

The Effects of Organizational Justice on Workplace Deviance and Job Satisfaction of Employees: Evidence from a Public Sector Hospital of Pakistan

Muhammad Asim Faheem

Faculty of Management, University Teknologi Malaysia, Johor Bahru, Malaysia

Dr. Norashikin Mahmud

Department of human resource development, University Teknologi Malaysia, Johor Bahru, Malaysia

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n5p342

Abstract

Applying the equity theory at public sector hospitals, present study aimed to investigate the impact of organizational justice on nurses' deviant behavior at workplace and also the job satisfaction. Present study was conducted on 51 nurses from one of the popular public sector hospital of Pakistan. These nurses belong from different department of that hospital. To elicit the response from nurses a questionnaire was used. Findings of present study revealed that organizational justice is negatively influenced the workplace deviance, while organizational justice positively correlated with job satisfaction. Present research highlights the valuable role of organizational justice in reduction of deviant behavior and increases the level of satisfaction among nurses at workplace.

Keywords: *Organizational justice, workplace deviance, job satisfaction, nurses*

1. Introduction

Organizations are facing challenges at present time because of globalization and structural revolution in every sector around the world. It is very tough to meet these transformational challenges (Chen et al., 2010), and even harder to sustain the position and maintain the standard in this competitive environment (Singh & Singh, 2010). Services organizations are the substantial globally, and health organization have top priority from all services organizations worldwide because they deal with the health of humans. Nurses have a significant role in all health care settings worldwide. The shortage of nurses is the widespread issue (Kingma, 2001); which escalates the importance of nurses everywhere in developing or even developed countries (Aiken et al., 2001; Fang, 2001; Lu et al., 2005). According to this situation, the retention and recruitment of nurses is increasing in many countries (Lundh, 1999). However a number of reasons are linked to the job satisfaction of nurses at workplace (Irvine and Evans, 1995). The core reason which affects the nurses is mistreatment at workplace (Laschinger et al., 2014). Research investigated from decades the justice in organizations creates fairness perceptions at work environment and positive behavioral outcomes among employees.

The perception of employees about fairness on workplace is referred to as organizational justice. Previous studies acknowledge that organizational justice can be evaluated through distributive justice which is related to the outcomes (Adams, 1963), procedural justice related to the process and interactive justice which related to the interpersonal interactions (Bies and Moag, 1986). Adams (1963) also stated the unfair treatment negatively affects the outcomes of employee, and also increases the chances of deviant behavior at workplace. The model of deviant behavior 1st time introduced and defined by Robinson and Bennett (1995), that workplace deviance is "the voluntary behavior that violate significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of organization, its members, or both" (p.556). The deviance of employees can be evaluated through two categories of workplace deviance is organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance (Bennett and Robinson, 2000; Robinson and Bennett, 1995). Dion, (2006) reported that the discourteous behavior on workplace and occupational stress decrease the job satisfaction of employees. Hoppock (1935) defined the job satisfaction as the blend of psychological, physical and environmental situations which makes employee to say that he is completely satisfy with job. According to this definition the job satisfaction is influenced by many external and internal factors that employee feels during job. And those internal or external factors which influenced the job satisfaction can be the organizational justice or injustice and workplace deviance which can effect vice versa towards job satisfaction of employees. Present study considering the nurses of public sector hospital of Pakistan and will try to

investigate the job satisfaction of nurses through deviance and organizational justice.

