Impact of Supervisor Expediency on Employee Unethical Behavior in BPO industry of Pakistan: The mediating role of employee unethical tolerance in the odd shift workers.

# ABSTRACT

This thesis is based on the research where the role of supervisor expediency in employee unethical behaviour is studied. Role of employee unethical tolerance as mediator has been studied thoroughly. The main focus of study is to check the role of variables on odd shift workers working in the BPO industry of Pakistan and how social learning theory works in these type of workers. S&P global has been chosen for this research where more than 1000 employees work in the odd shifts. The data is collected through a structured questionnaire with open ended questions. The analysis has been done on 130 responses and the role of employee unethical tolerance has been studied as a mediator. Ethical behaviour has been an issue in the companies working in Pakistan and it is a matter of focus in many public and private sector organizations working in Pakistan. As an American multinational has been chosen for this study, the orientation for these type of organizations is very different in culture as well as in completing the work. Unethical behaviour affects the organization’s position in the longer run and supervisor behaviour affects the thinking of employees in a significant manner. Hence deduced that supervisor expediency affects the employee unethical behaviour in a significant way in the presence of employee unethical tolerance acting as mediation
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# Introduction

In mentioning the organizational culture, the tolerance level and behavior of the employees is significant. However, amongst several factors, the attitude of supervisor or the manager is considered the most significant when it comes to developing employee attitude and tolerance level as well. The review of past studies has presented a mixed opinion on this stance. Some studies believe that lenient and expedient supervisors create a humble employee attitude as well (Nielsen, 2013). However, other studies present that leniency or supervisor expediency leads to a mismanaged and unethical working environment where employees have greater chances of bad attitude and less tolerance level. Considering these concerns, respective paper will briefly research the relationship between supervisor expediency and employee tolerance level and workplace attitude using the Social Learning Theory proposed by (Bandhura, 2014)

The idea of job attitudes streams from the more extensive writing on social attitudes, so we start our audit by examining how these literary works are connected (Martinko, Harvey, Brees, & Mackey, 2013). A job attitude, obviously, is a kind of attitude, and along these lines it is essential to put job attitudes look into in the more extensive setting of social attitudes inquire about. Notwithstanding the long history of research on attitudes, there is no all-around settled upon definition. Maybe the most generally acknowledged meaning of an attitude, in any case, was that a psychological propensity that is communicated by assessing a specific element with some level of support or disgrace (Maio, Haddock, & Verplanken, 2018). Thus, the idea of assessment is a bringing together subject in attitudes explore. One issue for attitudes explore is that people may shape an assessment of (and in this way hold an attitude around) an about boundless number of substances. A portion of these attitudes may verge on the paltry, at any rate in a general psychological sense (we may have an attitude about a popular on-screen character, about oak wood, or about the shading green), or might be adequately sectioned that they are just of specific intrigue (e.g., an attitude about private undertaking, about expressionist workmanship, and so on.). Given this variety of attitude objects, for what reason is it defended to consider job attitudes as a critical and focal part of social attitudes?

The significance of attitude in understanding psychological wonder was given formal acknowledgment right off the bat ever of psychology. From the season of the idea's entrance in to the dialect of psychology as of recently, enthusiasm for attitude has been solid and developing. Nonetheless, throughout the years attitudes have been contemplated with varying emphasis and strategies. It is important to be exact in characterizing attitudes, on the grounds that the assortment of distributed definitions and portrayals is relatively interminable. Attitude might be characterized in two different ways, Conceptual and Operational (Zhu, He, Treviño, Chao, & Wang, 2015) There is a significant distinction in the applied meaning of the term attitude, and dissimilar perspectives with respect to the idea of attitude have created. Attitude is a psychological and neural condition of availability composed through understanding, applying a mandate or dynamic impact upon the person's reaction to all articles and circumstances with which it is connected (Bandhura, 2014).

Employee confidence has been a conventional worry of staff (Alt, Díez-de-Castro, & Lloréns-Montes, 2015). It has dependably been accepted that employee assurance and profitability go turn in handy regardless of the uncertain proof in that score. In numerous quarters, the spirit of general population has been taken as a fundamental marker of adequacy in the release of the work force work. Work force confidence has dependably been viewed as one normal for the viable association (Alt et al., 2015).

The worry for employee spirit may have been at first a worry for expanded profitability, for enhanced authoritative execution, for the accomplishment of "hierarchical objectives" (which, for monetary associations, has generally been estimated regarding benefit (Raghavan, 2013).

## Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to analyse the role of employees unethical tolerance as a mediator between supervisor expediency and employee unethical behaviour. Study is being made to analyse the influence of employees to model the expedient behaviours of supervisors. Study also analyse the supervisor’s expediencies impact on the employees attitudes of unethical tolerance.

## Scope of Study

The study will focus on multi-national majorly from BPO industry with diversity in their employees. These will also us to evaluate multiple socio-psychological factors that shape up the employee behavior and tolerance level. As well as the impact of managerial attitude in shaping up this employee behavior (Alcover, Rico, Turnley, & Bolino, 2017). This research will be analysing how supervisor expediency affects the employee’s unethical behaviour. Alongside, it will analyze how unethical tolerance mediates the relationship between supervisor expediency and employee unethical behaviour. The study discusses the impact of employee’s behaviour on the expediency of employer.

## Research Title

Impact of Supervisor Expediency on Employee Unethical Behavior in BPO industry of Pakistan: The mediating role of employee unethical tolerance in the odd shift workers.

## Significance of Study

The study is significant as often employee tolerance level and attitude are said to be the product of his social influence, work pressure, etc. However, there is a lack of research and understanding how tolerant or “nice” attitude of managers can impact the employee attitude negatively in odd shift workers. This is a critical aspect that needs to be understood to ensure professional success and efficiency. We are focusing on the employees working in shifts (evening & night) where motivation and supervision works in total different way. The secondary research is more general and here in this study, it is narrowed down to only shift workers.

## Research Questions

 **1.5.1 Research Question 1**:
This research question studies the effect of our main variables as unethical behavior may be controlled by supervisions but if one has no tendency of being unethical, will supervisor’s expediency affect that individual?

