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Abstract: Justice is an important element in any organization. Innovative work behavior and Human Resource Management Practices (HRMPs) are affected by organizational justice (Distributive, Procedural, Interpersonal & informational). For this paper, distributive justice is selected as an independent variable. The purpose of this paper is to examine the mediating effect of HRM practices in distributive justice on innovative work behavior among the hotel industry of Pakistan. In total, 223 personnel were selected from 34 hotels from different cities of Pakistan. The survey instrument was adapted for collecting data. Top/middle management is selected for this study, therefore, convenience and purposive sampling technique is adopted. Findings were drawn using descriptive analysis, bivariate correlation, linear regression; and mediation was tested by using Prof. Hayes model 4 by using SPSS version 25. Results of the study revealed that distributive justice is significantly related to the innovative work behavior of employees working in hotels and HRMPs mediates relationship. Findings of this study suggested that distributive justice is an important factor for creating innovative work behavior of employees. Further, the top/middle management with higher distributive justice is taken to create new ideas with innovation which can be beneficial for the hotels and employees. The study provides essential information about the impact of distributive justice on innovative work behavior of employees of the hotel industry. The outcomes of this research are expected to improve further research and literature on distributive justice, HRM practices and innovative work behavior.
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INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problems

Justice in organizations is dealing with employees with fairness. Thus, this construct requires more focus from researchers on the subject of human resource management. The key estimations of organizational justice have a
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significant impact on the organization. This is essentially identified with HRM practices and specialists since familiarity with a balance are significant for each person (Hazzi, 2012; Nucharee & Teeradej, 2019).

Researches in Organizational context extend their emphasis that injustice in the workplace leads to negative and unfortunate responses (Devonish & Greenidge, 2010; Krischer, Penney, & Hunter, 2010).

Individuals with a high level of justice will act decidedly because sound social communication relies on a reasonable view of justice. For another situation, neglecting to ingrain trust and justice perception, the administration will confront such huge numbers of issues concerning individuals behavior’s and their performance (Awang & Ahmad, 2015).

In previous studies (Cole, Pathak, & Schneider, 2010; Farndale, Scullion, & Sparrow, 2010; Gomes, Asseiro, & Ribeiro, 2013), observed that developed countries have a capacity of rapid advancement whereas developing countries (Pakistan) don’t have resources for innovating the human resource management practices.

The fundamental purpose of applying innovation in human resource practices is to provide a competitive advantage to the organization. The researcher observed the same scenario in different hotels situated in different cities of Pakistan that there is no proper implementation of organizational justice, especially distributive justice. There is a huge difference between the area where customers are dealt and the area where the HR staff works.

Therefore, the researcher will investigate the impact of distributive justice on innovative work behavior. Furthermore, the researcher will investigate how HRM practices mediate the relationship between distributive justice and innovative behavior in the context of the hotel industry of Pakistan.

Distributive justice includes a fair perception of organizational results and originates from equity theory by Adams (1965). As indicated by equity theory, people compare inputs and outcomes with others for fair perception in the organization.

Perceptions regarding distributive justice are essential to organizations in light of their consequences for various organizational results (Flint & Haley, 2013).

Distributive justice has a noteworthy effect while discussing organization and employee’ performance as this is straightforwardly connected with HRM practices (Hazzi, 2012).

This investigation uses the distributive justice models of (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993) alongside this innovative work behavior model created by (Janssen, 2000). The basic role of this research was to analyze the effect of distributive justice on innovative work behavior of employees and how HRM practices mediate this relationship in the hotel industry of Pakistan.

Objectives

i. To know how significantly distributive justice affects the innovative work behaviour of employees in the hotel industry of Pakistan.

ii. To assess the mediating effect of HRM practices between distributive justice and innovative work behaviour of employees among the hotel industry of Pakistan.

