
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENCE ARTS AND COMMERCE

THE INFLUENCE OF LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE ON EMPLOYEES' COUNTER-PRODUCTIVE BEHAVIORS: BASED ON MEDIATING MECHANISM OF RESOURCE DEPLETION AND REGULATING MECHANISM OF MORAL IDENTITY

SHAN JINWEN

(Asia Metropolitan University)

Abstract

Under the background of global economy, the competition among enterprises is becoming more and more fierce, and the competition among enterprises begins to change to "soft power" competition. In this context, employees will become the core competitiveness. Excellent performance of employees can improve the competitiveness of enterprises and promote the development of enterprises. Employees' exchange relationship within the organization is one of the most important concepts in the workplace, which has an important impact on the performance and atmosphere of the organization. Leader-member exchange has a direct impact on the allocation of resources in an organization. Previous studies have shown that sense of loss of resources will lead to Counterproductive Work Behavior of employees. Counterproductive Work Behavior, as an immoral behavior, is closely related to the moral level of individuals. From the perspective of resource depletion and moral Identity, this study explores the influence mechanism of Leader-member exchange relationship on Counterproductive Work Behavior of employees. It is not only the first time to explore the relationship between resources and Counterproductive Work Behavior, but also provides a new way for enterprises to improve employee performance. The study conducted a questionnaire survey on the spot and processed data with SPSS21.0. This paper provides a new way to study the impact of Organizational Resources on employee behavior and fills this gap. At the same time, it provides a new channel for enterprises to intervene employees' Counterproductive Work Behavior, improve employees' performance and improve the operational efficiency of enterprises.

Keywords: Counterproductive Work Behavior; Leader-member exchange, Moral Identity; Organizational Resources

Introduction

Under the background of global economy, China's enterprise economy has entered a new normal, which makes the competition among enterprises increasingly fierce. In this situation, enterprises can hardly rely on "hard power" such as plant, equipment and capital to gain competitive advantage. Because in industry-intensive areas, this kind of "hard power" can easily be imitated, which leads to the weakening of its competitiveness, enterprises must adjust themselves to adapt to the changing environment in a timely manner, and acquire "soft power" with enterprise characteristics by improving learning ability and training a large number of excellent employees. And the foundation of the enterprise is the employees in the enterprise (Xioang et al. 2020). All the activities of the enterprise need the participation of employees. Employees working more actively and cooperating with the enterprise will be the key to enhance the competitiveness of the enterprise. From the organizational level, employees' good work performance not only helps to improve organizational effectiveness, but also helps to promote the innovation and development of the organization. On the contrary, employees' bad work performance is not only harmful to the development of the organization, but also may even endanger the survival of the organization. From the individual level, in the current environment, employees' job performance has an important impact on individual career development and family life. Good job performance contributes to the stability and development of employees' overall life. But in recent years, counterproductive behavior can be seen in the workplace. Counterproductive behavior (hereinafter referred to as CWB) is becoming more and more (Yannick 2020). Anti-production behavior does great harm to enterprises, and even leads to bankruptcy of enterprises. Surveys show that 33% to 75% of employees have committed theft, fraud and other acts, and have a direct connection with 30% of corporate bankruptcy (Harper, 1990). In 2003, PwC's survey of 4,000 companies found that nearly half of the companies that had experienced economic crimes, and the data showed signs of increasing year by year at 8%. Anti-production behavior will not only cause losses to the economic interests of enterprises, but will also seriously affect the long-term development of enterprises. Due to cultural factors, there are fewer reports on negative behaviors in the workplace in China, but this does not mean that employees' negative behaviors do not exist. Zhang Jiyuan and Wang Wenyu (2008) collected employee survey data through surveys of more than 20 companies. The results show that negative behaviors such as misappropriation of office supplies and dissemination of inappropriate speech are widespread. Foxconn's many jumping events since 2010 have made it notorious. As a labor-intensive enterprise, strengthening management of employees is of vital importance to the reputation of the company, as well as the internal atmosphere and work efficiency. With the development of the global economic integration trend and the ever-changing social environment, the organization requires more flexible management. Whether it is an administrative agency or a business institution, employees need to actively participate in the management of the enterprise from the perspective of long-term development. In the daily operation, we share information resources, actively respond to problems at work, enthusiastically invest in work, and provide constructive opinions on the operation of the organization and create a good working atmosphere. Therefore, the research on

management style, silent behavior, anti-production behavior, workplace bullying has become a research hotspot in some occupational and health psychology.

