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ABSTRACT
Employee deviance is a critical issue to be focused on in an organization. Most of the time, positive work behaviors are discussed in the studies, but negative behaviors do not get much attention. This research is based on understanding how the negative and deviant behavior of the employees can get affected. This research is based on examining the effect of trust in the manager-employee relationship on employees’ deviance and what would be the impact of job satisfaction by keeping it as the mediator among these variables. This study explored how trust in manager-employee relationships might help the organizations to reduce the employees’ deviance toward their organization, toward their colleagues, and toward their customers, known as organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, and frontline deviance, respectively. To investigate the phenomenon, the employees of private sector banks were taken as a sample for this study. Data was collected through online questionnaires. The results of this study validate that there is a negative impact of trust in the manager-employee relationship on employees’ deviance in the presence of job satisfaction as a mediator. If the employees are satisfied with their jobs and they have trust in their manager, they tend to show less deviant behavior toward the organization, their colleagues, and the customers.
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INTRODUCTION

Many managers have reported that their employees are engaged in deviant behavior, which can cause great harm to organizational performance and the firm's reputation and negatively impact co-workers (Yoo, Flaherty & Frankwick, 2014; Gill, 2000). When some of the employees violate organizational rules and resist accepting the prevailing norms of the firm, the internal operations of the firm will be harmed (Ball, Trevino & Sims, 1994). Employees’ deviance has become an essential topic of discussion for the organizational researchers nowadays because of its consequences being faced by the firms, but more research is needed to cover this area of the market’s social problem. It is imperative for the researchers to explore more about the employees' negative behaviors rather than just focusing on the positive side (Yoo, Flaherty & Frankwick, 2014).

Researchers are repeatedly working on intra-organizational behaviors of the employees like organization citizenship and, inter-organizational behaviors, customer-oriented behaviors (Wang et al., 2005); even though they have worked on service behaviors of employees, all these studies cater only to positive behaviors of the employees that would most likely impact in favor of the organizations and its members and ignore the negative side of their behavior (Mount et al., 2006). Employees do have to interact with their organization’s members along with the members of their customer organizations, so the behavior of employees or misbehavior not only affects the internal operations of the organization but also the external functions, including relationship building with the customers (Jelinek & Ahearne, 2006a).

Workplace deviance can be explained as “the voluntary and intentional behavior in which organizational norms and values are being violated by the employees, and as a result, it threatens the organizational well-being, the members of the organization or both” (Robinson et al., 1995). Researchers have been working on workplace deviance and its various types, including organizational deviance, customer deviance, interpersonal deviance, and frontline deviance. According to Jelinek and Ahearne (2014), to study the behavior of an individual, either normative or deviant, researchers have been using control theory which is also referred to as a choice theory by Glasser (1998) which identifies the predictors of such behaviors. Control theory depicts that the behavior of an individual is motivated by satisfying the essential needs, including survival/ basic needs, belonging, power, freedom, and fun needs (Novak, 1999). Glasser (1998) also identified that these unfulfilled needs could drive a person towards deviant or dysfunctional behavior like if a person feels that there is a threat to his/her need for
power, they may misbehave to take control over such circumstances. Similarly, if the need for belonging is fulfilled, that person will behave more normatively (Jelinek & Ahearne, 2014).

A few researchers worked on the reasons that can cause workplace deviancy. Work-family conflict is one of them. According to the research, Work-family conflict is the primary antecedent to cause employees’ deviance (Darrat, Amyx & Bennett, 2010). Other triggers for various kinds of employees’ deviance include organizational justice, bureaucracy, intrafirm competition, management as a role model and future orientation (Jelinek, Ronald & Ahearne, 2006). Another study suggests that various forms of social undermining (supervisor, customer, or co-worker undermining) affects the employee by triggering emotional exhaustion leading the employees towards an unethical and deviant behavior (Yoo & Frankwick, 2013). Research shows that job stress also predicts employees’ deviant behavior (Omar et al., 2011). Work-related stress shows a positive relationship with deviant workplace behavior. When stress at work increases, employees show more deviant behavior (Omar et al., 2011).