Significance of the Study

Due to the employee’ nature and its work it difficult to manage each employee in the hotel that can only be possible if they are being given equal rights and justice which is the biggest problem in the organizations. This study will be beneficial for the employees working in the hotels (especially top and middle management). Services organizations, especially the hotel industry may benefit from providing justice for employees. Moreover, in the current era organizational innovation is the dire need of organizations. So we propose a way of getting innovative work behavior of employees. Moreover, this study will provide guidelines for the management of the hotel industry. Furthermore, this study will benefit Pakistan Hotel Associations and policymakers so that they can transform the strategies related to the hotel industry into a better form.

Scope of the Study

This research used quantitative methodology by surveying to collect data from representative samples. This study utilized a quantitative strategy to gather data/information from the selected sample.

The focused group in this research was top/middle management who were working in the hotels in Pakistan. The survey divided into four parts namely; demographic data, distributive justice, HRM Practices, and innovative work behavior. Data collection in this research was undertaken by using two types of data: primary data and secondary data.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational Justice

The concept of organizational justice flourished substantially when the concept of distributive justice was introduced by Homans. Social scientists started to view the fundamental aspects of human behavior concerning OJ. Research Scholar like Blau & Adam started to pay attention to organizational justice in organizational behavior studies. The concept of organizational justice was derived from equity theory given by (Adams, 1963, 1965). Greenberg (1987) stated that organizational justice is the employees’ perception of fairness within an organization. Pekurinen et al. (2017) analyzed justice is seen as an action or decision that is known to be morally right remembering of good, strict, equity and value.

Distributive Justice

Greenberg (2006) divided organizational justice into three substructure which is distributive, procedural and interactional justice which is additionally partitioned into two structures: informational and interpersonal justice. A scope of researches directed on organizational justice in an alternate point of view with all its four sub-factors is (Erdogdu, 2018; Lambert, Liu, & Jiang, 2018; Pan, Chen, Hao, & Bi, 2018; Saad & Elshaer, 2017).

Magnitudes of organizational justice in the hotel industry;

- The strong positive effect between the perceptions of the distributive justice of a raise and organizational commitment and satisfaction with the raise (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998)
- Highest level of association of distributive justice of promotion decisions on turnover intentions (Parker, Nouri, & Hayes, 2011)
- The direct effect of distributive on job satisfaction (McCain, Tsai, & Bellino, 2010)
- A significant positive relationship between distributive justice and task performance (Devonish & Greenidge, 2010).

Innovative Work Behavior

Innovation is a fundamental factor for associations to adjust to quick monetary changes for maintaining competitive advantage (Hitt, Keats, & DeMarie, 1998). That’s why innovation and people gained more attention in every field. Almost three decades ago Van de Ven (1986) figured out that people are the individuals who create, encourage, react, and revise thoughts, which are necessities and most important factors for development. Janssen (2000) conceptualized that Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) is a purposeful creation, presentation, and use of new thoughts within work, gathering or association, to benefit work performance, the gathering or the association.

De Jong and Den Hartog (2010) made sense of four interrelated courses of action of social viewpoints: idea
recognition, idea generation, idea promotion and idea realization; these could improve the innovation and employee performance.

Outcomes of innovative work behavior in the hotel business;
- There is a strong relationship between psychological safety and innovative work behaviour of employees (Alzyoud, Partington, Mitchell, & Tom-Dieck, 2017).
- Behaviour regarding team culture and knowledge sharing has the highest impact on service innovation performance (Hussain, Konar, & Ali, 2016).
- The study signified that procedural justice has a positive impact on knowledge sharing and knowledge sharing has on innovative work behaviour (Noerchohida & Harjanti, 2019).

Distributive Justice and Innovative work behavior

The justice law is usually preferred by the groups focusing on efficiency (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Leventhal, 1980; Leung & Park, 1986). Stated organizational justice with its all components is related to employee behaviors and attitude.