The author works as a manager in steel structure installation companies and educational training institutions. Also as a labor-intensive enterprise, it was found in the course of work that the managers in the steel structure installation company often spontaneously take some actions that do not receive rewards to protect the interests of the enterprise, while the front-line production personnel's "Comply in appearance but oppose in heart" and "Seek private interests by public interests," Laziness, difficult management, etc., cause headaches. Workers in educational institutions have the benefit of harming organizations through false reimbursement, late leave, and negative absenteeism. These actions are anti-production behaviors, especially for employees. In the front line, employees often fail to get the care that can meet the psychological needs of employees because of long working hours, high pressure, and unreasonable perception. As a result, employees are exposed to negative production, such as absenteeism and absenteeism. Counterproductive Work Behavior is worthy of attention in different enterprises. Exploring the reasons for Counterproductive Work Behavior has certain practical significance for reducing the generation of Counterproductive Work Behavior, safeguarding the interests of enterprises and improving the efficiency of enterprises. Counterproductive Work Behavior is any behavior that an employee intends to take that is potentially harmful to the organization and its Member's legitimate interests or has caused substantial harm (Spector & Fox, 2002; Oboyle et al., 2011). Global competition has increased the uncertainty of the organization's environment, and the universal application of the Internet in the workplace and life has brought great challenges to the management of employees' behavior. Among them, employees are in the process of daily work communication, accomplishing goals, and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) in the workplace, such as deception, absenteeism, destruction, theft and corruption. The major challenges that behavior management needs to face. Information technology and instant messaging have facilitated CWB, making this behavior more subtle and difficult to discover, which has led to the increasing popularity of CWB. The concealment of the network makes the discovery of CWB significantly hysteresis. Therefore, in-depth exploration of the ways in which CWB spreads and differentiates in organizations and its psychological mechanisms have evolved into an important and urgent issue for researchers and companies.

Problem Statement

Counterproductive Work Behavior is a harmful behavior that is more or less present in every business and is inevitable. The relationship between Leader-Member Exchange and Counterproductive Work Behavior and the relationship between Counterproductive Work Behavior and verification have provided enterprises with a solution to reduce Counterproductive Work Behavior. This study demonstrates the relationship between Leader-Member Exchange and Counterproductive Work Behavior, explores the intermediary and regulation mechanism of this relationship, theoretically enriches the research content of Counterproductive Work Behavior, and provides new research for subsequent research on organizational behavior. The idea of

providing a high-quality Leader-Member relationship for the company, reducing negative behavior and improving operational efficiency.

Research Questions

Employee CWB is one of the problems that modern enterprises need to solve. This issue has attracted more and more attention from enterprises and scholars this year. Anti-production behavior will harm the interests of companies and employees. According to previous research, there are many antecedents of CWB, and leadership-member exchange is one of them. According to the Resource Conservation Theory (COR), we integrate the process of CWB from low-quality leadership-member exchange into a process of “resource loss” to “resource recovery”. First, low-quality leadership-member exchanges can cause wear and tear on individual resources, that is, “resource depletion process”. Resource depletion will pose a huge psychological pressure on individuals, so they may use CWB to recover these depleted resources. , that is, the "resource re-acquisition process." Second, individuals who decide to use CWB to recapture these depleted resources may be subject to ethical factors. From the perspective of statistics, the theoretical model of this paper is an adjusted mediation model. Around this theoretical framework, we systematically explore the mechanism by which leading members-member exchanges cause CWB (Shffer et al. 2020).

