impartial and unbiased, exhibit ethical behaviors, take the wishes of people into notice and protect their employees' rights fairly". Ethical leaders guide not only their workers in their enterprises but also the shareholders and aims of the enterprise (Elçi et al., 2012) and they are role models for their followers (Watson, 2010). Resick et al. (2006), in their study, indicated that 6 common characteristics of ethical leaders are character and honesty, ethical awareness, focusing on society, ability to motivate, encourage, empower and take ethical responsibility.

In Bass's (1990) transformational leadership theory, the idealized influence dimension puts forward the ethical aspect of leadership. However, Brown et al. (2005) emphasized that the idealized influence dimension reflects visionary leadership and is not related with ethical leadership. Additionally, Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) stated that transformational leadership should be examined equally with ethical leadership. They distinguished between authentic and false transformational leadership. False transformational leadership refers to a leader who is dishonest and unreliable and only thinks of his/herself, whereas authentic transformational leadership refers to leaders who care about other people and pay attention to constitution-based values of individuals who have adopted ethical values. Trevino, Brown and Hartman (2003) stated that the primary purpose of ethical leadership is to standardize behaviors and to set ethical values and principles, as these elements affect performance in a positive way. The European Business Ethics Commission indicated that 13 steps should be followed in order to create an ethical culture and emphasized that leaders should practice ethical principles and ‘walk the talk’ (Dercks, 2001).

Since leaders have the power and ability to lead and influence people, they influence mood (morale), motivation, performance and behaviors of employees. Therefore, leaders should behave ethically and express themselves clearly in order that employees in turn act in an ethical way (Brown and Mitchell, 2010;
Den Hartog and Belschak, 2012; Thomas, Schermerhorn and Dienhart, 2004). The reason why top managers are successful is that they understood the ethical concepts and behave in accordance with them. To improve ethical behaviors continuously and to work more ethically each day, managers need to willing (Thomas et al., 2004). Additionally, ethical leadership is an important component in terms of creating an ethical organizational culture and environment (Trevino et al., 2003). Besides, improvement observed in ethical leadership behaviors positively affects the commitment, organizational confidence and interpersonal relationships of employees (Ahmed et al., 2012; Brown et al., 2005).

2.2. Job Satisfaction

Research on job satisfaction started in the 1930s and has since then been the most focused subject of organizational behavior (Kim, Tavitiyaman and Kim, 2009). Researchers (Locke, 1976; Hoppock; 1935) have defined job satisfaction in different ways. One of the first definitions of the concept was by Hoppock (Tsai et al., 2007) who stated that psychological, physical and environmental conditions are affective on employees who say, “I am pleased with my job” (Yew, 2008: 30). One of the most comprehensive and acceptable definitions of job satisfaction in the literature is by Locke. Locke (1976) stated that job satisfaction is a positive emotion occurring as a result of employee value regarding job and working environment and perceptual interaction and is a result of employees’ assessments regarding their expectations from the job and real working environment. When the definitions are examined, it can be stated that job satisfaction is the contentment employees gain from their jobs.

Job satisfaction has also been expressed as an important component in many theories (Two Factor Theory, Equity Theory, and Maslow’s Theory of Hierarchy of Needs, etc.) (Aziri, 2011; Toker, 2007). As well, much job-satisfaction based research has been carried out (Üngüren et al., 2009; Saari and Judge, 2004; Van Saane et al., 2003; Lam, 2001; Aziri, 2011) using end scales (the Minnesota satisfaction scale, job description scale, Porter Need and Satisfaction scale, etc.) that have been developed to measure job satisfaction. For instance, the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale, developed by Weiss (1967) and a preferred scale in the research literature, is composed of three dimensions: internal (value, responsibility, success, social statue, position in the job, etc.) and external (wage, promotion, employee relationships, supports, management policies and applications, etc.) employee relationships and total job satisfaction (total of internal and external satisfaction.). The Michigan Organizational commitment Assessment Survey-Sub-Scale of Job Satisfaction is another job satisfaction scale composed of three questions and commonly used in the research literature for examining job satisfaction in a general sense. The reason why job satisfaction is so intensively researched is that it is important for both businesses and employees. It is important for business, because it affects productivity, performance, profits and many other outputs. It is also important for employees because having a good working life meets the needs of employees and positively affects life quality (Üngüren et al., 2010).

2.3. Organizational Commitment

The importance of organizational commitment has been emphasized in the literature as it relates to many subjects (i.e., job, profession, career, business) in many areas (i.e., sociology, industrial psychology, health psychology) (Martin and Roodt, 2008). Although much research has been done, often using improper scales, organizational commitment can be difficult to synthesize and define (Meyer and Allen, 1991; Kimbel, 2002). In general, organizational commitment describes the affective commitment of employees to their business (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Naqvi et al., 2011). Porter, Crampon and Smith (1976: 87-98) define organizational commitment “as the relative strength of an individual’s identification and involvement in a particular organization”. Buchanan (1974: 533) defined organizational commitment as a “parison, affective attachment to the goals and values of an organization, to one’s role in relation to goals and values, and to organization for its own sake, apart from, it’s purely instrumental worth.”