Researchers investigated the impact of Organizational justice on different variables related to behavior i.e., (Pan et al., 2018) positive organizational behavior; (Lambert et al., 2018) work attitudes; (Al-A’wasa, 2018) counterproductive behavior; (Gan & Yusuf, 2018; Yuen Onn, Nordin bin Yunus, Yusof, Moorthy, & Ai Na, 2018) Leelamanothum & Ngudgratoke, 2018; organizational citizenship behavior; Ismail (2020) innovative work behavior.

Justice is tested collectively with innovative work behavior. Organizational justice is probably foster innovative behaviors of employees, as formulated in the hypothesis and sub-hypotheses:

$$H1:$$ Distributive justice has a positive effect on innovative behavior.
$$H1a:$$ Distributive justice has a positive effect on idea generation.
$$H1b:$$ Distributive justice has a positive effect on idea promotion.
$$H1c:$$ Distributive justice has a positive effect on idea realization.

Human Resource Management Practices

This is the era of technology and innovation, so day by day; it’s becoming so challenging for HR managers to manage effectively. Organizations need a viable HRM framework to contend and support the upper hand. As Khatri (1999) contended, for any association individuals are the most significant resource who receives change for the advancement of the organization.

The effective HRM structure helps organizations to improve the attitudes and behavior that will ultimately lead to improving the performance of employees (Koch & McGrath, 1996). HRM rose in the mid-1980s and continues progressing as an alternate field of study (Hendry & Pettigrew, 1990). As R. Schuler and Jackson (2014) conceptualized HRM practices as a framework that appeals, progress, encourage, and retains employees to guarantee the effective implementation and the survival of the organization and its individuals.

Various researchers characterized the idea of HRM in various manners i.e., (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002) help to manage human resources (Damanpour & Gopalakrishnan, 1998; Gilang, M., Pradana, Saragih, & Khairunnisa, 2018; Ling & Nasurdin, 2010) HRM practices and organizational innovation (Joseph & Dai, 2009) HRM practices and performance (Hornsby, Kuratko, & Zahra, 2002) HRM practices and SMEs (Huselid, 1995) HRM practices and turnover productivity (R. S. Schuler, 1992) strategic human resource management. HRM practices help to improve the performance and behavior of the employees. More crucial aspects of consideration in recent years in the hotel industry:
- Human capital significantly mediated the relationship between human resource management practices and innovation performance (Nieves & Quintana, 2018)
- A significant gap was identified between the new employee and the existing pool. Only compensation practices showed a significant relation (Bagri, Babu, & Kukreti, 2010).
- Selection and assessment methods in hotels are resume and recruitment interview rather than interest, attitude, and preference (Chan & Kuok, 2011).


In organizations, HRM practices and organizational justice are the key segments. Various researches are led to feature the significance of HRM rehearses with various results (performance, efficiency) most conspicuous is hierarchical execution, for example, Ahmed, ul Hassan, and Shabbir (2018), Amyan (2016), Hoque, Awang, Siddiqui,
Results of these studies showed a positive impact of HRM practices on performance. Perception of fairness in the working atmosphere has become the dominant figure in the last decade. Employees can perform well if they are treated well in the organization (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Along with these aspects, researchers featured the job of organizational justice with HRM practices:

- Distributive justice had a positive impact on both types of engagement but procedural justice had not and interactional justice had a partial impact on organizational engagement (Lamprakis, Alamani, Malliari, & Grivas, 2018).
- Business organizations can stimulate required behaviours by utilizing HRM practices that support particular states of mind and behaviours, and discourage undesired behaviour and practices (Alfes, Shantz, Truss, & Soane, 2013). Various researchers investigated HRM practices with different behaviors like organizational citizenship behavior, innovative work behavior.
- HRM is important for improving behaviour and performance (Zhang & Zhang, 2012)
- Human resource management practices improve the innovative work behaviour of employees ( Bücker & Van Der Horst, 2017).