Therefore, this study proposes the following research problems that need to be solved:

(1) Low-quality leadership-member exchange triggers the mechanism of action of CWB. CWB is a behavior that points to victims or organizations. It is influenced by many factors, including some intermediaries and regulatory factors. This study explores the impact of resource depletion and moral identity on the mechanism of leadership-member exchange on CWB. Therefore, the study used questionnaires to measure the employees of the construction industry and manufacturing enterprises, and conducted statistical analysis to draw conclusions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Counterproductive Work Behavior

Definition of Counterproductive Work Behavior (definition)

As early as the beginning of last century, in the book Principles of Scientific Management written by Taylor, the father of scientific management, it was found that in order not to be eliminated because of productivity improvement, workers would use deliberate delays to reduce labor productivity and ensure their work (Taylor, 1910). Since the middle of last century, some scholars in the field of human resources management and organizational behavior at home and abroad have noticed the negative behaviors of employees such as lateness, passive idleness and theft, which are harmful to the organization, and began to carry out relevant research (Xiong et al 2020). However, due to the different fields of scholars, the fate of such behaviors is different.

Names did not reach agreement. At that time, they were named as deviant behavior, workplace deviant behavior, anti-production behavior and so on. At the same time, no scholars gave specific definitions. Until the end of the 20th century, Bennett and others put forward the earliest definition of "anti production behavior". But the term anti-productive behavior first appeared in 1987. Philip & Spector mentioned Counterproductive Work Behavior in his abstract when he studied employee frustration behavior, which was used as a reflection of employee frustration. Subsequently, since 1950, there have been studies on the damage to the interests of enterprises and employees in academia, mainly focusing on the corresponding study of individual behaviors, such as employee absence, theft, etc. Some scholars have carried out detailed studies and published monographs. With the continuous development of research and the development of past research and actual situation, anti-production behavior has gradually formed a complete definition, which is defined from a kind of behavior (Shaffer et al. 2020). The first systematic and explicit definition of Counterproductive Work Behavior was proposed by Bennett and Robinsion, Bennett et al. (1995) through integrated research, which proposed "organizational deviation behavior", that is, organizational members act spontaneously in accordance with organizational rules and regulations and norms of conduct, directly or potentially to organizational and organizational members. The act of threatening interests. At the same time, many different scholars have studied this kind of negative behavior from different perspectives and named it differently, such as anti-social behavior (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997), retaliatory behavior (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), aggressive behavior (Neuman & Baron, 1998). Since the 21st century, the concept of anti-production behavior has been adopted in relevant research. Sackett et al. (2001) argued that anti-production behavior is a series of actions that result in loss of organizational interests by members of the organization as the main body. Spector and Fox (2005) argue that anti-production behavior is harmful to organizations and stakeholders, including superior leaders, customers, and colleagues. Some scholars also believe that as long as members of an organization intentionally violate the interests of the organization, they are anti-productive.

Domestic scholars have also carried out relevant research on employees'anti-production behavior. Zhang Jianwei and Liu Yuxin (2008) believe that anti-production behavior refers to all kinds of acts that employees objectively cause losses to the property (including tangible property and intangible assets) of the organization or its members. Zhang Jianwei and Liu Yuxin (2009) pointed out that anti-production behavior is the intentional negative behavior of employees, which violates the formal or informal norms of the organization and will objectively harm the interests of the organization or its employees. Cheng Gang (2009) proposed three dimensions of employee CWB in the context of China. Wang Chen and Chen Weizheng (2009) believe that anti-production behavior refers to the behavior of employees who intentionally destroy the normal operation of the organization in the workplace. Its purpose is often to reduce the efficiency of the members of the organization and reduce the productivity of the organization by intentionally destroying the interests of the organization or related personnel. Peng He (2010) further expanded the definition of anti-production behavior, believing that anti-production