Extending the research, job satisfaction also serves as an antecedent of workplace deviance. Job satisfaction plays a vital role in identifying the employees’ deviant behavior (Bowling, 2009). Research study shows a negative relationship between job satisfaction and deviant behavior of the employees (Omar et al., 2011), which demonstrates that if the employees are more satisfied with their jobs, they will show a positive behavior and behave less deviant vice versa.

Trust is supposed to be a building block and a positive component in working relationships (Rousseau et al., 1998). Previously, a lot of work has been done on the relationship between managers and employees. The study shows that the employees who have higher trust in their managers have higher job satisfaction (Robertson et al., 2012), and they show more commitment to their jobs and organization (Flaherty & Pappas, 2000).

In previous studies, the direct effect of job satisfaction on various forms of employees’ deviant behavior has not been studied. In this study, the effects of job satisfaction on different types of employees’ deviant behavior are explored, including frontline deviance, organizational deviance as well as interpersonal deviance. Furthermore, the mechanism of how trust in managers and employees’ relations can affect job satisfaction and its further impact on employees’ deviance on the basis of its three types is discussed.
RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this study are:

i. To identify the relationship of trust in the manager-employee relationship with job satisfaction.

ii. To identify the relationship between job satisfaction and employees’ deviance.

iii. To identify the effect of trust in the manager-employee relationships on employees' deviance.

iv. To identify the effect of trust in the manager-employee relationship on employees’ deviance with mediating role of job satisfaction.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Researchers have identified employees’ ethics in marketing management since the 1980s (Chonko & Hunt, 1985). Those behaviors that leave harmful effects on others and are illegal or generally not acceptable to the larger community are considered unethical behaviors. (Jones, 1991). While employees’ deviance is defined as “the voluntary and intentional behavior in which organizational norms and values are being violated by the employees, and as a result, it threatens the organizational well-being, the members of the organization or both” (Robinson et al., 1995).

Employees’ Deviance

According to Lewis (1985), there is a noticeable difference between unethical behavior and workplace deviance; unethical behavior determines right and wrong in terms of the law, justice, or societal guidelines, while workplace deviance focuses on violation of organizational norms. This means employees can behave both unethically as well as deviant behavior. These two behaviors are not alike, and they are not dependent on each other (Robinson et al., 1995).

According to Bolin and Heatherly (2001), employees’ deviance should be taken seriously as it is a severe problem for any business holder. The key outcomes of an organization will get affected by the violation of the norms of that organization by its employees and workforce (Darrat, Amyx & Bennett, 2010). This shows that there is a threat to the organization’s outcome and profitability if the employees of that organization are showing deviant behavior.

As mentioned above, past research suggests that employee deviance is of various types. Employee deviance affects the organizational well-being, deviance towards the customers, and
deviant behavior toward the co-workers and colleagues. Researchers have classified these behaviors as:

**Organizational Deviance**
Intra-organizational negative behaviors are directed toward employee organizations (Bennett et al., 2000; Yoo, Flaherty & Frankwick, 2014). This is a violation of the organizational norms towards the organization, and it is directly affecting the organization. This can be represented as if the employee uses organizational supplies for personal work.

**Interpersonal Deviance**
Intra-organizational negative behaviors are directed toward other people in the organization (Bennett et al., 2000; Yoo, Flaherty & Frankwick, 2014). Interpersonal deviance can be seen among the employees of the organization, like blaming the co-workers for any issue that has been arising in the office or criticizing any colleague for their decisions or suggestions.

**Frontline Deviance**
Inter-organizational negative behaviors are directed towards organizational outsiders, for example, customers and prospects (Jelinek & Ahearne, 2014). Frontline deviance could be shown by the employee’s behavior if he used to discuss something bad about the organization or its product with the customer or misguide the prospect about the organization.