* **Does supervisor expediency impact the employee’s unethical behavior significantly?**

It’s a descriptive study. Primary data collection method will be used to collect relevant information. Statistical analysis methods will be used to analyse the data to check the viability of the relationship between supervisor expediency and unethical behaviour of employees

 **1.5.2 Research Question 2**:

* **Does supervisor expediency have an impact on employee’s unethical tolerance?**

It’s a descriptive study. Primary data collection method will be used to collect relevant information. Statistical analysis methods will be used to analyse the data to check the viability of the relationship between supervisor expediency and unethical tolerance of employees

 **1.5.3 Research Question 3**:

* **Does employee’s unethical tolerance affect the employee’s unethical behavior?**

It’s a descriptive study. Primary data collection method will be used to collect relevant information. Statistical analysis methods will be used to analyse the data to check the viability of the affect of tolerance on employee’s unethical behaviour.

**1.5.4 Research Question 4**:

**Does employees unethical tolerance mediates the relationship between SE and EUB?**

It’s a descriptive study. Primary data collection method will be used to collect relevant information. Statistical analysis methods will be used to analyse the data to check the mediation due to unethical tolerance on the relationship of supervisor expediency and Employee unethical behaviour.

## Classification

As per the research model, the research study is classified as empirical, descriptive and co relational. This study will explain the relationship between the variables and the mediator and how they affect each other hence deduce the significance of each variable involved in the study. This study is cross-sectional study as it is going to be studied one time to collect data and to interpret them

Furthermore, we contend that supervisor expediency, particularly when the impact of supervisor expediency is high, impacts employees' attitudes of unethical tolerance, which at that point influences employees' expedient behaviours.

## Research Objectives:

* To find out the critical factors which affect the employee unethical behaviour
* To study the strength of the relationship between supervisor expediency and the employee unethical behaviour
* To determine any connection present between Employee unethical tolerance and supervisor expediency in BPO industry
* To find out if the employee unethical tolerance mediates the connection between supervisor expediency and employee unethical behaviour of the employees working in odd shifts.

## Limitations

This study is going to be focused on the BPO industry and the employees working in odd shifts. From the total population, the employees working in S&P global are taken as sample. Time scarcity and low resources are the major limitation in this study. The gap has been analyzed from the study done by Greenbaum, 2017. In the context of Pakistani culture, gathering data through employees while they are in office is very difficult as they are busy in their work also unwilling to take out time for filling any questionnaire especially where they have to write about their supervisor behaviours.

##  1.9. Hypotheses

**H 1:** Supervisor Expediency has a significant impact on Employee unethical behaviour.

**H 2**:Employee unethical tolerance has a significant role in employee’s unethical behaviors

**H 3**: Supervisor’s expedient behavior enhances the tolerance of employees towards unethical tasks

**H 4:** Employee unethical tolerance mediates the relationship between the significant effect of supervisor expediency on employee unethical behaviour

## Theoretical Framework

#

# Literature Review

**Venn diagram:**

****

Supervisor Expediency means the feasibility and usefulness of supervisor in order to regulate the efficient work in the workplace, along with ethical behaviour of his/her workforce. Many unethical leadership research has been conceptual. A possible explanation is that supervisor’s engage in ethically questionable behaviour by adopting a frame of mind which causes them to do so. This is considered as bottom-line mentality as they engage in questionable unethical behaviour for the sake of their own benefit. It is notable to mention that certain organizational practices are responsible for unethical behaviours of both supervisors and employees. These organizational practices includes goal settings as well. There are many researchers who described the idea of unethical behaviour due to bottom-line mentality. Bottom-line mentality may contain both extension of goal shielding and adoption of a business frame. A bottom-line mentality of supervisor is an obsession with the outcomes of the business. Bottom-line mentality is seen as important factor in the behaviour of supervisors. Certain economists argued that the goal of an organization is to increase the revenue for that organizations, especially shareholder. Whereas supervisors are accepted by standards of profit maximization and efficiency.

## Impact of Supervisor Expediency

Now and again, a manager believes that they should be "nice" at work (Nielsen, 2013). They're excessively put resources into being enjoyed and they're uneasy setting points of confinement or giving results. They particularly don't care for dealing with relational clashes between staff, expecting that something like one individual will be troubled with the manner in which they settle the issue. Be that as it may, this makes a great deal of issues in the work environment.

Maybe they have an employee who's behaving gravely, by coming in late, leaving early, staying away from work, or surfing the net when they should work. Rather than calling this individual to undertaking, the manager chooses to give this specialist another opportunity, at that point a third, a fourth, and an eighth. The "nice" manager is planning to maintain a strategic distance from a showdown and needs to trust that the employee has the earnest aim of doing their business to the best of their capacity (Nielsen, 2013). In the meantime, there are repercussions all through the whole working environment because of the manager's decision to be "nice" to this employee.

Despite the fact that the working environment isn't equivalent to the home, and despite the fact that the general population at work aren't our family, when we're assembled together for quite a while with similar people, we individuals normally have family-type responses to each other (Tziner & Sharoni, 2014). As it were, relational elements at work will frequently reflect familial ones.

For instance, the manager is regularly observed as a parental figure. The manager's job, similar to that of the parent, is to control their laborers, resolve troubles that emerge with them, and give suitable ramifications for an insufficient execution or unsuitable behavior (Tziner & Sharoni, 2014). At the point when the manager neglects to do these things it results in a work environment without a "decent parent," and prompts indistinguishable kinds of outcomes from would occur in a family with remiss child rearing.

At the point when the "nice" manager gives second, third, and eighth opportunities to an employee, it completes a couple of things (Vale, 2013). As a matter of first importance, much the same as with a ruined tyke, it empowers the misbehaving employee to continue escaping with their inadmissible work environment behaviors. What's more, much the same as a ruined youngster who never again considers their lenient parent important, the misbehaving specialist, in the wake of being given such huge numbers of shots, winds up persuaded that they can escape with doing whatever they please (Namasivayam, Guchait, & Lei, 2014).

At the point when the "nice" manager enables the misbehaving specialist to escape with their improper behavior, alternate labourers end up furious with their "sibling" who by one way or another doesn't need to pursue the standards that whatever is left of them are being held to (Vale, 2013).

This unjustifiable circumstance assembles hatred, and prompts alternate employees taking more wiped out days, not being completely present when they are grinding away, and even possibly carrying on in inactive forceful behavior; suppose, by not getting an essential bit of work done by the deadline, conceivably making profound shame the manager (Namasivayam et al., 2014). The employees additionally feel a feeling of powerlessness, on the grounds that the individual they were relying on to determine this issue - the manager - has relinquished their parental, or managerial, job by enabling the misbehaving employee to keep doing whatever they need.