In 21st century the role of nurses become the core of every health care setting worldwide (Tingen et al., 2013). The nurses are very less in numbers according to the requirement and this is the issue for every country (Kingma, 2001), so this problem deteriorates the significance of nurses especially in developing countries (Aiken et al., 2001; Fang, 2001; Lu et al., 2002). A number of problems are linked with the nurses' outcomes and job satisfaction at workplace (Irvine and Evans, 1995). One of the major reasons which negatively influenced the outcome of nurses is mistreatment at workplace shown in a study conducted on nurses of US health sector (Laschinger et al., 2014). Another study conducted on nurses of US health care settings identified the negative behavior at workplace influenced the job satisfaction negatively. Study on UK health care also coded the harmful instances among nurses and their adverse effects on outcome (Edwards and Connell, 2007). In a view of Pakistan the same problem is seen in nurses of public sector hospitals and their harmful effects towards outcome of nurses (Somani and Khowaja, 2012). Particularly because nursing is very less respectable profession in Pakistan society which creates stress and chances for them to face negative behavior at workplace (Leeds and Saeed, 2001). Another main cause of mistreatment is the dominant position of nurses between management doctors and patients also the job nature like cleaning and touching the body parts and changing the clothes of patient (Somani and Khowaja, 2012). Moreover these issues increase the sensitivity of nurses about negative behavior towards them (Leeds and Saeed, 2001). Massive research demonstrated that negative behavior is the cause of unfairness at workplace which negatively affects the job satisfaction of nurses (Laschinger et al., 2014). So, the present study aims to investigate the job satisfaction and deviance of nurses in public sector hospitals of Pakistan through organizational justice, and also aiming to find out that can justice on workplace control these problems?

2. Theorizing and Hypotheses Development

The concept of organizational justice is studied from decades by researchers and studies confirmations that it creates fairness perceptions at work environment and positive behavioral outcomes among employees (Adams, 1963). The organizational justice consists of three types which influenced the employees perception about justice and injustice at workplace, and these types contain distributive justice is referred to as the outcome of individual through fairness at workplace like pay rise, training opportunities and promotions (Adams, 1963). Procedural justice is argued to be the fairness perceptions of individuals regarding official procedures of governing decisions. Bies and Moag, (1986) mentioned the third type interactional justice is the quality of interactive treatment with individual during the procedures implementations and outcomes. The concept of organizational justice is not only including the perception of the judgment of fairness in income but also include the judgment of allocation decision and social interactions towards employees (Greenberg, 1993; Tyler and Bies, 1990). So the overall organizational justice is the combination of all three sub dimensions (Colquitt et al., 2001). Adams (1963) is also stated the unfair treatment negatively affects the outcomes of employee, and also increases the chances of deviant behavior at workplace.

The workplace deviance workplace deviance is defined as "voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both" (Robinson & Bennett, 1995, p. 556). The main cause of the growing interest in workplace deviance by researchers and practitioners because of the growing prevalence in workplace and incredible cost linked with this behavior (Peterson, 2002). According to Bensimon (1994), the US organizations suffered production loss of 4200 Million Dollar because of deviance behavior. Moreover 69% public sector employees of US and Canada experienced some kind of verbal aggression on workplace (Pizzino, 2002). Because of misconduct, the Injustice in organizations is cited frequently (Neuman and Baron, 1998; Robinson and Bennett, 1997). Multiple methods used by researcher to study about the relationship of organizational justice and workplace deviance. Scholars have different perception about this relationship like one dimension of justice is the predictor of the outcome of some specific form of deviance (Judge et al., 2006; Jones and Skarlicki, 2005). Distributive justice has effect on deviance like theft (Hollinger and Clark, 1983). According to Greenberg (1990a), the amount of fairness with employees refers to the value of outcome in distributive justice. The procedural justice as perception of employees about decision of allocation is made by organizations according to the formal procedures (Moorman, 1991). And this is very important for employees on workplace because when employees feel dissatisfaction by the procedures fairness, they are probably violating the norms of organization (Folger and Greenberg, 1985). Aquino et al. (1999) also provided the empirical evidence regarding the procedural justice impact on workplace deviance. Findings by multiple studies about interactional justice and workplace deviance states the interactions with employees are affected and vice versa on workplace deviance and productivity (Goldman, 2003; Skarlicki et al., 1999; Greenberg, 1993b). According to Brockner and Wiesenfeld, (1996) organizational justice is multidimensional construct where everyone interacts with one another. The equity theory by Adams (1965) proposed that the beliefs and association

between injustice and employees outcomes because of the dis-satisfied feeling of employees.