HRM practices as a framework that appeals to progress, encourage and retains employees to guarantee effective implementation and the survival of the organization and its individuals. Based on the literature following hypothesis are formulated to check the moderating and mediating impact of HRM practices between the relationship of organizational justice and innovative work behaviors. Innovative work behavior is extremely hard to accomplish if representatives are not treated decently Based on this hypothesis is formulated:

**H2:** HRM practices significantly mediated the relationship between distributive justice and innovative work behavior.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**Population and Sample Size**

Different hotels from selected cities located in Pakistan were selected for this study i.e., Islamabad, Lahore, Karachi, Faisalabad and Multan to investigate the mediating effects of HRMPs in distributive on innovative work behavior. For this study top/middle management of selected hotels are selected.

**Determine the Sample Size**

In this study, the researcher used Taro Yamane formula to find out the sample from the finite sample population in a condition of a 95% confidence level (Israel, 1992).

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + NE^2} \]

In this equation,  
\( n = \) sample size  
\( N = \) number of the population  

The results of the sample calculation are:

\[ n = \frac{505}{1 + [505(0.05)]} = 223.20 \]

**Sampling Methods**

This study focused on the top and middle management of the hotel industry. This study adopted a multi-stage sampling approach consisting of Convenience and Purposive sampling. Top and Middle management were targeted as they have knowledge, experience and a better understanding regarding various aspects of Organizational justice, HRMPs and innovative work behavior. The researcher assumed that the top/middle management of 34 hotels from the different cities of Pakistan were 505 and the calculated sample was 223 managers which are around 44% of the entire population.

**Data Collection Methods**

The study is quantitative that’s why for data collection 34 hotels were selected. Data was collected by distributing questionnaires, personally visiting all hotels one by one and collected by hand. A total of 228 questionnaires were designed for data collection and 223 filled questionnaires were received. The response rate is given in (Table 1) Data was compiled through ethical code standard and, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 was used.
for data analysis. All participants were well informed about this study. Further, it was cleared in the questionnaire that their data would be used confidentially and only for the research purpose.

A structured questionnaire was utilized to make sure that there was standardization in the response given and in the gathering of data. So, data was collected from respondents through the questionnaire. Questionnaires against all variables are adopted and measured using five-point Likert’s scale starting from strongly disagrees to strongly agree/very little extent to a very great extent.

For measuring the distributive justice scale of (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993) is adopted. For Innovative work behavior scale of (Janssen, 2000) is adopted that represented nine items and measured the extent of individual idea generation, promotion, and implementation. For HRMPs scale of Chen and Huang (2009) and Masood (2010) is adopted.

Table 1 RESPONSE RATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Industry</th>
<th>Distributed</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Not Received</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Test

The reliability of the review survey was the main factor to be evaluated quantitatively. As Osburn (2000) mentioned, the estimation of Cronbach Alpha is utilized to test measurably the dependability. The magnitude of reliability for this study is 0.769, which is suggestive of the fact that the survey designed for data collection is reliable.

Table 2 RELIABILITY STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’ Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

Descriptive Analysis

For analyzing demographic data descriptive analysis is used in this research to find out of the percentage. These variables included gender, education, current position, household income, current status, tenure and supervision of staff. It was determined that around 76.68% of the respondents were males. The age of most of the respondents ranged from 30 years to 40 years, whereas the education level of most of the candidates was bachelors and masters. This indicates that the employees are capable to compete with their competitors and also have the flexibility to act according to the dynamics of the market. Table 3 summarizes the demographic analysis.

Correlation Analysis

According to statistical results, the value of the Pearson correlation, between distributive justice (M_DJ_ORG) and innovative work behavior (M_IWB) is 0.288. This shows a positive and direct association between organizational justice and innovative work behavior, but a weak relationship.