Alternate employees can't address their manager about this, and working environment morale dives, causing more non-attendance, presenteeism and irate carrying on (Aheaene, Mathieu & Rapp, 2005). Rather than concentrating on doing their work to the best of their capacities, alternate employees invest their energy at work concentrated on how their partner is escaping with homicide and how their manager has surrendered them.

Contentions start breaking out between associates, as the disappointed employees take out their outrage on their apathetic partner and in a roundabout way, release their hatred out on their manager (Coiyle-Shapiro &Neuman, 2004). Efficiency drops steeply and the entire work environment condition starts crumbling underneath the manager's feet. This should be "nice" and to give "one more shot" to their employee has made a lethal working environment that is lost its essential core interest.

The response to the issue is for the manager to really manage their employees. Giving such huge numbers of opportunities to one sluggish or flighty laborer is a horrible thought for the majority of the above reasons (Coiyle-Shapiro &Neuman, 2004). Rather, the manager ought to pursue the HR convention of their working environment in directing and disciplining any specialist who is avoiding their obligations.

Unethical behaviour in the workplace is referred as the actions that are against the standards of conduct established by the organization. Unethical behaviours are described as those in which an employee goes about his business but he neglects the standards of that company. There are many circumstance when an unethical behaviour can even break the law of the country. Employees can commit that crime by using the belongings of company for their own benefit. Spending random time on net surfing during work time also considered as an unethical work because employees waste their valuable time which must be spend for betterment of that particular organization. Time misuse also considered an unethical behaviour as employees are not engaged in activities to perform their specified tasks which can reduce the productivity. Extending breaks beyond allocated time, falsifying time sheets, leaving early, or during work time, engaging in lengthy gossip sessions also considered as unethical behaviour. One of the major crime is to embezzle company funds which can even results in imprisonment if proved. An employee who has access to the financial record of a company can embezzle the funds of company by using his expertise and access. Abusive behaviour with other employees is very unethical and employers often face difficulties dealing with such behaviours.

The ruined laborer doesn't care for or regard their manager any more than alternate specialists do; they're simply exploiting their manager's niceness, similarly that ruined kids lack of respect and endeavor their lenient guardians. The manager must see that being so "nice" is empowering their employee's terrible behavior, while in the meantime distancing their different specialists (Festing & Schäfer, 2014). The manager needs to see that being kind, not nice is the best approach to be powerful in the working environment.

The kind manager has clear expectations and sets clear breaking points. They treat everybody in their work environment reasonably, and they enable nobody to escape with unsuitable behavior (Festing & Schäfer, 2014).

The kind manager takes a gander at the master plan and instead of staying away from encounters that make them uneasy, they put the welfare of their laborers and their work environment first. In this sort of condition, the employees feel regarded and empowered, which moves them to give a valiant effort, making high morale and a very gainful work environment.

In the working environment, being a "nice" manager is an impasse, though being a kind manager (a great parent) is a win-win, as it draws out the best in the laborers and makes an exceptionally utilitarian, instead of useless working environment condition (Festing & Schäfer, 2014).

**Hypothesis 1:** Supervisor Expediency has a significant impact on Employee unethical behaviour.

## Model of Approach (Social Learning Skill Theory; The impact of employee unethical tolerance on unethical behavior in daily tasks

The Social learning by Bandura fills in as a connection that associates the behaviorist perspective and the cognitive perspective, supporting the behaviorist's confidence in the significance of fortification on keeping up conduct on the one hand, while recognizing the impact of cognitions on learning on the other (Walsh et al. 2014).

As opposed to the radical behaviorists, be that as it may, Bandura's social learning hypothesis recognizes the more noteworthy significance of cognition or contemplations about discernments instead of unimportant reflexive reactions to demonstrations of fortification or discipline as the bases for conduct (Walsh et al. 2014). Because of these constant learning encounters, individuals shape speculations about their particular advantages, capacities, qualities, and convictions. A few encounters may create paramount interests and interests; others may not. Individuals tend to float normally toward exercises that yield passionate, social, and budgetary advantages. They tend to keep away from exercises that are distasteful and yield few advantages. After some time these inclinations lead individuals to participate in different kinds of occupations.

With the concepts of social learning skill theory, the employee learns a specific behavior from their supervisors if that particular behavior is beneficial for their supervisors. They intend to learn that if a certain task regardless of being ethical or unethical, benefits their supervisor; this type of practice will benefit them too. The employees tend to get more tolerant towards this type of behavior hence acts in the same way for the desired outcomes.
Through the process of learning they learn that if expedient behavior of the supervisor is beneficial for supervisor’s performance, employees tend to get more tolerant towards expediency hence employee being tolerant towards unethical tasks results in enhanced unethical behavior in the longer run.
**Hypothesis 2:** Employee unethical tolerance has a significant role in employee’s unethical behaviors.

Employee unethical tolerance is characterized as the mediator in the research association developed by the researcher. The phenomenon of the employee unethical tolerance refer to the level of the friction concerning to their attitudes towards unethical practices. If employees are more intend towards unethical behaviors then it’s the responsibility of employers to make certain changes in order to tolerate their behavior.

Bandura's social learning hypothesis recognizes the more noteworthy significance of cognition or contemplations about discernments instead of unimportant reflexive reactions to demonstrations of fortification or discipline as the bases for conduct. According to swank Trust is the establishment of the counselling relationship, and supervisors commit to regard and ensure the hopeful's privilege to security and mystery. Employee’s unethical behaviour positively related to employee’s victimization. Co-worker’s deontic injustice mediated the relationship between employee’s unethical behaviour and employee’s victimization. The mediating effects would be exacerbated by ethical leadership, yet mitigated by task interdependence. According to swank, ethical leadership moderated the relationship between employee’s unethical behaviour and co-worker’s deontic injustice. Task interdependence moderated the relationship between co-worker’s deontic injustice and employee’s victimization.

## Leniency Bias

Higher evaluations can influence incentive arrangement decidedly by expanding coinciding between execution rating expectations and got execution appraisals (Swank, Fahs, & Frost, 2013). People tend to overestimate themselves and consequently to rate themselves higher than their supervisors do. Employees who trust they have gotten a lower execution rating (and thus less pay) than they merit, are expected to bring down their execution with the end goal to reestablish a feeling of value. More lenient execution appraisals may limit these feelings of injustice and the subsequent negative consequences for execution (Swank et al., 2013).