Job satisfaction is important topic with extensive interest for the people who are working in organizations and who are studying them. Job satisfaction is the combination of psychological, physical and environmental conditions which makes employee to say that he is satisfy with job (Hoppock, 1935). On the ground of Maslow's theory some of researchers are stated that the fulfillment of all needs of employees regarding the job is consider as job satisfaction (Worf, 1970; Conrad et al., 1985). The satisfaction of individuals regarding multiple job elements is considered as job satisfaction (Herzberg and Mausner, 1959). The employee's effective direction towards job is considered that he or she is satisfied with work (Price, 2001). Job satisfaction is positively influenced by the distributive and procedural justice (Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996). They also found the satisfaction with supervision regarding to promotions and pay is related to distributive justice and the appraisal performance with procedural justice (Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996). According to Fatt et al. (2010), the higher level perception of employees about justice in organizations is referred to as the high level of job satisfaction at work. Therefore, the positive approach by organizations towards employee's perception of justice at workplace can make them satisfied and can reduce the retentions ratio and the related cost and deviance behavior at workplace. Thus these relations are hypothesised:

H1: Organizational justice is negatively associated with workplace deviance of employees.

H1a: Distributive justice is negatively associated with workplace deviance of employees.

H1b: Procedural justice is negatively associated with workplace deviance of employees.

H1c: Interactional justice is negatively associated with workplace deviance of employees.


H2: Organizational justic is positively associated with job satisfaction of employees.

H2a: Distributive justice is positively associated with job satisfaction of employees.

H2b: Procedural justice is positively associated with job satisfaction of employees.

H2c: Interactional justice is positively associated with job satisfaction of employees.

Conceptual Framework of this Study:



3. Method

The current study aims to investigate the relationship of organizational justice with workplace deviance and job satisfaction in nurses of public sector Shaikh zaid hospital of Lahore, Pakistan. More than 400 nurses performed duty at different timing in public sector hospital. Questionnaire base survey was used to find the respondents and sample size of this study is 15% of whole population which is 60 approximately. And 84% of effective response rate is found 51.

Questionnaire is composed of 40 items for this study, which contains eighteen items of organizational justice with its four dimensions of procedural justice, interactional justice and distributive justice. And nineteen items for workplace deviance and last three items of job satisfaction. This Questionnaire used five-point Likert scale.

4. Results

4.1 Estimation of Reliability

The reliability analysis of organizational justice (procedural justice, interactional justice, distributive justice) workplace deviance and job satisfaction has been calculated through SPSS software and result is given in table 1

Table 1. Estimates of Reliability

Variables:	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Procedural Justice:		
Procedures are designed to collect accurate information necessary for making decisions. Procedures are designed to provide opportunities to appeal or challenge the decision. Procedures are designed to have all sides affected by the decision represented. Procedures are designed to generate standards so that decisions could be made with consistency. Procedures are designed to hear the concerns of all those affected by the decision. Procedures are designed to provide useful feedback regarding the decision and its implementation. Procedures are designed to allow for requests for clarification or additional information about the decision.	7	75.6
Interactional Justice:		
My supervisor considered my viewpoint. My supervisor was able to suppress personal biases. My supervisor provided me with timely feedback about the decision and its implications. My supervisor treated me with kindness and consideration. My supervisor showed concern for my rights as an employee. My supervisor took steps to deal with me in a truthful manner.	6	82.5
Distributive Justice:		
I am fairly rewarded considering the responsibilities. I am fairly rewarded in view of the amount of experience I have. I am fairly rewarded for the amount of effort I put forth. I am fairly rewarded for the work I have done well. I am fairly rewarded for the stresses and strains of my job.	5	76.2
Workplace Deviance:		
Employees made fun of others at work. Employees said something hurtful to others at work. Employees made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work. Employees cursed at others at work. Employees played a mean prank on others at work. Employees acted rudely toward others at work. Employees took property from work without permission. Employees publicly embarrassed others at work. Employees spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working. Employees falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than you spent on business expenses. Employees took an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your workplace. Employees come in late to work without permission. Employees littered work environment. Employees neglected to follow boss's instructions. Employees intentionally worked slower than others could have worked. Employees discussed confidential company information with an unauthorized person. Employees put little effort into work. Employees dragged out work in order to get overtime Employees used an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job	19	78.4
Job Satisfaction:		
All in all, I am satisfied with my job. In general, I do not like my job. In general, I like working here.	3	83.7
Overall Reliability	40	0.845