Regression Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

In this study, distributive justice has been selected as the independent variable, whereas innovative work behavior with all its three sub-variables; Idea generation, idea promotion, and idea realization has been considered as the dependent variable. For hypothesis testing regression analysis is applied. Results are compiled at a 95% confidence interval. Table 4 demonstrates the results of hypotheses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Male n = 171</th>
<th>Female n = 52</th>
<th>Total n = 223</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>23(10.31%)</td>
<td>18(8.07%)</td>
<td>41(18.38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>5(2.24%)</td>
<td>3(1.34%)</td>
<td>8(3.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>57(25.56%)</td>
<td>17(7.62%)</td>
<td>74(33.18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>54(24.21%)</td>
<td>11(4.93%)</td>
<td>65(29.14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>26(11.65%)</td>
<td>2(0.89%)</td>
<td>28(12.55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>6(2.69%)</td>
<td>1(0.44%)</td>
<td>7(3.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter</td>
<td>2(0.89%)</td>
<td>1(0.44%)</td>
<td>3(1.34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>41(18.38%)</td>
<td>8(3.58%)</td>
<td>49(21.97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>120(53.81%)</td>
<td>41(18.38%)</td>
<td>161(72.19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>7(3.13%)</td>
<td>1(0.44%)</td>
<td>8(3.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1(0.448%)</td>
<td>1(0.44%)</td>
<td>2(0.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>2(0.89%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2(0.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>32(14.34%)</td>
<td>3(1.34%)</td>
<td>35(15.69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>87(39.01%)</td>
<td>24(10.76%)</td>
<td>111(49.77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>19(8.52%)</td>
<td>6(2.69%)</td>
<td>25(11.21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>5(2.24%)</td>
<td>4(1.79%)</td>
<td>10(4.48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>25(11.21%)</td>
<td>15(6.72%)</td>
<td>40(17.93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20000</td>
<td>12(5.38%)</td>
<td>3(1.34%)</td>
<td>15(6.72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20000-300000</td>
<td>10(4.48%)</td>
<td>7(3.13%)</td>
<td>17(7.62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30000-40000</td>
<td>13(5.82%)</td>
<td>6(2.69%)</td>
<td>19(8.52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40000-500000</td>
<td>43(19.28%)</td>
<td>13(5.82%)</td>
<td>56(25.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;500000</td>
<td>93(41.70%)</td>
<td>23(10.31%)</td>
<td>116(52.01%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Year(s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2yrs</td>
<td>55(24.66%)</td>
<td>25(11.21%)</td>
<td>80(35.87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 yrs.</td>
<td>51(22.86%)</td>
<td>14(6.27%)</td>
<td>65(29.14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8yrs</td>
<td>36(16.14%)</td>
<td>12(5.38%)</td>
<td>48(21.52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10yrs</td>
<td>16(7.17%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16(7.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs.</td>
<td>13(5.82%)</td>
<td>1(0.44%)</td>
<td>14(6.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3employees</td>
<td>36(16.14%)</td>
<td>13(5.82%)</td>
<td>49(21.97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7 employees</td>
<td>30(13.45%)</td>
<td>9(4.03%)</td>
<td>39(17.48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10 employees</td>
<td>29(13%)</td>
<td>10(4.48%)</td>
<td>39(17.48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 employees</td>
<td>60(26.90%)</td>
<td>8(3.58%)</td>
<td>68(30.49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16(7.17%)</td>
<td>12(5.38%)</td>
<td>28(12.55%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firstly, the effect of distributive justice on innovative work behavior was estimated (H1). Empirical evidence suggests that there is a positive/significant relationship of organizational justice with innovative work behavior. The beta coefficient value of distributive justice is 0.164, which means that every unit increase in organizational justice will result in 0.164 units increase or appreciation in the variable of innovative work behavior at a significant level of $p < 0.05 = > 0.000 <0.05$. Consequently, the researcher concluded that at a 95% confidence interval, there is a failure to reject the null hypothesis based on findings. Secondly, the effect of distributive justice on idea generation was estimated (H1a). The effect of organizational justice was estimated on sub-variables of innovative work behavior which are idea
generation, idea promotion, and idea realization.