The most focused models used to explain organizational commitment are the Three Dimensional Organizational Commitment Model of Meyer and Allen and the Organizational Commitment Model of Mowday and his associates. Meyer and Allen (1991) separated organizational commitment into three dimensions: affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. Affective commitment is defined as staying in a job for emotional reasons; continuation commitment, commitment caused by the fear of losing the gains (money, position, etc.) from a job; and normative commitment defines the commitment, which is based on the feeling that leaving a job would be unethical because of employee’s responsibilities and obligations (Brown, 2003; Cohen, 2007). Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) indicated that in order to insure organizational commitment, it is necessary to (a) accept the values and goals of a business; (b) to voluntarily make an effort for the interests of the business; and (c) to have
a wish to stay in the business (Maxwell and Stelee, 2003). Similarly, Buchanan (1974) indicated that such factors as business identification, involvement and loyalty are necessary for organizational commitment. Mowday et al. (1979) examined organizational commitment in terms of attitudinal and behavioral aspects in their organizational commitment scale. The attitudinal perspective presents the identification of values and aims of employees with the enterprise’s values and aims, whereas behavioral perspective defines commitment according to the employee’s approach towards problems in enterprises and his/her continuation in the enterprise (Meyer and Allen, 1991).

The one-dimensional organizational commitment scale of Mowday et al. (1979) was used in this study because it was preferred in many studies (Cohen, 1993; Testa, 2001; Suki and Suki 2011; Çokluk and Yılmaz, 2010; Çavuş and Gürdoğan, 2008) and it reveals the psychometric characteristics of employees in detail (Angle and Perry, 1981).

2.4. Ethical Leadership, Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction Relationships in the Hotel Industry

There are many studies (Ahmadi, Ahmadi and Zohrabi, 2012; Atmojo, 2012; Darvish and Rezaei, 2011; Munir et al., 2013; Ponnu and Tennakoon, 2009) in the literature that examine the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. However, the research, especially targeting the relationship of ethical leadership with organizational commitment and job satisfaction, is notably limited. It has been established that leaders are effective in creating organizational commitment and ensuring job satisfaction (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Lam, Zhang and Baum, 2001). The ethical behavior of leaders especially increases the commitment and job satisfaction of employees (Ahmed et al., 2012; Brown, 2005). Ghahroodi, Mohd and Ghorban (2013), Zhu et al. (2004), Lim (2012), Toor and Ofori (2009) found in their studies that ethical leadership positively affects organizational commitment, while ethical leadership may also have a positive effect on job satisfaction (Brown et al., 2005). With the increase of job satisfaction in business, organizational commitment increases (Testa, 2001). Jermier and Berkes (1979), Gomes (2009) and Kappagoda (2012) also indicated in their studies that organizational commitment affects job satisfaction positively. Accordingly, the hypotheses and research model of the study was developed as stated below:

H₁: Ethical leadership positively affects job satisfaction.

H₂: Ethical leadership positively affects organizational commitment.

H₃: Organizational commitment positively affects job satisfaction.

H₄: Organizational commitment has a mediator role in the relationship of ethical leadership and job satisfaction.

Figure 1: Research Model

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Instrument

A survey research technique was used as the quantitative research method. The survey questionnaire in the study is composed of four sections. In the first section, there are 10 statements used for measuring ethical leadership behaviors, 7 statements for measuring the organizational commitment of employees are in second section and 3 statements for measuring job satisfaction of employees are in the third section. The questionnaire benefitted from the studies of Brown et al. (2005) for leadership behavior scale, Mowday et al. (1979) for the one-dimensional scale for organizational commitment and Brayfield and Rothe (1951) and Barsky et al. (2004) for job satisfaction scale. One of the job satisfaction statements was measured with reverse coding to ensure control. In the fourth section, there are seven questions regarding demographic information about employees.

3.2. Data Collection and Sample

The population of the study was composed of employees working in four and five star hotels in the Antalya region in Turkey. The questionnaires prepared with this scope were conducted by pollsters and applied to employees of four and five star hotels in the centre of the Antalya, Alanya and Manavgat region. 500 questionnaires were delivered in total and 400 copies of them returned. After removing those questionnaires with incomplete information, 391 questionnaires were used for analysis.