4.2 Result of Reliability Analysis

Reliability indicates that how much an instrument is stable. It depicts that every time the instrument is used the results are same. By using Cronbach's alpha the reliability of an instrument can be calculate. If Cronbach's alpha is 0.70 or higher the reliability of scale is considered reliable. This table shows that the Cronbach's alpha of procedural justice has75.6%, interactional justice has 82.5% and distributive justice has 76.2% these are three dimensions of organizational justice which is independed variable. Workplace deviance has 78.4%, job satisfaction has 83.7% and these are two depended variables. And overall reliability is 0.845.

5. Respondent's Demographic Information on the Basis of Questionnaire

Demographic information of respondent's being collected from Jinnah Hospital of Pakistan which has been described in the following tables. The samples of demographics information have been given below in table 2.

Table 2: Respondent's Demographic Information

Variables	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	0	0.0%
Female	100	100%
Qualification		
Bachelors	27	53%
Masters	6	12%
Others	18	35%
Designation		
Lower level job	17	33%
Middle level job	26	51%
Top level job	8	16%
Working Experience		
0-5 years	19	37%
5-10 years	23	45%
10-more	9	18%

5.1 Interpretation

Total population of study consist 51 respondents who were the nurses in public sector hospital of Lahore. Out of complete population the distribution of population in relation to gender includes male respondent 0 (0%) and female respondent 100 (100%). Out of total population, (53%) respondents are having bachelor degree and (12%) are having master degree remaining (35%) are belong to others degree in which FA and metric included. And it shows majority of population having Bachelor. Lower level, middle level and top level these three categories are made for designation of the nurses. Out of 51 respondents, 33% nurses falling in lower level which is 1st category and 51% nurses are belong to middle level and finally 16% nurses lie in the 3rd category which is top level. Concerning the job experience, table 2 shows that (37%) respondent were 0- 5 years. Then (45%) respondent was on 5-10 years and finally (18%) respondent was on more than 10 years.

Table 3. Pearson correlation matrix:

		1	2	3	4	5
1.Procedural Justice	Pearson Correlation	1				
2.Interactional Justice	Pearson Correlation	.581**	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000				
3.Distributive Justice	Pearson Correlation	.775**	.683**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000			
4.Workplace Deviance	Pearson Correlation	-.117	-.056	-.007	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.412	.694	.963		
5.Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.663	.557	.627		1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

6. Correlation Analysis

Correlation coefficient was calculated with the purpose of determining the relation among organizational justice (procedural justice, interactional justice, and distributive justice) workplace deviance, job satisfaction in Jinnah Hospital of Pakistan

6.1 Result of Correlation (r) Analysis

Table 3 describes the values of Pearson correlation of this study. There are 3 dimensions of independent variable and 2 dependent variables. The significance value should be below the significance level of 0.01 or 0.05 which shows that are there any significant relationship exist between variables or not? If the value of Pearson correlation is around 0.5 or

more, it means that the relationship between two variables is strong and the positive and negative signs show the direction of the relationship. In above table 3 the correlation value of procedural justice and workplace deviance is -0.117 which depicts that there is strong negative relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance. The sig (2-tailed) value of these variables is 0.412 which is much higher than 0.001. It means that there is no significant relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance. So H1a hypothesis has been accepted.

Interactional justice and workplace deviance has -0.056 correlation value which shows that there is strong negative relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance. The sig (2-tailed) value of these variables is 0.694 which is much higher than 0.001. It means that there is no significant relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance. So H1b hypothesis has been accepted.