**Job Satisfaction**
Job satisfaction is a widely studied research variable because of its widespread impacts and effects on a variety of outcomes that may include performance, commitment, trust and turnover intentions (Spector, 1997). According to Spector (1997), job satisfaction is defined as how one feels about his job and its different aspects. Job satisfaction plays an important role in determining deviant workplace behavior as it acts as an antecedent of employees' deviance and has a negative effect on it (Omar et al., 2011). According to the research, workplace deviance can be resulted due to multiple factors, including the financial pressure on the employees, organizational injustice, employee perception, the environment of the organization, lower job satisfaction, etc. Job satisfaction is among the most important factors that can cause or remove workplace deviance (Nasir & Bashir, 2012).

**Trust in Manager-Employee Relationship**
Trust has also become a widely studied research variable in different disciplines like sociology, psychology, and economics. Recently, attention has been increased to learning trust in the manager and employee relationship in management research. According to the studies, the
employees who have trust in their managers have more job satisfaction and commitment towards the organization (Flaherty & Pappas, 2000). According to Flaherty and Pappas, the Leader-member exchange theory (LMX) helps in better understanding the manager-employees’ relationship. According to the research, there is a strong connection between the interpersonal trust of managers and employees over the job satisfaction of the employees. Employees get more satisfied with their job if there is a trusted relationship between the managers and the employees (Matzler & Renzl, 2006). Another study shows that trust plays an important role in the success of a sales organization. If there is trust in the relationship between the sales force and their management, it will have a positive influence on the organization's success and performance (Strutton, Toma & Pelton, 1993). According to the research, organizational trust plays an essential role in creating positive relationships among the colleagues between the manager and his employees or between the employees and their managers (Krot & Lewicka, 2012).

**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

![Diagram showing conceptual framework](image)

**Figure 1. Conceptual Framework**

This study is backed by the leader-member exchange (LMX) theory. On the basis of this theory, the relationship between managers and employees can be studied (Schriesheim et al. 1999). According to LMX, the leaders create a different kind of relationship with their followers/subordinates (Bartram & Casimir, 2007). For example, binding factors like trust, the presence of common goals and respect are considered high LMX relationships and splitting factors like contractual and impersonal interactions of leader and members or the managers and
employees that are limited just on their job descriptions are characterized as low LMX relationships (Brower et al., 2000; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

According to Lin & Ma (2004), LMX helps improve the job performance of the employees and it also improves job performance and job satisfaction. According to Jelinek and Ahearne (2014), to study the behavior of an individual, either normative or deviant, researchers have been using control theory which is also referred to as a choice theory by Glasser (1998), which identifies the predictors of such behaviors. Control theory depicts that the behavior of an individual is motivated by satisfying the essential needs, including survival/ basic needs, belonging, power, freedom, and fun needs. Glasser also identified that these unfulfilled needs could drive a person toward deviant or dysfunctional behavior; like if a person feels that there is a threat to their need for power, they may misbehave to take control over such circumstances (Novak, 1999).

**RESEARCH HYPOTHESES**

**H1.** Trust in the manager-employees relationship has a positive impact on employees’ job satisfaction.

**H2:** Job Satisfaction has a negative impact on employees’ deviance.

**H3:** Trust in the manager-employee relationship has a negative impact on employees’ deviance.

**H4:** Trust in the manager-employee relationship has a negative impact on employees’ deviance in the presence of job satisfaction.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The research design or the nature of this research is a causal study which is also known as a cause-and-effect study. This type of study identifies the relationship between two variables on the basis of cause and effect. The instrument used in this research to collect the data was an online questionnaire, as this is a quantitative study. Questionnaires are comprised of a number of questions related to the variables of the study that are used to collect the required information about the study from its respondents. The primary objective of using this instrument for data collection is to get accurate and reliable information from the targeted people or the sample of the study with the aim of getting the information like what the chosen simply think, do, and feels (Collis & Hussey, 2013). Data collection through the questionnaire is easy and convenient. It is a better and more reliable way to collect the data as compared to any other
form of survey. It is a quick way to get standardized answers which is a convenient option for compiling the data.