Empirical evidence suggests that there is a positive/significant relationship of distributive justice with idea generation. The beta coefficient value of distributive justice is 0.211, which means that every unit increase in distributive justice will result in 0.211 units increase or appreciation in the variable of idea generation at a significant level of $p < 0.05 = 0.000 < 0.05$. Consequently, the researcher concluded that at a 95% confidence interval, there is a failure to reject the null hypothesis based on findings.

Thirdly, the effect of distributive justice on idea promotion was estimated (H1b).

Empirical evidence suggests that there is a positive/significant relationship of distributive justice with idea promotion. The beta coefficient value of distributive justice is 0.183, which means that every unit increase in distributive justice will result in 0.183 units increase or appreciation in the variable of idea promotion at a significant level of $p < 0.05 = 0.001 < 0.05$. Consequently, the researcher concluded that at a 95% confidence interval, there is a failure to reject the null hypothesis based on findings.

Fourthly, the effect of distributive justice on idea realization was estimated (H1c).

Empirical evidence suggests that there is a negative relationship between distributive justice with idea realization. The beta coefficient value of distributive justice is 0.096, which means that every unit increase in organizational justice will result in 0.096 units increase or appreciation in the variable of idea realization at a significant level of $p > 0.05 = 0.147 > 0.05$. Consequently, the researcher concluded that at a 95% confidence interval, there is a failure to accept the null hypothesis based on findings.

**Mediation Analysis (Prof. Andrew Hayes Model 4)**

To test the mediation, Sobel test or Prof. Andrew Hayes Model (Model 4) was used. Empirical evidence proves that HRMPs significantly mediated the relationship between organizational justice and innovative work behavior. The direct effect of $x$ on $y$ is $p < 0.0000$, and since “0” does not fall between the lower and upper limit values, there seems to be an indirect impact. $R^2$ mediation effect magnitude is $p < 0.0259$ which is significant. Along with this, the $p$-value of normal theory checks for the indirect effect; this checking yields that the $p$-value is $p < 0.0000$, which is significant. So, it is concluded at a 95% confidence interval that there is a failure to reject the H2 (null). Results are given in Table 4.

Table 4 **MEDIATION ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.4559</td>
<td>.2079</td>
<td>.0526</td>
<td>28.8659</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>220.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>2.5932</td>
<td>.2155</td>
<td>12.0320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_HRMPs</td>
<td>.3333</td>
<td>.0566</td>
<td>5.8893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_DJ_ORJ</td>
<td>.0745</td>
<td>.0373</td>
<td>1.9980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The total effect of X on Y</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.1635</td>
<td>.0366</td>
<td>4.4720</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The direct effect of X on Y</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0745</td>
<td>.0373</td>
<td>1.9980</td>
<td>.0469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An indirect effect of X on Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Table 4 Continue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M_HRMPS</td>
<td>.0891</td>
<td>.0191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared mediation effect size (R-sq_med)</td>
<td>Effect Boot SE BootLLCI BootULCI</td>
<td>M_HRMPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect se</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.0891</td>
<td>4.3665</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 The Results of Hypothesis Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Distributive justice has a positive effect on innovative work behavior</td>
<td>Accepted H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a: Distributive justice has a positive effect on idea generation</td>
<td>Accepted H1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b: Distributive justice has a positive effect on idea promotion</td>
<td>Accepted H1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c: Distributive justice has a positive effect on idea realization</td>
<td>Rejected H1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: HRM Practices significantly mediates the relationship between distributive justice and innovative work behavior</td>
<td>Accepted H2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion and Implementation

This study discusses the enhancement of knowledge in the hospitality sector specifically the hotel industry in terms of understanding organizational justice and the behavior of employees working in the hotel industry. Initially, the concept of organizational justice was based on the promotion of justice and fairness among the employees working in the organization. Secondly, contribution and function of the HRM practices between employee behavior and distributive justice within the organization that could lead towards the implication of both of the factors into the Hotel industry in an effective manner.