The correlation value of distributive justice and workplace deviance is -0.007 which depicts that there is strong negative relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance. The sig (2-tailed) value of these variables is 0.963 which is much higher than 0.001. It means that there is no significant relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance. So H1c hypothesis has been accepted.

The sig (2-tailed) value procedural justice and job satisfaction is 0.000 which shows that there is a significant relationship between these two variables. And the correlation value of procedural justice and job satisfaction is .663 which depicts that there is strong positive relationship between procedural justice and job satisfaction. So H2a hypothesis has been accepted.

Interactional justice and job satisfaction has 0.557 correlation value which shows that there is strong positive relationship between interactional justice and job satisfaction. The sig (2-tailed) value interactional justice and job satisfaction is 0.000 which shows that there is a significant relationship between these two variables. So H2b hypothesis has been accepted.

The sig (2-tailed) value distributive justice and job satisfaction is 0.000 which shows that there is a significant relationship between these two variables. And the correlation value of distributive justice and job satisfaction is 0.627 which depicts that there is strong positive relationship between distributive justice and job satisfaction. So H2c hypothesis has been accepted.

7. Regression Analysis

Whenever the researchers seek to find the impact of one or more variables on other variables, the regression analysis is used with the help of SPSS software. In this research study, regression analysis is used to know the impact of organizational justice on the workplace deviance and job satisfaction. As there are two dependent variables and one independent variable with three dimensions (procedural justice, interactional justice and distributive justice).

7.1 Procedural Justice with Workplace Deviance:

Table 4.1.

	R	R ²	Beta	P
Procedural Justice	.117	.014	-.079	.412

a. Predictor: (Constant), Procedural Justice

b. Dependent variable: Workplace Deviance

H1a: Procedural justice is negatively associated with workplace deviance of employees.

7.1.1 Interpretation

The above table 4.1 explains the findings of regression analysis of procedural justice and workplace deviance which shows the value of R, R-square, Beta and the P-value. Procedural justice is 1st dimension of independent variable and workplace deviance is taken as dependent variable in this study. The result of regression analysis of these variables shows the value of R² that is correlation co-efficient to be 0.014 that shows that 14% variation in dependent variable is due to independent variable and remaining variation due to other factors.

Beta of procedural justice and workplace deviance is -0.079 that is -79% that shows the fact that increase in one unit of independent variable will increase dependent variable by -0.079 and vice versa. The P-value for these variables is 0.412 which means that there is a not a significant relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance. In

this way these results supports hypothesis H1a which shows that there exists negative relation between procedural justice and workplace deviance.

7.2 Interactional Justice with Workplace Deviance:

Table 4.2.

	R	R ²	Beta	P
Interactional Justice	.056	.003	-.036	.694

a. Predictor: (Constant), Interactional Justice

b. Dependent variable: Workplace Deviance

H1b: Interactional justice is negatively associated with workplace deviance of employees.

7.2.1 Interpretation

The above table 4.2 explains the findings of regression analysis of interactional justice and workplace deviance which shows the value of R, R-square, Beta and the P-value. In this study interactional justice is 2nd dimension of independent variable organizational justice and workplace deviance is taken as dependent variable. The result of regression analysis of these variables shows the value of R² that is correlation co-efficient to be 0.003 that shows that 0.3% variation in dependent variable is due to independent variable and remaining variation due to other factors.

Beta of interactional justice and workplace deviance is -0.036 that is -3.6% that shows the fact that increase in one unit of independent variable will increase dependent variable by -0.036 and vice versa. The P-value for these variables is 0.694 which means that there is a not a significant relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance. In this way these results supports hypothesis H1b which shows that there exists negative relation between interactional justice and workplace deviance.

7.3 Distributive Justice with Workplace Deviance:

Table 4.3.

	R	R ²	Beta	P
Distributive Justice	.007	.002	-.006	.963

a. Predictor: (Constant), Distributive Justice

b. Dependent variable: Workplace Deviance

H1c: Distributive justice is negatively associated with workplace deviance of employees.