The target population of this research is the people working in the private banks of Pakistan. Due to limited resources, this research is limited to the private sector banks operating in Islamabad. 4 banks were randomly selected out of 19 private sector banks of Pakistan working in different areas of Islamabad. The banks we have chosen to collect the data are HBL, UBL, SILK BANK, and FAYSAL BANK. Online questionnaires were used as an instrument for data collection. Questionnaires were distributed to 135 employees of these banks through their HR department via email on convenience bases, and 117 questionnaires were received back. Out of these 117 responses, there were five questionnaires whose data was missing which were not considered appropriate. So, the data of 112 questionnaires were used for the result. Thus, the response rate of the study was 82.9%. The sample frame for this research was the employees of these private banks in Pakistan, including managerial level employees.

For each variable, the scales developed and used by previous studies are used to collect the data. Detailed information about the scales, number of items, and their sources is given below.

**Trust in Manager-Employee Relationship**
A sixteen-item scale is used to measure trust in the manager-employee relationship, which was opted by Tzafrir and Dolan’s Trust scale (2004). These items are measured on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 is strongly disagree, and 7 is strongly agree.

**Job Satisfaction**
5 items scale is used to measure Job satisfaction of the employees, which was used by Judge et al. (2006) and developed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951). A 5-point Likert scale is used where 1 is strongly disagree, and 5 is strongly agree.

**Employees’ Deviance**
14 items scale is used to measure employees’ deviance in the form of organizational, interpersonal, and frontline deviance of the employees, which is developed by Jelinek and Ahearne (2006a & 2006b). These items are scored on a 5-point Likert type scale where 1 is strongly disagree, and 5 is strongly disagree.

Online questionnaires were used to collect the data about the dependent and independent variables as well as for the mediator of our study. These questionnaires were also aimed to gather information about the research respondents like their gender, designation, education, age, experience, the bank they are currently working in, etc.
RESULTS

As mentioned in the methodology section, the study is based on the sample responses collected from the employees of the private bank sector in Islamabad. Four banks were chosen (HBL, UBL, SILK BANK, and FAYSAL BANK). The demographics of these employees are discussed in the table below.

| Name of Organization | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percentage | Cumulative Percentage |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Valid                |           |         |                 |                       |
| HBL                  | 27        | 24.1    | 31.8            | 31.8                  |
| UBL                  | 16        | 14.3    | 18.8            | 50.6                  |
| Silk Bank            | 24        | 21.4    | 28.2            | 78.8                  |
| Faysal Bank          | 18        | 16.1    | 21.2            | 100                   |
| Total                | 85        | 75.9    | 100             |                       |
| Missing              | 27        | 24.1    |                 |                       |
| System Total         | 112       | 100     |                 |                       |

Table 1. Correlation Matrix

|                      | Mean | SD    | 1    | 2    | 3    |
|----------------------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| 1. Trust in M/E Relationship | 3.96 | 0.734 | 1    |      |      |
| 2. Job Satisfaction   | 3.79 | 0.850 | .681**| 1    |      |
| 3. Employee Deviance  | 2.14 | 0.868 | -.500**| -.619**| 1    |

Note: N = 112
*p < .01.
**p < .001

In table 1 mentioned above, there is the data of the respondents according to the organizations (Banks) they are currently working in. This table shows that there were 24.1% respondents from HBL, 14.3% respondents were from UBL, 21.4% respondents were from the Silk Bank, while 16.1% respondents of the questionnaires were from Faysal Bank. There is also a column by the name of the missing system, which shows that 24.1% of respondents did not want to disclose their personal information.

Table 1 also shows the statistics on the gender of the respondents. There were 76.8% male employees out of the total 112 respondents who filled the questionnaire, and 23.2% of female respondents filled the data. The ratio of male employees in banks is higher than the female employees in Pakistan. The gender statistics show the real difference in the number of male and female employees working in the offices and banks. The rate of male employees is higher than that of female employees.
The above-mentioned table 2 represents the complete result of correlation among all the variables of the study. The range of possible correlation among the two variables is from -1 to +1. Bivariate correlation helps us to find the expected direction among the variables too. The first hypothesis of this study states that there is a positive impact of trust in the manager-employee relationship and job satisfaction. If we see the relationship between trust in manager-employee relation and job satisfaction from the table, a 68.1% relation is coexisting among these variables as per the statement of first hypothesis H1, and the value is positive, which shows a positive relationship among the variables. The result of the first hypothesis thus shows that it has the right direction.