Moreover, more lenient execution appraisals can keep up or increment the employee's trust in his capacity and adequacy, which can be significant to the firm since it builds the employee's inspiration to attempt goal-oriented undertakings and endure notwithstanding when looked with difficulty.

Then again, since execution evaluations give employees a flag about how their execution is seen by their supervisor, lenient appraisals may lead employees to erroneously presume that they are playing out their errands as wanted by their supervisor (Swank et al., 2013). Furnishing employees with this mixed up impression will negatively affect execution since it spurs them to keep on taking incorrectly/imperfect activities (Swank et al., 2013). Consequently, leniency bias is anticipated to positively affect exertion, yet this will just prompt enhanced execution if the behavior that is animated is attractive. Since supervisors are expected to be mindful about animating bothersome activities, the general impact of leniency bias is expected to be certain.

## Importance of Complying with State Laws and Ethics Codes

Right, when supervisors are looked with moral circumstances that are hard to decide, they are depended upon to participate in a carefully saw as a moral essential initiative process, counselling available resources as required. Supervisors perceive that settling moral issues is a technique; moral reasoning consolidates thought of master regards, capable moral guidelines, and moral checks (Whmeyer et al. 2018).

Supervisors' exercises should be solid with the spirit and what's more the letter of these moral rules. No particular moral essential administration always indicate best, so supervisors are depended upon to use an acceptable model of fundamental authority that can hold up under open examination of its application. Through a picked moral essential administration process and evaluation of the setting of the situation, supervisors work helpfully with a contender to settle on decisions that propel applicants' advancement and change (Hirschi et al. 2015). A break of the measures and gauges gave in this does not so much constitute honest to goodness commitment or encroachment of the law; such action is set up in legitimate and lawful techniques.

Supervisors support applicant advancement and change in ways that develop the intrigue and welfare of competitors and propel course of action of strong associations. Trust is the establishment of the counselling relationship, and supervisors commit to regard and ensure the hopeful's privilege to security and mystery (Walsh, 2014). Supervisors viably try to fathom the different social establishments of the hopefuls they serve. Supervisors moreover explore their own social identities and how these impacts their characteristics and feelings about the counselling strategy. Besides, supervisors are asked to add to society by devoting a piece of their master practices zero financial return.

## Multiculturalism

Fouad and Bingham built up the Culturally Appropriate Workplace Model, which recommends that notwithstanding special individual qualities, an individual's career choices are affected by sex, family, racial/ethnic personality, and opportunity structures (Di Fabio et al. 2015). Essentially, Leong and Hartung (1997) introduced a model concentrated on culturally suitable interventions, starting with recognizing professional issues and analyzing the choice to get to administrations inside the structure of the candidate's cultural setting. Since these more up to date theories center around career determinants, for example, cultural standards and qualities, family, and wellbeing, they would likely function admirably with various grown-ups who are thinking about work by tending to the more extensive cultural settings that shape career designs (Rochat & Rossier, 2016). While these multicultural models of workplace don't expressly address work fulfilment and inspiration; they can expand the pertinence of workplace interventions formed by formative or characteristic theories by recognizing and investigating sociocultural impacts on retirement choices.

Contingent upon the culture, basic career leadership might be a family procedure, is frequently impacted by social boundaries, for example, discrimination, and might be less striking than different parts (Rochat & Rossier, 2016). In this way, helping experts adjust the C-DAC model to give all the more culturally proper interventions. For example, notwithstanding the professional appraisals that Super and partners suggested, supervisors can evaluate their candidate's (a) cultural character advancement, (b) acculturation, (c) individualism-community, and (d) encounters of stereotyping, partiality, and discrimination (Barunstein-Bercovitz et al. 2014). As opposed to expecting conventional elements of basic career leadership are all-inclusive, these measures can enable supervisors to distinguish culturally proper methods to investigate retirement choices. Thought of cultural variables can likewise help career supervisors to abstain from giving "excessively disentangled arrangements" (Flum, 2015) to complex retirement concerns. In fact, the supervisor's utilization of self-reflection and metacognitive techniques all through the counseling procedure to evaluate the suitability and adequacy of interventions is a basic bit of multicultural systems (Alfes, Shantz, Truss, & Soane, 2013). Cultural components are additionally associated with usage of administrations. Boundaries to proficient care incorporate cultural standards of looking for help from group individuals, question of the healthcare framework, dialect, and learned weakness (i.e., long-haul career appears to be unattainable) because of unequal open doors and discrimination (Masdonati et al. 2014). In this manner, to break down, these obstructions helping experts could give exceed inside confided in group associations and recognize bilingual referrals and assets inside their zone, among different illustrations.

## Social Learning Theory

The social cognitive theory was created by Bandura (1969) to clarify the way identity, and practices emerge from a person's one of a kind learning encounters and the impacts antagonistic and encouraging feedback have on these encounters. As indicated by social cognitive or learning hypothesis, three noteworthy kinds of learning encounter impact practices and skills that enable a man to work successfully in society. Bandura recommended that instrumental learning encounters happen when an individual is decidedly or contrarily fortified for conduct, associative learning encounters happen when an individual associate a formerly impartial occasion with a sincerely loaded occasion, and vicarious encounters happen when one individual watches the conduct of others or increases new data and thoughts from different sources.

Krumboltz's hypothesis (Brown, 2015) based on crafted by Bandura (1969, 1977) to build up his reexamined hypothesis which "places two noteworthy sorts of learning encounters that outcome in individual behavioral and cognitive skills and inclinations that enable individuals to work successfully on the planet" (234). Initially, it is instrumental learning encounters which "happen when a man is decidedly strengthened or rebuffed for the activity of some conduct and the associated cognitive skills" (234).

Second, is associative learning encounters which "happen when individuals associate some already affectively impartial occasion or jolt with a sincerely loaded occasion or boost" (234). Inside these elements, Krumboltz built up various testable suggestions and confirmed that equivalent significance lays on the opposite impact of each (Swartz, 2014). Recorded here are the three fundamental factor bunches (Capuzzi& Stauffer, 2016).