behavior refers to all kinds of intentional acts that are harmful or potentially destructive to the organization or related stakeholders in a specific workplace. The following year, Peng He (2011) divided knowledge workers' counter-productive behavior into six dimensions, and verified that the six-dimensional structural model has good reliability and validity. Liu Wenbin and Jing Runtian (2010) studied the impact of organizational ethical climate on employees' anti-productive behavior. They found that the three orientations of organizational ethical climate, namely, self-interest orientation, care orientation and rule orientation, had different effects on employees' anti-productive behavior, property-based anomaly and productive anomaly. From the perspective of self-determination theory, Liu Yuxin, Zhang Jianwei and Huang Guohua (2011) investigated the influence of organizational justice on anti-production behavior (CWB) and its mechanism. They believed that organizational justice had an important impact on self-determination and induced employees' anti-production behavior. Liu Zhen and Xu Meixin (2011) from the perspective of financial indicators, the study found that personal and organizational fit has a positive impact on anti-productive work behavior, and also has a certain impact on the financial performance of the company. Liu Yuxin, Zhang Jianwei and Peng Kaiping (2012) confirmed the impact of these two aspects on employees' anti production behavior from two aspects of workplace bullying and interpersonal conflict, and found that employees' emotional intelligence has a certain moderating effect on their anti production behavior. Zhang Yongjun et al. (2012) after integrating many definitions of anti-production behavior, put forward that anti-production behavior is an alternative work behavior based on organizational perspective, which has three characteristics: 1. behavior is negative and harmful to the organization and its members; 2. behavior is subjective and spontaneous; 3. behavior is subjective and spontaneous. Extra-role behavior. At present, the definition which has been widely accepted and used by scholars at home and abroad is put forward by Bennett et al. (1995). Jiang Tao and Fang Tao (2013) studied the turnover tendency of the new generation of employees, and concluded that the factors affecting the turnover of the new generation of employees include organizational commitment and individual.

With the in-depth development of the research, the scholars sorted the Counterproductive Work Behavior and divided the Counterproductive Work Behavior by factor analysis. There are many ways to divide.

According to the information reviewed, Hollinger and Clark (1983) first classified the dimensions of Counterproductive Work Behavior as a one-dimensional structure containing the property Counterproductive Work Behavior and the production of Counterproductive Work Behavior. The property Counterproductive Work Behavior includes the abuse of company resources, etc., and the production of Counterproductive Work Behavior includes Completion, passive absenteeism, etc. Bennett and Robinson (1995) proposed a four-dimensional structure of Counterproductive Work Behavior, which classifies four categories of Counterproductive Work Behavior based on behavioral objects (interpersonal, organizational) and behavioral nature (slight, severe). On this basis, they proposed a new dimension division in 2000. According to the

behavioral direction, the Counterproductive Work Behavior is divided into the organization pointing to Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB-O) and the Interpersonal Pointing Productive Work Behavior (CWB-I). A measurement scale consisting of 19 entries. Gruys and Sackett (2003) used factor analysis to obtain two dimensions, interpersonal-organizational orientation, task-related orientation, and Rotundo and Xie (2008) obtained similar conclusions after studying with Chinese employees as samples. Later, Jiang Darong and Wu Mengling (2005) proposed a three-dimensional model based on the Chinese context. Spector and Fox (2006) propose a five-dimensional model for better study of the motivations and potential antecedent variables of different types of Counterproductive Work Behavior. Stewart and Bing (2009) proposed a three-dimensional structure through exploratory factor analysis. The three dimensions are production deviation behavior, property deviation behavior, and interpersonal attack behavior. Although there are many models, the models that have been proven to be fully effective are not yet determined, and the dimensions of behavior-oriented partitioning proposed by Bennett and Robinson are widely used in scholars' research on Counterproductive Work Behavior.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study was conducted in the form of literature studies and questionnaires. Firstly, according to the relevant literature, there is a clear enough understanding and understanding of each concept of the research. According to these documents, the appropriate maturity scale is selected to translate, eliminate the items and modify the expression, and combine with the seven points of Likert. The table format forms the initial questionnaire. The initial questionnaire is delivered in a small scope, ie pre-test. The reliability and validity analysis of the collected data results, according to the opinions formed by the interviews of the respondents in the pre-test, delete the invalid items, modify the expression of the statements, and finally form a formal questionnaire. The formal questionnaire is filled in and collected by the authors through the network of the authors. The results of the questionnaire data are statistically analyzed and the results are analyzed.