The majority of participants were composed of men (62.7%). When the ages of participants were analyzed, it was seen that the highest portion were in the 26-33 age range. Also, 62% of participants were single. When the educational background of
participants was analyzed, it was seen that the majority held high school diplomas (45.8%) and had a primary school (22.3%) education. When the occupational background of employees was examined, it was found that of the majority from five star hotels (79%), 29.9% has been working less than 1 year and 32.5% were working in catering departments.

3.3. Data Analysis

In accordance with the scope of the current study, structural equation modeling was used in order to determine the relationship between leadership, organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The two step approach, recommended by Anderson and Gerbing (1988), is preferred in structural equation modeling. Therefore, the measurement model was tested first followed by the structural model. Since the likelihood procedure method was used in estimation of the measurement model and structural model, normal distribution presumption was checked. For that reason, skewness and kurtosis values were analyzed. It can be stated that normal distribution was not disturbed since the skewness and kurtosis values did not exceed the proposed value (Kline, 2011).

In determining the mediator role of organizational commitment between leadership and job satisfaction, which is the other scope of the study, the B-K method (Baron and Kenny, 1986) was preferred.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Measurement Model
Since, following the results of the measurement model, the standard factor loadings regarding the first statement of organizational commitment and second statement of job satisfaction were under the recommended value .50, these two statements were removed and the model was re-estimated. Results regarding the measurement model are as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Measurement Model Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Observed Variables</th>
<th>Std. Fac. Load.</th>
<th>t values</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Leadership</td>
<td>My manager conducts his/her personal life in an ethical manner.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>*Fixed</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction .81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager defines success not just by results but also the way</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that they are obtained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager listens to what employees have to say.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager disciplines employees who violate ethical standards.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager makes fair and balanced decisions.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When making decisions, my manager asks “what is the right thing</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to do?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager can be trusted.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discusses business ethics or values with employees</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager sets an example of how to do things the right way</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in terms of ethics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager has the best interests of employees in mind.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>*Fixed</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>keep working for this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I find that my values and the organization’s values are very</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>17.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>similar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This organization really inspires the very best in me in the</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>way of job performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>17.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my job at all points.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>*Fixed</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like working here in general sense.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-fit statistics</td>
<td>$\chi^2$=415.99, df=132, $\chi^2$/df=3.151, RMSEA=.074, CFI =.98, NFI=.98, IFI=.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: *Parameter fixed at 1.0 during ML estimation)
When the Table 1 is analyzed, it can be stated that goodness-of-fit-statistics is at an acceptable level (Marsh and Hocevar, 1985; Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger and Müller, 2003). Addition to fit indices regarding the measurement model, information regarding the discriminant validity, construct reliability and convergent validity used for the check of construct validity are shown in Table 1. When the Table 1 is analyzed, it is seen that all standard factor loadings are bigger than the recommended .50 value and all AVE values are in excess of the .50 value. Accordingly, it can be stated that convergent validity was provided (Hair et al., 2009). Also, the discriminant validity was insured, since the correlation values between structures exceeded the .90 value (Kline, 2011). Lastly, composite construct reliability (CCR) was checked while the construct reliability was being evaluated. As seen in Table 1, CCR values are .94 for leadership, .92 for organizational commitment and .80 for job satisfaction. According to findings, construct reliability was insured (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Thus, it can be stated that construct validity was insured in addition to fit indices.

4.2. Structural Model

After developing the measurement model, the structural model was developed in order to test the hypotheses. The results regarding the structural model are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Results of SEM and Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Std. Fac. Load. $\lambda$</th>
<th>t values</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_1$: Ethical Leadership $\rightarrow$ Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>21.12</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2$: Ethical Leadership $\rightarrow$ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3$: Organizational Commitment $\rightarrow$ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$: Organizational Commitment =.62, Job Satisfaction =.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the Table 2 was analyzed, it was seen that fit indices regarding the structural model are at an acceptable level ($\chi^2/df=3.299$, RMSEA=.077, CFI=.98, NFI=.97, IFI=.98) (Marsh and Hocevar, 1985; Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003). It was found that ethical leadership has a positive effect on organizational commitment ($\beta=.79$, $t=21.12$) and job satisfaction ($\beta=.24$, $t=3.85$), while organizational commitment has a positive effect on job satisfaction ($\beta=.72$, $t=11.17$). Therefore $H_1$, $H_2$ and $H_3$ were supported.

4.3. Mediation Analysis

Measuring the mediator roles of intervening variables in structural models is important for a developed model (Baron and Kenny, 1986). Therefore, the mediator role of organizational commitment between ethical leadership and job satisfaction was examined in this study.