7.3.1 Interpretation

The above table 4.3 explains the findings of regression analysis of distributive justice and workplace deviance which shows the value of R, R-square, Beta and the P-value. Distributive justice is 3rd dimension of independent variable and workplace deviance is taken as dependent variable. The result of regression analysis of these variables shows the value of R² that is correlation co-efficient to be 0.002 that shows that 0.2% variation in dependent variable is due to independent variable and remaining variation due to other factors.

Beta of distributive justice and workplace deviance is -0.006 that is -0.6% that shows the fact that increase in one unit of independent variable will increase dependent variable by -0.006 and vice versa. The P-value for these variables is 0.963 which means that there is a not a significant relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance. In this way these results supports hypothesis H1c which shows that there exists negative relation between distributive justice and workplace deviance.

7.4 Procedural Justice with Job Satisfaction:

Table 4.4.

	R	R ²	Beta	P
Procedural Justice	.663	.440	.299	.000

- a. Predictor: (Constant), Procedural Justice
- b. Dependent variable: Job Satisfaction

H2a: Procedural justice is positively associated with job satisfaction of employees.

7.4.1 Interpretation

The above table 4.4 explains the findings of regression analysis of procedural justice and job satisfaction which shows the value of R, R-square, Beta and the P-value. Procedural justice is 1st dimension of independent variable and job satisfaction is taken as dependent variable in this study. The result of regression analysis of these variables shows the value of R² that is correlation co-efficient to be 0.440 that shows that 44% variation in dependent variable is due to independent variable and remaining variation due to other factors.

Beta of procedural justice and job satisfaction is 0.299 that is 29.9% that shows the fact that increase in one unit of independent variable will increase dependent variable by 0.299 and vice versa. The P-value for these variables is 0.000 which means that there is a significant relationship between procedural justice and job satisfaction of employees. In this way these results supports hypothesis H2a which shows that there exists positive relation between procedural justice and job satisfaction.

7.5 Interactional Justice with Job Satisfaction:

Table 4.5.

	R	R ²	Beta	P
Interactional Justice	.557	.310	.237	.000

- a. Predictor: (Constant), Interactional Justice
- b. Dependent variable: Job Satisfaction

H2b: Interactional justice is positively associated with job satisfaction of employees.

7.6 Interpretation

The above table 4.5 explains the findings of regression analysis of interactional justice and job satisfaction which shows the value of R, R-square, Beta and the P-value. In this study interactional justice is 2nd dimension of independent variable organizational justice and job satisfaction is taken as dependent variable. The result of regression analysis of these variables shows the value of R² that is correlation co-efficient to be 0.310 that shows that 31% variation in dependent variable is due to independent variable and remaining variation due to other factors. Beta of procedural justice and job satisfaction is 0.237 that is 23.7% that shows the fact that increase in one unit of independent variable will increase dependent variable by 0.237 and vice versa. The P-value for these variables is 0.000 which means that there is a significant relationship between interactional justice and job satisfaction of employees. In this way these results supports hypothesis H2b which shows that there exists positive relation between interactional justice and job satisfaction.

7.7 Distributive Justice with Job Satisfaction:

Table 4.6.

	R	R ²	Beta	P
Distributive Justice	.627	.393	.370	.000

- a. Predictor: (Constant), Distributive Justice
- b. Dependent variable: Job Satisfaction

H1c: Distributive justice is positively associated with job satisfaction of employees.

7.7.1 Interpretation

The above table 4.6 explains the findings of regression analysis of distributive justice and job satisfaction which shows the value of R, R-square, Beta and the P-value. Distributive justice is 3rd dimension of independent variable and job satisfaction is taken as dependent variable. The result of regression analysis of these variables shows the value of R² that is correlation co-efficient to be 0.393 that shows that 39.3% variation in dependent variable is due to independent variable and remaining variation due to other factors.