The main methods of research are as follows:

(1) Literature research method

Scientific research is not subjective and arbitrary. The determination of research directions and the formulation of hypotheses require a certain theoretical basis. Through reading the relevant literature, we can deepen the understanding of the research variables, find out the shortcomings of the current research and the places to be solved, so as to clarify the purpose and significance of the research. This article has used a number of Chinese and foreign language databases such as HowNet, EBSCO, Baidu Academic, Google Academic and other academic websites to collect a

large number of research related journal articles and master papers, and borrowed the corresponding management books in the library. Through reviewing the existing literature, the concept connotation, dimension division and measurement methods of Leader-Member Exchange, insider identity cognition and Counterproductive Work Behavior are clarified, and the interaction mechanism between variables is clarified, and corresponding research hypotheses are put forward. And theoretical models.

(2) Series of questionnaire survey methods

This study was conducted mainly through questionnaires. The study used the existing maturity scale to obtain the data of the subjects through questionnaire measurement to analyze the production of CWB and the role of various factors. The scale used in the initial questionnaire was: Bennett & Robinson (2000) on the scale of Counterproductive Work Behavior, in which the items on banned drugs and races did not correspond to the reality in China, and because the questionnaires were mainly from construction companies, they were generally adopted. Untimed working hours, which is subject to the completion of the task, so the project on overtime is also inconsistent with the facts, deleted; Aquino & Reed (2002) on the Moral Identity scale; Dienesch and Liden (1986) on the Leader-Member Exchange Scale; for the selection of the working resource scale, refer to the relevant research of Karasek (1979), Zhang Zhe (2007), Bakker (2004), Tang Xuelian (2012), and the selection of the personal resource scale refers to Duan Lusheng (The scale used in the 2008 study, namely the scales of Schwarrner & Jeusalem (1995), Pierce (1989), Yuan Lixin et al. (2007)). The above scales are scales with good reliability and validity after repeated verification.

(3) Scientific data statistics methods

This study will obtain data on Leader-Member Exchange, Organizational Resources, Moral Identity, and Counterproductive Work Behavior, and analyze it through SPSS software.

Population, Sampling and Unit of Analysis

The respondents of this study are from a number of companies in Jiangsu. The purpose of this study is to study the relationship between Leader-Member Exchange relationship and Counterproductive Work Behavior, organization identification, and Organizational Resources depletion. The survey is mainly for enterprises. Employees, through personal relationships and contacts, the author adopts snowballing to distribute paper questionnaires in their own enterprises, classmates and friends. Enterprises include Jiangyin Construction Engineering Group Co., Ltd., Weige (Jiangsu) Electric Equipment Co., Ltd., and Jiangsu Construction Group. Ltd., Wuxi Zhongyi Steel Products Co., Ltd., Changzhou Gumei Bend Pipe Co., Ltd., Jiangsu Saite Steel Structure Co., Ltd., Wuxi Saite Steel Structure Installation Co., Ltd., etc., in order to ensure stronger authenticity, the questionnaire will be filled before the meeting. There is simple communication, indicating the purpose and content of the questionnaire, pursuing the other party's willingness, not doing any reluctance, and obtaining the consent of the other party, issuing a paper questionnaire, and filling in the on-site submission.

The participants in this study are all employees of the above-mentioned companies. They have great differences in age, participation in working hours, current positions, etc., and have certain representativeness.

In this study, questionnaires were collected by means of on-site paper questionnaires, and some questionnaires were excluded. The elimination rule is: 1. The questionnaire with obvious regularity of the answer, such as the questionnaire with the same option in the same table; 2. The multiple questions in the whole questionnaire are missing; 3. The 4 questions in the questionnaire are reversely scored, if there are positive and negative scores. If the title conflicts, the questionnaire is deleted. 234 questionnaires were entered and the reverse-scoring items were re-processed. At the same time, the missing items were filled in the average of the dimensions of the items in the missed items. According to the above-mentioned elimination rules, the questionnaires were selected and removed. The final effective questionnaire was 210, and the questionnaire was effective at 89.7%.