![Figure 2: Constrained Model](image)

![Figure 3: Mediating Model](image)

The B-K method was preferred in determining the mediator role of organizational commitment. As seen in measurement and structural models, the first three conditions of B-K were provided. Because of this, the fourth condition was examined. Therefore, the constrained model, with which the effect of leadership on job satisfaction was measured, was developed first (Figure 2). According to this model, the effect of leadership on job satisfaction was found significant ($\beta=.84$, $t=21.38$). Following this, the mediating model by which the hypotheses were also tested was developed (Figure 3). According to this model, the effect of leadership on job satisfaction was found significant ($\beta=.24$, $t=3.85$), but its effect was decreased. Accordingly, it can be stated that organizational commitment has a partial mediator effect between ethical leadership and job satisfaction.

In order to understand which model is better, the mediating model ($\chi^2=485.07$, df= 147, $p<.001$) and constrained model ($\chi^2=578.78$, df= 148, $p<.001$) was compared. For this comparison, the chi-square difference test was used. According to the results of the chi-square difference test, it can be stated that the mediating model is better ($\Delta\chi^2= 93.71$, $\Delta$df= 1,


p<.001), and so the mediator role of organizational commitment is significant. Therefore, $H_4$ was partially supported.

5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

As mentioned earlier, much research has been conducted in order to explain the relationship between leadership studies and job satisfaction and organizational commitment and it has been found that there is a significant relationship between leadership, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Raja (2011), Rehman et al. (2012), Buçünienė and Škudienė (2008), Lagomarsino and Cordona (2003) and Lo, Ramayah and Min (2009) showed in their studies that there is a positive relationship between transactional leadership and transformational leadership and organizational commitment and job satisfaction, while Randere and Chaudhry (2012) stated that there is a positive relationship between consultative and participative leadership and employee commitment and job satisfaction. Buçünienė and Škudienė (2008) as well stated that there is a negative relationship between laissez-faire leadership and organizational commitment. However, there is little research that shows the relationship between ethical leadership and organizational commitment and job satisfaction, especially in terms of accommodation businesses. In this study in which the relationship between ethical leadership and organizational commitment and job satisfaction were examined, it was found that ethical leadership has a positive influence on organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Our results support the results of Ponnu and Tennakoon (2009), Brown et al. (2005), Lim (2012), Toor and Ofori (2009) Ghahroodi et al. (2013) and Zhu et al. (2004). In the research, it was determined that organizational commitment has a positive influence on job satisfaction. This result supports Jermier and Berkes (1979), Gomes (2009), Kappagoda (2012) in their studies. But there is much study in the literature showing that job satisfaction influences organizational commitment positively (Lumley et al., 2011; Lok and Crawford, 1999; Salami, 2008; Azeem, 2010; Günlü, Aksaraylı and Perçin, 2010). It was seen in the analysis results that organizational commitment has a mediator role between ethical leadership and job satisfaction. In other words, the effect of ethical leadership on job satisfaction is quite small, whereas it becomes more effective when organizational commitment and ethical leaderships are integrated. In this regard, it can be stated that leaders who act ethically make employees more satisfied with their jobs by enhancing organizational commitment. While studies that show organizational commitment’s mediating role between ethical leadership and job satisfaction could not be found in the literature, there have been other studies (Trang et al., 2013; Clugston, 2000; Gomes, 2009) conducted on organizational commitment’s mediating role for other variables (work motivation, leadership style, learning organization, employees performance, job satisfaction and organizational change). Consequently, $H_1$, $H_2$, $H_3$ and $H_4$ hypothesis are supported.

When the research results were analyzed, the fact that ethical leadership has an influence on job satisfaction and organizational commitment was seen both in the research results and the literature. This situation should be taken into consideration, especially in the hotel industry. Business managers and owners can enhance organizational commitment by acting ethically and can influence job satisfaction in an environment positive organizational commitment. In this way, managers can decrease worker rate of turnover, which is a chronic problem in the tourism sector. The ethical problems seen in the tourism sector (over-time, having no job security, wage problems, cheating tourists, broken promises, etc.) can be minimized if managers act ethically and impose ethical behaviors on employees.

This study was carried out in four and five-star hotels in the Antalya province in Turkey with the help of the questionnaire method. The main reason why the study is not comprehensive was limited time and budget. However, considering the deficiency in the literature, the relationship between ethical leadership and different regions, different tourism management with different perspectives on subjects, especially organization culture, organizational trust, strategic decision making, organizational inertia, etc. should be further investigated. Also, transnational comparisons could contribute to the ethical leadership literature. In addition, researchers could research ethical leadership using qualitative study methods, as well as quantitative study methods.

Today, acting ethically, transparency and accountability have become more important for businesses; therefore, researchers should examine the effect of ethical leadership on business by carrying out quantitative and qualitative research regarding this point. Taking into consideration the deficiencies in literature, topics such as ethical leadership, organizational culture, spirit, confidence, strategic decision-making, game theory and organizational inertia could be investigated in different places and businesses. As well, the role of social culture in perceiving ethical leadership could be examined by making comparisons between societies.
REFERENCES