Beta of distributive justice and job satisfaction is 0.370 that is 37% that shows the fact that increase in one unit of independent variable will increase dependent variable by 0.370 and vice versa. The P-value for these variables is 0.000 which means that there is a significant relationship between Distributive justice and job satisfaction of employees. In this way these results supports hypothesis H2c which shows that there exists positive relation between distributive justice and job satisfaction.

8. Conclusion

Considering the importance of nursing staff in health sector of Pakistan, this research is investigating the effect of organizational justice on nurses' workplace deviance and their job satisfaction. Organizational justice has three dimension named as procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice. All the variables are measured through reliable and valid scale.

From the correlation analysis it is revealed that procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice are negatively correlated with workplace deviance, while procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice are positively correlated with job satisfaction. Correlation analysis just shows the positive and negative association among variables. Therefore, regression analysis is conducted to investigate the effect of one variable on other.

From the regression analysis it is found that procedural justice is negatively affects workplace deviance but this relationship couldn't achieve the desirable significance level. Similarly interactional justice negatively affects the workplace deviance of nurses but that this relationship is also not significant. Results on the relationship of distributive justice and workplace deviance are also not much different. Although negative effect of distributive justice is found on workplace deviance but this relationship is also insignificant. Moreover the effect of interactional justice and distributive justice is minimal on workplace deviance. So from the data analysis on the effect of organizational justice on workplace deviance, it can be concluded that organizational justice doesn't have any significant impact on the workplace deviance of the nurses.

Considering the regression analysis of the organizational justice dimensions and job satisfaction of the nurses, it is found that all the three dimensions of organizational justice i.e. procedural justice, interactional justice and distributive justice positively and significantly predict the job satisfaction. This means, if the hospitals ensure proper organizational justice system in hospital towards nurses, their job satisfaction can be increased significantly.

This study implies that there is further need to explore the relationship of organizational justice on workplace deviance. Although this relationship has theoretical foundation but for this study it couldn't be proved empirically on the nursing staff. If the study is conducted on national level instead of one district then results might be improved. Relationship of organizational justice and job satisfaction is proved in this study so it implies that hospitals of Lahore should take proper measures to implement the organization justice in hospitals so that nurses can perform their jobs with higher satisfaction level which in returns might improve the overall performance of hospitals.