Instrumentation

Counterproductive Work Behavior scale: Bennett & Robinson (2000) on the Counterproductive Work Behavior scale, which excludes items related to banned drugs and races, overtime pay items, and projects that slow down the work and are not in line with the facts. According to the results of the pre-test and the recommendations of the test, due to "unauthorized misappropriation of public property" and "falsification during reimbursement expenses", there is basically no public property in the first-line production workers group, and there is no reimbursement. There is no relevant Behavior, in order to delete, "ignoring the supervisor's instructions" can not be clearly determined to point to the individual or to the organization's Counterproductive Work Behavior, so it is deleted, "leaking company secrets or other important information to others" because the first-line production workers are not in contact with the company Internal information is also deleted. After deletion, this scale has a total of 11 items. Six of the items were used to measure the Counterproductive Work Behavior pointing to the interpersonal, and five items were used to measure the Counterproductive Work Behavior directed to the organization.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Profile of Respondents

According to the needs of this study, the descriptive statistical analysis of the sample in this study includes gender, age, education level, working years, current position, and sample descriptive analysis results such as Table 4-1, where gender, age, education level, and working years are included. There are 6, 5, 11, 7, and 5 default values for the current positions. The following is a descriptive analysis of the remaining valid data.

Table 4-1 Descriptive statistical analysis of data results

Statistical variable	category	Effective sample size	Effective percentage
gender	male	162	79.4%
	Female	42	20.6%
age	18-25 years old	12	5.9%
	26-35 years old	63	30.7%
	36-45 years old	48	23.4%
	46-50 years old	44	21.5%
	51-60 years old	38	18.5%
Educational level	High school, high school and below	106	53.3%
	College	63	31.7%
	Bachelor	28	14.0%
	Master degree and above	2	1.0%
Working years	Within 1 year and less	16	7.9%
	1-3 (inclusive) year	26	12.8%
	3-5 (inclusive) year	17	8.4%
	5-10 (inclusive) year	42	20.7%
	More than 10 years	102	50.2%
post	General staff	145	70.7%
	Grassroots manager	33	16.1%
	Middle manager	19	9.3%
	Senior manager	8	3.8%

Source: Author

4.2 Leader-Member Exchange's Mechanism of Action on Counterproductive Work Behavior

Research objective 1 is to explore the mechanism of action of leadership-member exchange on anti-production behavior. Before performing regression analysis between variables, a bivariate correlation analysis was first performed.

In this paper, Pearson correlation analysis is used to analyze the relationship between variables, and then regression analysis is used to analyze the relationship between variables more accurately.

According to the results of the relevant analysis, the leadership-member exchange relationship is inversely related to age ($r=-.141, p=0.43<0.05$), and is related to the working years ($r=-.152, p=0.30<0.05$). Leadership-membership is the worst in state-owned enterprises. The CWB that points to the interpersonal relationship is gender-related, that is, men are more likely to implement CWBs that point to the interpersonal relationship. The CWBs that point to the organization are related to the nature of the enterprise, that is, the anti-production behaviors of the state-owned enterprises that point to the organization are the most. According to the results of the research data, the organizational resources are negatively correlated with the working years ($r=-.155, p=0.027$), that is, the longer the working hours are combined, the less resources are obtained.

As shown in Table 4.2, the leader-member exchange is negatively correlated with the employee CWB at the upper edge of the 0.1 level (two sides) ($r=-.124, p=0.074<0.1$), but has a significant negative correlation with the anti-production behavior pointing to the human. ($r=-.136, p=0.050$). The emotional dimension and contribution dimension of leadership-member exchange were significantly negatively correlated with the anti-production behavior directed at human ($r=-.175, p=0.011<0.05$; $r=-.137, p=0.047<0.05$). There is also a significant negative correlation between the emotional dimension of the leadership-member exchange relationship and the anti-production behavior of the organization ($r=-.183, p=0.008<0.01$).