* Variables that impact inclinations with an instructive or word related inclination being an evaluative self-perception speculation in light of those learning encounters apropos to any career undertaking and suggestions clarifying the obtaining of these inclinations.
* Elements are impacting career-basic leadership skills with suggestions clarifying how these specific skills are gained.
* Elements impacting passage practices into instructive or word related choices with suggestions clarifying variables accounting for the genuine section practices into occupations, preparing programs, or instructive courses of study.

The theory of social learning isn't formative, does not by any means account for work change, and would in this manner not be valuable in deciding to regulate conduct or outlining career advancement programs. Krumboltz's (1981) hypothesis isn't a noteworthy impact on career improvement inquire about or the act of workplace (Capuzzi& Stauffer, 2016). Scientists do hope to see analysts pulled in to ventures including the develops of the Krumboltz hypothesis because the hypothesis is firmly built and speculations of the hypothesis are testable.

Learning about career choices, creating premiums, detailing desires, and testing career ways are frequently associated with vicarious learning and shift in the view of the accessibility of assets and openings (Corey, 2015). Cultural determinants, for example, race/ethnicity and sexual orientation, among different components of decent variety impact career choices. Consequently, existing models of work fulfillment and inspiration that were created inside an individualistic system may not make a difference too to people from collectivistic cultures (Corey, 2015).

## Changing Action into Learning; Impact of Supervisor Expediency on Employee unethical tolerance

Learning can be characterized as either instrumental or associative. Instrumental learning happens when a man makes a move and watches the results of that activity (Gordon & Steele, 2015). Outcomes may incorporate remarks from other individuals, detectable outcomes, or effect on others. Thomas learned that exceeding expectations in math had positive prizes. He delighted in observing his schoolmates enhance because of his mentoring, and he liked the recognition he got from his educator.

Associative learning happens when a man makes associations between two marvels or boosts. Learning comes about because of perception and molding; for instance, watching and tuning in to other individuals and watching the positive prizes or discipline they get from specific activities. Thomas watched that fitness and happiness appeared to go together. He noticed that some of his schoolmates could begin despising math while getting horrible scores however then learned to like it after they comprehended it. The model of this study works with this theory, as if the supervisor tends to be expedient it will affect the tolerance of employees too. First, the action will change into learning and then learning into action.

**Hypothesis 3:** Supervisor’s expedient behavior enhances the tolerance of employees towards unethical tasks

## The mediating role of employee unethical tolerance

This study further focuses on the effects of expediency on the behaviors of our employees by judging the attitudes of unethical tolerance as a mediation tool. Literature shows that any interaction between two parties socially can mold the attitudes of one or the other party involved (Bradford, Jentzsch, & Gomez, 2015). The tolerance for any attitude tends to move person towards that attitude in a whole bigger perspective. If the employee is tolerant for unethical tasks then the employee tends to be more acceptable for the unethical and illegitimate tasks of organization (Greenbaum, Hill, & Mawritz, 2017).

The tolerance of unethical tasks is also enhanced with the concept of Machiavellianism. Machiavellianism in psychology refers to a personality trait which sees a person so focused on their own interests they will manipulate, deceive, and exploit others to achieve their goals (Cacciattolo, 2015). As per our model for this study, supervisor expediency affects the unethical behaviour of the employees with tolerance for unethical behaviour acts as mediator. Well, in literature it is shown that supervisor expediency is enhanced when a supervisor derives his/her benefits to enhance the organizations benefit (Graham, Ziegert, & Capitano, 2015). Hence when an employee follows the supervisor’s steps to be beneficial for the organizations whether through ethical or unethical behaviour, it increases the employee’s unethical tolerance for unethical tasks.

**Hypothesis 4:** Employee unethical tolerance mediates the relationship between the significant effects of supervisor expediency on employee unethical behaviour.

## Recognizing the Influence of Genetic Factors and Environmental Conditions

Hereditary variables and natural conditions, for example, physical characteristics and capacities (or special needs), abilities, aptitudes, birth family, birth area, and family assets cooperate with learning encounters to frame a candidate's undertaking approach skills. These skills incorporate the manners by which candidates cognitively process their general surroundings, including their convictions, values, states of mind, emotions, work propensities, objectives, and desires (Hartung, 2016).

## Accentuating Lifelong Learning

Candidates must not see their absence of a career design as uncertainty however rather praises it as receptiveness. Individuals have an assortment of learning encounters, both arranged and impromptu, because of the happenstance occasions they encounter (Rottinghaus et al. 2017). Career supervisors must get ready candidates for a counseling procedure that holds onto happenstance as an essential part. Supervisors ought to solicit candidates to recognize past examples from happenstance in their lives, analyze specific activities that made these spontaneous occasions, and afterward start new activities to produce facilitate impromptu occasions. Candidates ought to be urged to see startling occasions as open doors for learning and investigation (Rottinghaus et al. 2017). Career supervisors should call attention to that candidates can start an activity that will make more shot occasions utilizing their triumphs with earlier happenstance occasions as proof that the candidates know how to do it.

# 3. Research Methodology

## 3.1 Preface

This research is a quantitative research which focused on our defined variables in a way that desired results were deduced. The research was to be conducted in such a way that we can check the situations where and how supervisor expediency affects the employee unethical behaviour directly or indirectly.

**3.2 Research Methodology**

In this chapter, the procedures and methods of data collection and analysis are defined

### 3.3 Research Process



###

### 3.4 Sources of Primary Data

The research was conducted on the employees of various companies who are working in shifts that are evening and the night shifts. Supervisors were most likely to be lenient and not focused on ethical ways of doing certain tasks. Shift workers were more likely to be different in doing their tasks as there is very less supervision on them in the shifts. Our main focus was S& P Global, Skyscrapers Pvt Ltd, J Telecommunication and MTBC. The questionnaires were shared with the employees whom are mostly in night & evening shifts. The research was going to be descriptive in nature to broaden the avenues of reality.

# 3.5 Data Collection

The primary data was collected through a structured questionnaires adopted from secondary sources. Following table shows the variables and the Authors from where questionnaires have been adopted.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Supervisor Expediency | Rebecca L. Greenbaum (2017) | 4 |
| Employee Unethical Behavior | Newstrom and Ruch, (1975) | 17 |
| Employee Unethical Tolerance | Froelich & Kottke (1991) | 6 |

## 3.6 Questionnaires

The questionnaire was to be 7 point scale starting from strongly agree to strongly disagree along with some other items where 6 point scale was used. The questionnaire started from the demographic section following an item for expediency, unethical behaviour and tolerance. For the purpose of collecting data total 200 questionnaires were floated to the sample and 130 responses were collected. The questionnaires were distributed randomly with employees as well as the supervisor’s too. As we know supervisors also work under specific persons, if a person was working as a team lead over 4-5 employees, he/she was considered as a supervisor in our study.