References

- Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., & Bradfield, M. 1999. Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: A proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20: 1073-1091.
- Aiken, L., Clarke, S., Sloane, D., Sochalski, J., Busse, R., Clarke, H., Giovannetti, P., Hunt, J., Rafferty, A., Shamian, J., 2001. *Nurses' reports on hospital care in five countries. Health Affairs* 20(3), 43-53).
- Adams, J. S. 1963. Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67: 422-436.
- Brockner, J., & Wiesenfeld, B. M. 1996. An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: Interactive effects of outcomes and procedures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120: 189-208.
- Bies, R., & Moag, J. 1986. Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R.
- Lewicki, M. Bazerman, & B. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations*: 43-55. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Bensimon, H. F. 1994. Violence in the workplace. *Training and Development Journal*: 27-32.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. 2000. Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85: 349-360.
- Conrad, K.M., Conrad, K.J., Parker, J.E., 1985. Job satisfaction among occupational health nurses. *Journal of Community Health Nursing* 2, 161-173.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. 2001. Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: p 425-445.
- Chen, S.-C., Wu, M.-C., & Chen, C.-H. (2010). Employee's Personality Traits, Work Motivation and Innovative Behavior in Marine Tourism Industry. *J. Service Science & Management*, 198-205.
- Dion, .. M. (2006). The Impact of workplace incivility and occupational stress on the job satisfaction and turnover intention of acute care nurses. *The Impact of workplace incivility and occupational stress on the job satisfaction and turnover intention of acute care nurses*. ProQuest Dissertation and Theses.
- Edwards, S., & Connell, C. F. (2007). Exploring bullying: Implications for nurse educators. *elsevier, Nurse Education In Practice*, 26-35.
- Folger, R. and Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural Justice: an interpretive analysis of personnel systems. In K.M. Rowland and G.R. Ferris (ed). *Research in personnel and human resources management*, Greenwich: JAI Press, 141-183.
- Fatt CK, Khin EWS, Heng TN (2010). The Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee's Job Satisfaction: *The Malaysian Companies Perspectives*. Am. J. Econ. Bus. Adm., 2 (1): 56-63.
- Fang, Y.Q., 2001. Turnover propensity and its causes among Singapore nurses: an empirical Study . *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 12(5), 859-871).
- Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54: 81-103.
- Greenberg, J. 1990. Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75: 561-568.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., 1959. The Motivation to Work, second ed. *Wiley*, NewYork.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). Job Satisfaction, *Harper and Brothers*, New York, p. 47
- Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. 1982. Formal and informal social controls of employee deviance. *Sociological Quarterly*, 23: 333-343.
- Irvine, D.M., Evans, M.G., 1995. Job satisfaction and turnover among nurses-integrating research across studies. *Nursing Research* 44 (4), 246-253.
- Judge, T., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. 2006. Hostility, job attitudes, and workplace deviance: Test of a multilevel model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 126-138.
- Jones, D. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. 2005. The effects of overhearing peers discuss an authority's fairness reputation on reactions to subsequent treatment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90: 363-72.
- Kingma, M., 2001. Nursing migration: global treasure hunt or disaster-in-the-making? *Nursing Inquiry* 8, 205-212.
- Laschinger, H. K., Duffield, C., & Read, E. (2014). *Laschinger, H. K. S., Duffield, C. & Read, E. (2014). The Role of leadership in creating empowering*. Australia: Elsevier.
- Lee, M. B., & Saeed, I. (2001). Oppression and horizontal violence: The case of nurses in Pakistan. *In Nursing Forum, Blackwell Publishing Ltd.*, 15-24.
- Lu, H., E. A., While, K., & Barriball, L. (2005). Job satisfaction among nurses: a literature review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 42, 2001-227.
- Lundh, U., 1999. Job satisfaction among Swedish nurses and laboratory technologists. *British Journal of Nursing* 8 (14), 948-952.
- Moorman, R. 1991. Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76: 845-855.
- Neuman, J., & Baron, R. 1998. Workplace Violence and Workplace Aggression: Evidence Concerning Specific Forms, Potential Causes, and Preferred Targets. *Journal of Management*, 24: 391-419.
- Peterson, D. K. 2002. Deviant Workplace Behavior and the Organization's Ethical Climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. 17: 47.
- Price, J.L., 2001. Reflections on the determinants of voluntary turnover. *International Journal of Manpower* 22 (7), 600-624.
- Pizzino, A. (2002). Dealing with violence in the workplace: the experience of Canada unions. In M. Gill, B. Fisher, & V. Bowie (Eds.). *Violence at Work: Causes, Patterns and Prevention* (pp. 165-79). Cullompton, UK: Willan.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. 1997. Workplace deviance: Its definition, its manifestations, and its causes. *Research on negotiation in organizations*, 6: 3-27.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of management journal*, 555-572.
- Singh, A., & Singh, A. (2010). Role of stress and organizational support in predicting organizational citizenship behavior. *The IUP journal of organizational behavior*, 07-25, 46.
- Somani, R. K., & Khowaja, K. (2012). Workplace violence towards nurses: A reality from the Pakistani Context. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, 148-153.
- Tingen, M. S., Burnett, A. H., Murchison, R. B., & Zhu, H. (2013). The Importance of Nursing Research. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 167-170.
- Tang TL, Sarsfield-Baldwin LJ (1996). Distributive and procedural justice as related to satisfaction and commitment. *SAM Adv. Manage. J.*, 61(3): 25-31.
- Tyler, T. R., & Bies, R. J. 1990. Beyond formal procedures: The interpersonal context of procedural justice. In J. S. Carroll (Ed.), *Applied*

social psychology and organizational settings, 67: 77-98. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
Worf, M.G., 1970. Need gratification theory: a theoretical reformulation of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and job motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 54, 87-94.