If we check the statement of the second hypothesis, H2, it states that there is a negative impact of job satisfaction on employees’ deviance. This hypothesis can be proved right if we see the value in the table; a relation of -61.9% coexists between job satisfaction and employees’ deviance. As we can see that the value is negative, this shows that the inverse relation of these two variables has been proved by the data collected from the employees. Thus, we can see that there is an inverse relationship between job satisfaction and employees’ deviance, and the result is according to the expected direction.

To check the correlation between trust in the manager-employee relationship and employees' deviance as per H3, which states that there is a negative impact of trust in the manager-employee relationship on the employees' deviance. This shows that increased trust among the managers and employees in the bank will help in reducing the deviant behavior of the employees and vice versa. According to the results of the table, the independent variable trust in the manager-employee relationship is -50% correlated with the dependent variable employees' deviance. A correlation exists in these variables and has a negative value which represents the negative relation. So, the results show that results are in the right direction, which was expected.

**Testing the First Hypothesis**

**Table 2.** Regression Analysis

| Predictors | β    | R²    | Δ R²  |
|------------|------|-------|-------|
| Model 1: Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction  |      |       |       |
| Predictor: Trust in manager-employee relationship | 0.681** | 0.463** | 0.463** |
| Model 2: Dependent Variable: Employee Deviance |       |       |       |
| Predictor: Job Satisfaction | -0.619** | 0.383** | 0.383** |
| Model 3: Dependent Variable: Employee Deviance |       |       |       |
| Predictor: Trust in manager-employee relationship | -0.5** | 0.250** | 0.250** |

*Note: N = 112
*p < .01.
**p < .001
(H1): The positive impact of trust in the manager-employee relationship on job satisfaction.

The first hypothesis of this study (H1) claims that there is a significant and positive relationship between trust in the manager-employee relationship and job satisfaction. In order to prove the claim right or wrong, we will see the results generated by regression analysis through SPSS software 25th version, which is based on the responses of those banks’ employees who have filled the questionnaire.

The above table shows that the independent variable (trust in the manager-employee relationship) has been entered to measure its effect on the mediator by keeping the mediating variable (job satisfaction) as the dependent variable. For the regression analysis, first, we measured the significance of the variables. The value of change in R square is .463 which shows that there is a 46.3% impact of independent variable (trust in manager-employee relationship) on job satisfaction i.e. \( \Delta R^2 = .463, p < .001 \). This also represents that out of 100% of job satisfaction, 46.3% was the impact of trust in the manager-employee relationship, while the remaining 53.7% depends upon other factors that are not included in this study that can influence this variable. These factors can be studied in future research. In order to measure the significance level of the variables, i.e., between trust in the manager-employee relationship and job satisfaction, we can see p-value shows significance, i.e. \( p < 0.001 \), which is less than the 5% chance of error. This value of alpha shows that there is a highly significant relationship among these variables. The beta value shows that the relationship between trust in the manager-employee relationship and job satisfaction is positively significant (\( \beta = .37, p < .001 \)). Thus, Hypothesis 1 is accepted with a significance level \( p < 0.001 \).

**Testing the Second Hypothesis**

(H2): Negative impact of job satisfaction on employees’ deviance

To measure the negative effect and significance of these two variables, we will analyze the results of regression analysis of both variables, i.e., Job satisfaction and employees’ deviance. The results of the table show that the value of change in R square is .383 and the significance level is less than .001, i.e. \( \Delta R^2 = .383, p < .001 \). This means that there is a highly significant relationship in these variables. However, there is a 38.3% influence of job satisfaction on the employees’ deviance. This percentage shows that out of 100%, employees’ deviance is influenced by job satisfaction at the rate of 38.3%. The remaining percentage shows that other factors influence the variable employees’ deviance. Beta value for Job satisfaction and the
dependent variable employees’ deviance is -61.9% with a negative impact i.e. \((\beta = -0.619, p < 0.001)\). Thus, H2 is also accepted with a significance level \((p < 0.001)\).