## 3.7 Measures:

* **Supervisor Expediency:**

A 7 point scale was used to gather the responses against the independent variable of this study. There were 4 items used in this section to study how the supervisor’s expediency was measure with the perceptions of employees. The scale starts from “Never” to “All the time”. The scale was adopted from (Greenbaum, 2017) paper about supervisor expediency.

* **Employee Unethical Behavior:**

The second section of our questionnaire focused on our dependant variable. It was also a structured questionnaire containing 17 items which were studied in 5 point scale. It was filled by the respondents which were employees working under specific supervisors.

* **Employee Unethical Tolerance:**

The mediating variable was studied in this section. It was a structured questionnaire with open ended questionnaires containing 6 items. It was a 7 point scale starting from “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”

## 3.8 Data Analysis

Data analysis was a procedure of structure and desiring to the mass of collected knowledge. To conduct analysis on the data collected through questionnaires from our sample, statistical techniques was used. Correlation and regression analysis was conducted to check the strength and the viability of the hypothesis. SPSS was used to conduct the statistical analysis. It was categorized as quantitative information analysis. In order to testify hypothesis of mediation, mediation model was analyzed to check the role of employee unethical tolerance in the relation of the independent and the dependent variables.

# 4. Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Result and Analysis:
This chapter will focus on the results we got from our instrument. All the three variables involved in the study are studied statistically to check the relation between them. 200 questionnaires are sent to the sample. Total 130 responses were received and were studied further for our study. The results are obtained by using these responses using SPSS and as desired result will be highlighted and how it works in the shift workers.

This chapter will start from the analytics of the demographics of our respondents and how our study gets moulded with respect to the demographics. Further in this chapter we will explain the analytics and all the results we obtained while using our instrument.

## Table 4.1

**Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid Male Female Total | 84 | 64.6 | 64.6 | 64.6 |
| 46 | 35.4 | 35.4 | 100 |
| **130** | **100.0** | **100.0** |  |

The total respondents were 130. Out which 84 were male and 46 were females. It was expected as in Pakistan majorly male population works in the shifts especially if we focus on the night & evening shift.

## Table 4.2

**Age**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| **Valid 20-25 25-30 30-35 35&Above**  | 44 | 33.7 | 33.7 | 33.7 |
| 66 | 51.1 | 51.1 | 84.8 |
| 17 | 13 | 13 | 97.8 |
| 3 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100 |
|  **Total** | **130** | **100.0** | **100.0** |  |

We used four options for this demographic variable. 66 respondents were in the age group of 25-30 which was the highest in frequency among all the age groups as more than 50% were from this age group.

## Table 4.3

**Time of Shift**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| **Valid Evening Night Total** | 84 | 64.8 | 64.8 | 64.6 |
| 46 | 35.2 | 35.2 | 100 |
| **130** | **100.0** | **100.0** |  |

As the population on which the study is conducted was shift workers so sample was taken from the evening and the night shift. Almost 65% are working in the evening shift and 35% are working in the night shift.

Overall, the study was conducted successfully as the almost 70% of the questionnaires were filled completely and the responses were in real time. Most of the respondents were working in the company for more than one year and had worked with more than 1 supervisor

## Table 4.4

**Tenure in the Organization**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| **Valid 1-2 2-3 3-4 4 or more** | 64 | 48.9 | 48.9 | 48.9 |
| 41 | 31.5 | 31.5 | 80.4 |
| 17 | 13 | 13 | 93.4 |
| 8 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 100.0 |
|  **Total** | **130** | **100.0** | **100.0** |  |

This table shows the tenure of the employees in the organization. 6.6% (n=8) were working for more than 4 hours in the organization, 13% (n=17) were working for 3-4 years, 31.5% (n=41) were working for 2-3 years and 64% (n=64) were working for more than one year but less than 2 years in the organization from the total of 130 respondents.

## Table 4.5

**Education Level**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| **Valid Bachelors  Masters Mphil Doctorate** | 52 | 40.4 | 40.4 | 40.4 |
| 63 | 48.3 | 48.3 | 88.7 |
| 10 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 96.3 |
| 5 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 100.0 |
|  **Total** | **130** | **100.0** | **100.0** |  |

This table shows the education levels of the respondents. 40.4%(n=52) are undergraduates, 48.3%(n=63) are done with Masters, 7.6%(n=10) are done with Mphil and 3.7%(n=5) are at doctoral level out of total 130 respondents

## Table 4.6

**Number of supervisors an employee has worked with**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| **Valid 1  2 3 4 or more** | 27 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 21.7 |
| 58  | 42.4 | 42.4 | 64.1 |
| 32 | 25 | 25 | 89.1 |
| 13 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 100.0 |
|  **Total** | **130** | **100.0** | **100.0** |  |

This table shows the data for how many supervisors an employee has worked with/under in the organization. 21.7%(n=27) has worked with only one supervisor, 42.4%(n=58) has worked with 2 supervisors, 25%(n=32) has worked with 3 supervisors and 109%(n=13) has worked with 4 or more than 4 supervisors out of total 130 respondents.

## 4.2 Reliability Analysis

To check the reliability and viability of the data gathered, pilot testing was conducted after getting 40 responses from our respondent. The reliability is defined by Cronbach’s Alpha.