In this particular study, the distributive relationships have been evaluated among all the sub-factors regarding the employee work behavior in terms of innovation that may include the generation of innovative ideas, promotion of these ideas and the realization of these ideas based on innovation that reflects the innovative work behavior of employees working in the hotel industry. The findings carried out in this study provoked and emphasized mainly on the significance of the distributive justice to see innovative work behavior in employees working in these organizations and also in the HRM practices.

However, the findings carried out through the regression analysis concluded that there is a higher impact of distributive justice on the innovation of employees that means the innovative work behavior of employees increases when the organization has the proper implementation of justice within its work environment. Employees working in the hotel industry are the primary seekers of the fair treatment and equality while they are working that lead them towards showing a positive behavior and also their innovative working behavior increase due to justice perception in terms of employees inputs and outputs.

The outcomes of this research bolstered through the researches led by Almansour and Minai (2012), Dutta (2013) De Spiegelaere, Van Gyes, De Witte, Niesen, and Van Hootegem (2014), Jiun-Lan and Jeng-Hwan (2015) and Kim and Lee (2013) that state the significance of having distributive justice in an organization in terms of fair treatments among the employees and promoting justice within the work environment that shows employee work with positive behavior and their creativity level increases when the organization is providing justice to employees and treats its employees equally. So, based on the findings of these studies conducted by the previous researchers, it can be said that the perception of the fair treatment and justice is significant and highly impactful within the organizations and
their working environment that has a direct impact on the employees working behavior in terms of creating new ideas, promoting those ideas and also the innovative implementation of those ideas for the betterment of the organization.

It has been found in this study that there is a significant impact of distributive justice on the idea realization of employees working in the organizations. However, the previous studies conducted by Gozukara, Yildirim, Yildiz, et al. (2016), Jiun-Lan and Jeng-Hwan (2015) Janssen (2000), and Momeni, Ebrahimpour, and Ajirloo (2014) state that there is a significant relationship between distributive justice and employee innovative work behavior. These studies focused that distributive justice is essential to be followed in the organizations to make the behavior of employees positive and to direct them towards bringing innovation in their work. The outcome of the current study is different from the previously conducted studies in the same field. But there are also some previous studies conducted on the impact of organizational justice and employee positive behavior that include the study conducted by Gozukara et al. (2016), Ismail (2019), indicated a negative relationship between distributive justice and innovative work behavior.

The current study focused that there is a positive impact of distributive justice on the innovative working behavior of employees working in the organizations and the innovation factor is affected by it. Other studies led by Akram, Haider, and Feng (2016), Jiun-Lan and Jeng-Hwan (2015), Kim and Lee (2013) and numerous different researches that underlined on the consistency in acknowledging and compensating employees on their great performance and reasonable assessment of them that would lead the employees to react positively towards work regarding expanding innovativeness level in employees working in the organization. In mediation scenario (HRMP) are positively mediating between distributive justice and innovative work behavior of employees. Flint and Haley (2013), Ghosh, Sekiguchi, and Gurunathan (2017) Ismail (2019); Leelamanothum, Na-Nan, and Ngudgratoke (2018), and Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001) supported the current study. The distributive justice, innovative work behavior and human resource management practice should be the most integral part of the organization. Employees must be treated with justice to improve their efficiency and performance.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Although this study gives significant implications to innovative behavior, HRMPs and distributive justice literature with regards to the hotel industry still it is liable to few limitations. The data was collected only from hotels located in big cities of Pakistan; which needs further expansion to other cities and countries as well other than Pakistan to broaden the scope of the study. Furthermore, research is required to identify green HRMPs which can play an important role in supporting the relationship of organizational justice and innovative work behavior. Future research could be conducted by including control variables i.e., age gender these could be used as mediating/moderating variable to know their impact between distributive justice and innovative work behavior of hotel’ employees. Last but not the least, for this current study only middle and top management of hotels, is targeted so there is also a need to include the lower management to see the overall impact.
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