**Testing the Third Hypothesis**

\((H3): \textit{negative impact of trust in the manager-employee relationship on employees’ deviance.}\)

The third hypothesis claims that there is a negative impact of trust in the manager-employee relationship on the dependent variable of this study, i.e., employees' deviance. The table shows that the R square change is .250, which means that there is a 25% effect of the predictor, i.e., trust in the manager-employee relationship on the dependent variable employees' deviance, i.e. \((\Delta R^2 = .250, p < .001)\). There is a highly significant relationship between these two variables as the \(p\)-value of these variables is less than .001 \((p < 0.001)\), which represents a significant relationship among the variables. The beta value shows a 50% influence of the predictor (Trust in the manager-employee relationship) on the dependent variable, employee deviance, and the negative value supports the negative relation among these variables, i.e. \((\beta = -0.50, p < .001)\). Thus, the third hypothesis is also accepted with a significance level \((p < 0.001)\).

**Testing the Fourth Hypothesis**

\((H4): \textit{Negative impact of trust in the manager-employee relationship on employees' deviance with the mediating effect of job satisfaction.}\)

**Table 3. Mediation Model**

| Dependent Variable: Employee Deviance | Predictors                                      | \(\beta\) | \(R^2\)  | \(\Delta R^2\) |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|-----------------|
|                                      | Job Satisfaction                                | -0.518*** | 0.383***| 0.383***        |
|                                      | Job Satisfaction, Trust in manager-employee relationship | -1.48    | 0.394   | 0.12            |

*Note: \(N = 112\)

*\(p < .01\).

**\(\ast\)p < .001.**

Hypothesis four claims that there is a negative impact of trust in the manager-employee relationship on employees' deviance with the mediating role of job satisfaction. Table shows that the value of R square change is 38.3% \((\Delta R^2 = .383, p < .001)\) for job satisfaction (the mediator) and there is 12% R square change \((\Delta R^2 = .12, p > .05)\) for the independent variable (trust in the manager-employee relationship). This means that the mediator has a stronger effect on the dependent variable than the independent variable, and it mediates the relationship of the independent variable with the dependent variable. This can be proved by the alpha value in the
The significance level of job satisfaction is high (p < .001) with the employees' deviance, while there is no significant relationship between the independent and dependent variables in the presence of the mediator. This hypothesis is proved right, and the relationship of the independent and dependent variables is amplified with the mediation.

Results show that there exists a negative impact of job satisfaction and trust in the manager-employee relationship with the employees' deviance as the beta values are negative. For job satisfaction and employees' deviance Beta value is 51.8% (β = -.518, p < .001) while for trust in manager-employee relationship and employees’ deviance it is 148% (β = -1.48, p > .05). There is a negatively significant relationship between job satisfaction with employee deviance, while the relation of trust in the manager-employee relationship with the employees' deviance is negatively insignificant, which shows that these variables are adequately mediated due to the presence of the mediator. Thus, the fourth hypothesis is also accepted.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, banks and other organizations must focus on the negative behavior of their employees. According to this research, by making the relationship between employees and their managers trustworthy, the negative behaviors of the employees could be reduced. Meanwhile, job satisfaction plays a vital role in reducing the employees' deviant behaviors. Less satisfied employees tend to have and show more negative behaviors than satisfied employees. While according to the leader-member exchange theory, trust in the manager-employee relationship can help the organizations to get their employees more satisfied, which further helps in reducing their deviant behavior. Thus, trust in the manager-employee relationship has a positive impact on job satisfaction, and there is a negative relationship between job satisfaction and employees' deviance. If the trust in the manager-employee relationship improves, job satisfaction increases, and by improving these two variables, the employees show less deviant behavior.

**MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS**

This study is based on the employees and manager relationship that can help mitigate the employees' negative behaviors towards the organization, their colleagues, and their customers. The results of this study may benefit the organizations to improve the relationship between managers and employees in order to reduce the negative behavior of the employees in an organizational setting. This research will help the organizations focus on the employees' negative behaviors, which are generally ignored. This study shows that trust in the manager-employee relationship will help the organizations to reduce employees' deviant behavior.
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