## Table 4.7

**Supervisor Expediency**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reliability Statistics** |
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .821 | 4 |

Supervisor expediency acts as an independent variable for the study. It is significant as Cronbach’s Alpha is higher than .8. Hence the data collection is continued in the same way to get the optimum responses to study the relationships and the mediation

## Table 4.8

**Employee Unethical Behavior**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reliability Statistics** |
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .937 | 17 |

Employee unethical behavior acts as dependant variable in this research. It has a significant value thus the data collection is continued for further study

## Table 4.9

**Employee Unethical Tolerance**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reliability Statistics** |
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .909 | 6 |

Employee unethical tolerance acts as mediator in this study. It has to be studied significantly to check the role of this variable in the model suggested. It has its significance checked as the Cronbach’s Alpha score is more than .8,

## Table 4.10

**Descriptive Statistics**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | **N** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** | **Skewness** | **Kurtosis** |
| Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Std. Error | Statistic | Std. Error |
| **SE** | 130 | 1.00 | 7.00 | 3.5135 | 1.46216 | -.156 | .212 | -1.002 | .422 |
| **EU\_Tol** | 130 | .83 | 5.00 | 2.5013 | .95495 | .062 | .212 | -.687 | .422 |
| **EU\_Beh** | 130 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 2.4577 | .80493 | .012 | .212 | .176 | .422 |
| Valid N  | 130 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

It is a basic descriptive measures, which try to summarize data by giving a few numerical measures of where the ``center'' of the data set is and how the rest of the values fall away from that center (Ho & Yu, 2015). It measures the means, standard deviations, skewness and the kurtosis measures of the data collected. As SE has a skewness value -.156 it means that the data is majorly left tailed and having comparatively higher values. The Kurtosis value for SE is -1.002, it means that the data collected for this variable has flatter peaks which mean that the variance s distributed throughout. As EU\_Tol has a positive skewness that is .062 which means that it is right tailed and has lower values. The Kurtosis value is -.687 which means that the data for this variable is also flat peaked. EU\_Beh is the dependant variable is positively skewed and also has a positive value for Kurtosis which shows that the data collected for this variable is right tailed and has sharper tails as compare to the normal distribution.

## Table 4.11

## Model Summary

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .853 | .727 | .723 | .42386 |
| 1. Predictors: (Constant), EU Tol, SE
2. Dependent Variable: EU behavior
 |

This table shows the summary of our regression analysis. There are some concerned calculations which explain the relationship between our variables. The first value that is denoted by R is known as multiple coefficient. This value shows the significance of the observed and the predicted values of the dependent variable that is “Employee Unethical Behavior”. The higher the value the enhanced is the relationship. The value deducted after the analysis is .853 that shows it is more than 85%. It shows our dependent variable has a significant relationship with the observed values.

Table 4.12 **ANOVA**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **Sum of squares** | **df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig** |
| 1 Regression ResidualTotal | 60.76422.81783.581 | 2127129 | 30.382.180 | 169.109 | .000\* |

This table is an ANOVA table. It measures the differences between means and it also tests the differences for our given variables. The significance is 0.000 and it shows there is a significance relationship between Supervisor expediency and employee unethical behavior in the shift workers.

Table 4.13 **Coefficients**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **Unstandardized Coefficients** | **StandardizedCoefficients** |  **t**  |  **Sig** |
|  **B** | **Std.Error** |  **Beta** |  |  |
| 1 (Constant)SEEU\_Tol | .626.194.459 | .106.042.064 | .353.545 | 5.8864.6157.135 | .000.000.000 |

This table explains the test ran to check the relationship of our independent variable and the mediator with our dependent variable used in our model. . In the first column, the relationship between the independent variable is explained in terms of the value of β. The value of β is for the relationship between supervisor expediency and the employee unethical behavior. The value of β is .194 and value of t is 4.615 and in the last row significance is .000. The main model of this study focuses on the relation of supervisor expediency and the employee unethical behavior. So if there is 100 units increased in the expediency the employee unethical behavior is increased by 19.4%. It means is the supervisor is expedient the employee’s behavior tends to be unethical in the terms explained above in the shift time workers. It is observed that the independent variable affect the dependent variable directly to a significant extent. In this paper, “Employee unethical tolerance” is taken as the mediator variable. As mentioned in the Coefficients table the value of β is .459 and value of t is 7.135. So it states that our mediator variable affects the dependent variable in a way which enhances or makes the relation possible between supervisor expediency and the employee unethical behavior. Mediator variable basically defines the relationship between the independent and the dependent variable. This explains that if an employee is tolerant in the unethical behavior, he/she is intended to the act in an unethical behavior.

Table 4.14 **Correlation:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | **SE** | **EU\_Tol** | **EU\_Beh** |
| SE | Pearson Correlation | 1 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| EU\_Tol | Pearson Correlation | .795\*\* | 1 | . |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| EU\_Beh | Pearson Correlation | .786\*\* | .825\*\* | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). |

This table shows the correlation between variables of this study. P value for all variables is .000 which is significant and shows significant relationship between variables. .795 shows the relation between mediator and supervisor expediency, it means that if there is an increase of one unit in Supervisor Expediency, the unethical tolerance is increased with .795 units. There is a significant positive relationship between supervisor expediency and employee unethical tolerance.
The relation between supervisor expediency with employee unethical behavior is also positive and significant.

Table 4.15 **Mediation Model Analysis:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DV** | **Direct Effect of IV on M****(a path)** | **Direct Effect of M on DV****(b path)** | **Direct effect of IV on DV****(c path)** | **Total effect of IV on DV****(c' path)** | **Bootstrap results for Total effects** |
|  | β | t | Β | t | β | t | β | t | LL 95% CI | UL 95% CI |
| **EU\_Beh** | .591\*\* | .0350 | .4595\* | .0644 | .1941\* | 4.6147 | .4326\* | 14.3773 | .1522 | .3394 |

 The above table explains the mediation model that we used to check the viability of mediator in our research. Nonparametric bootstrapping method with 95% confidence interval was used (Bonett & Wright, 2015). To check the significance of the variables, it has to be checked whether there is any zero value in between upper and lower limits (Bonett & Wright, 2015). P value has to be less than .05 and it is a two tailed test. Bootstrapping method is used where 5000 bootstrap resamples were applied. Model 4 of SPSS is also performed for Employee Unethical Behavior to analyze the direct and indirect effect on it.

To check the viability of mediator and it’s mediation on the study conducted, the last two columns where lower and upper limits are mentioned had to be focused. First of all there has to be no zero value in the limits extracted through boot strapping. As upper limit is .3394 and lower limit is .1522, employee unethical tolerance has an effect of mediation on the relation between SE and EU-Beh.

# Discussion

After conducting all the analysis, we have come to the deduction that there is a significant relationship between our variables. Total 130 responses were analyzed from the total population as total 200 questionnaires were distributed. As mentioned in the previous chapters all the demographics are explained. This chapter will discuss the crux of the study where we explain the relationship in a more exploratory way.

The study can be explained in a way which can help the organizations for a better outcome and for researchers it can be helpful too for further conventions in the study on shift time workers. As the targeted organizations work 24 hours a day. The higher management is not present in odd shifts which affect our study for unethical behavior. Our main focus was on the supervisor expediency which is already explained in the introduction of this paper. As every research is conducted to review the relationship between the variables and how or what affect this relationship. In this study it was the mediator which enhances the process of the relationship the variables contain. The gap measured for this research was the difference orientation of work in the odd shifts especially in the corporate culture of Pakistan. This study focused on four research questions that are mentioned in the start of the paper. After evaluating the SPSS analysis all of the before-mentioned questions will be discussed in this chapter.

## 5.1 Research question

* **Does supervisor expediency impact the employee’s unethical behavior significantly?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | StandardizedCoefficients |  t |  Sig. |
|  B |  Std. Error |  Beta |  |  |
| 1 (Constant) SE | .626.194 | .106.042 | .353 | 5.8864.615 | .000.000 |

As per the details mentioned in the above table, this question has a positive answer as per our analysis the significance value is less than 0.05 so there is a significant relationship between the independent and the dependent variable. So yes supervisor expediency affects the unethical behavior in positive terms.

**H1** is accepted

## 5.2 Research Question

* **Does employee’s unethical tolerance affect the employee’s unethical behavior?**

As analysis was conducted in order to check the viability of the intervening variable that is employee unethical tolerance. It may have an impact on both independent and the dependent variable. Employee unethical tolerance not only enhances the relationship between the variables but it has a larger impact on our dependent variable which makes the relationship between main variables viable.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Effect | Path | β | Std. error | t |  p | Decision |
| Direct | Employee unethical tolerance  Employee Unethical Behavior | 0.4326 | 0.0301 | 14.3773 | .000 | Accepted |

To accept any hypothesis or to check whether the research question is viable in the desired outcome of the study, the p-value is the significant factor. The p-value is .000 which is less than .05 so there is an existing direct relationship which intervenes between the relationship of employee unethical tolerance and the employee unethical behavior. As the beta value for the effect of supervisor expediency on employee unethical behavior directly is around 19% and the beta value for the effect of mediating variable on the dependent variable is 44% so it shows that employee unethical tolerance intervenes the relationship of the variables.

**H2** is accepted

## 5.3 Research Question

* **Does supervisor expediency have an impact on employee’s unethical tolerance?**

This relation is quite clear in the statistical analysis. It can be checked through various analyses. Firstly, it is studied by co relation analysis. In the following table it is stated that the relation between supervisor expediency and the employee unethical tolerance is significant having a value of .795 as co efficient of correlation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SE** | **EU\_Tol** |
| SE | Pearson Correlation | 1 |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  EU\_Tol | Pearson Correlation | .795\*\* | 1 |

The model 4 for the mediation analysis also explains this relation when the outcome is selected as the mediator that is employee unethical tolerance. It shows the β value .591in Table 4.14 that is significant and shows the clear relationship between supervisor expediency and EU-Tol. Mediation is also dependent on this hypothesis or research question, hence it is discussed later in the chapter.
**H3** is accepted

## 5.4 Research Question

**Does employees unethical tolerance mediates the relationship between SE and EUB?**

It is evident by the analysis and statistics that the independent variable that is supervisor expediency affects the employee unethical behavior directly in the presence of employee unethical tolerance. The significance levels are defined and are suitable for the study conducted in this paper. Hence the role of independent variable (supervisor expediency) is defined in the presence of a mediator on employee unethical behavior. Mediation analysis is stated in the previous chapter in table 4.14 where it is clearly mentioned that there are no zero values in the limits of the boot strapping so role of EU\_Tol as mediator exists significantly in this study

|  |
| --- |
| **Bootstrap results for Total effects** |
| **LL 95% CI** | **UL 95% CI** |
| .1522 | .3394 |

**H4** is accepted.

# 6. Conclusion:

This study is conduct to explain the relationship of supervisor expediency and the employee unethical behavior in the tasks. These both variables are well known and their importance is clearly defined in the organizations. BPO and customer services industry is a major part of the employment in Pakistan. The previous study clearly explained that the variables used in our study are linked with each other as our study focuses on the role supervisor expediency in the odd shift workers; it is more intense in our targeted sample.

This is research is backed up with social learning theory which works in back end to explain the relationship proposed. Behaviors can be acquired by observation and reinforcement (Bandhura A. , 2014). As if the supervisor is expedient the employee tolerance for unethical tasks is breached in a way that he or she starts acting unethical in the daily routine. The questionnaires used were adopted from the secondary research and it is divided in three parts where supervisor expediency, employee unethical tolerance and unethical behavior are studied.

This paper focuses on the mediating role of employee unethical tolerance in the relation of main variables. The role of mediator is clearly significant in this research as there are four research questions derived from the framework model. All of these questions are studied through scrutiby and answered accordingly. After analysis and deductions the results are in the favor of the research which can contribute in future research on HR practices of the same industry. As our study focuses on the companies working in Pakistan, there are some norms and contextual variables which work in the enhancement of the relationship between the variables.

## 6.1 Limitations of Study:

 As every research have some barriers while studying the desired outcome. In this study role of supervisor expediency is measure in an employee’s unethical behavior. Following are the some limitations faced while conducting this study

1. Time and resources barriers. As the study would have been more descriptive and accurate if the time was ample.
2. The responses were taken from the subordinates who had to measure the expediency of their supervisors. Biases are expected in the responses as the employees may or may not be truthful in their responses
3. The data was collected from the employees from the odd shifts. It was difficult to visit these organizations in the evening or night.
4. The BPO industry works 24 hours a day and the employees are on the go every second in the office. So they were very busy whenever I visited them. Time shortage may have been an issue as they have limited breaks and every break is measured by high level software.
5. The study is also derived from the social and the cultural aspects of our organizations which may not be true for the other countries but it can be further researched in Pakistan in the same or any other industry.

## Directions for Future Research:

This research focuses on the issues in HR practices in odd shifts workers of big organizations. In this era organizations are intending to work 24 hours to achieve optimum success in their ventures. In future the research can be conducted on a bigger scale where more factors can be studied which affects the work life of odd shift workers The variables can be studied further with an addition of moderators and it can be really helpful in the organizations working in private or the public sector for the betterment of ethical and moral orientation of the employees.
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