In addition, it can be seen that there is a significant positive correlation between the leader-member exchange and the organizational resources ($r=.468, p=0.000$), that is, there is a significant negative correlation with resource consumption. There is a significant negative correlation between organizational resources and employee CWB ($r=-.243, p=0.000$). There are significant correlations between the three dimensions of leadership-member exchange and the two dimensions of anti-production behavior. There is a significant correlation between moral identity and anti-production behavior, leadership-member exchange, and organizational resources.

The results of the correlation analysis initially confirmed the two-to-two correlation between the variables. Based on this, this study will further explore the relationship between leadership-member exchange, resource depletion, employee anti-production behavior and moral identity, and explore the predictive role of leadership-member exchange on employee anti-production behavior.

Table 4-2 Pearson correlation coefficient matrix between variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
GENDER	1														
AGE	-.213**	1													
NATURE	-.116	-.036	1												

EDUCATIO N	.261**	-	-	1															
		.387**	.327**																
TIME	.078	.323**	-.126	.056	1														
POSITION	-.059	.057	-	.356*	.242**	1													
			.331**																
CWB	-.114	.023	-.171*	.027	.092	.103	1												
Recourse	-.094	-.093	.024	.060	-.155*	.223*	-	1											
							.243**												
LMX	-.071	-.142*	.141*	-.058	-.152*	.125	-.124	.468**	1										
Moral Identity	.071	-.113	.047	.115	-.066	.119	-	.585**	.230*	1									
							.350**												
LMXQ	-.144*	-.070	.192**	-.122	-	.039	-	.525**	.851*	.336**	1								
					.226**		.199**												
LMXG	-.018	-	.046	-.004	-.086	.208*	-.086	.433**	.828*	.211**	.567**	1							
		.182**																	
LMXC	.006	-.117	.090	.001	-.045	.087	-.002	.187**	.807*	-.001	.481**	.551*	1						
CWBI	-.176*	.110	-.060	-.093	.047	-.024	.898**	-	-	-	-.175*	-	-	1					
								.297**	.136*	.401**		.137*	.017						
CWBO	-.031	-.061	-	.132	.112	.199*	.896**	-.139*	-.086	-	-	-.017	.013	.610*	1				
			.232**							.226**	.183**								

Source: Author

The results of Regression Analysis between Leader-Member Exchange and employee CWB are shown in Table 4-3. The determination coefficient R^2 of Model 1 is 0.046, which means that Controlled Variable can explain 4.6% of OCB, and the adjusted R^2 value is 0.015. In Model 1, the F value is 1.475, $p=0.189$, which is not significant. Indicates that the regression is invalid.

Model 2 introduces Leader-Member Exchange, and the coefficient R^2 is increased to 0.064, which indicates that 6.4% of Organizational Citizenship Behavior can be explained. After adjustment, the value of R^2 is 0.028, and the interpretation ability of the model is improved. The F value is 1.779, reaching a significant level of margin, indicating that the overall regression is more effective. The data results show that Leader-Member Exchange and employee Counterproductive Work Behavior have a significant negative impact on the edge ($\beta=-0.143$, $p=0.063$).

Table 4-3 Leader-Member Exchange Regression Analysis of Employee CWB

	Model 1		Model 2	
	β	P	β	P

	Model 1		Model 2	
(constant)		.000		.000
GENDER	-.129	.096	-.134	.082
AGE	-.049	.581	-.076	.393
NATURE	-.153	.059	-.130	.109
EDUCATION	-.031	.738	-.053	.567
TIME	.101	.213	.082	.313
POSITION	.027	.751	.066	.446
LMX			-.143	.063
R ²		.046		.065
Adjusted r ²		.015		.028
f value		1.475		1.779
Significance of f value		.189		.094

Note: 1 The dependent variable is employee CWB; the predictive variables in Model 1 are gender, age, business nature, education level, working time, and post; the predictive variables in Model 2 are Controlled Variable and Leader-Member Exchange in Model 1. 2β is the standard regression coefficient.

Source: Author

Conclusion

In the organization, anti-production behavior caused by improper management exists more or less. The impact of anti-production behavior on the organization can be large or small, but it definitely has a negative impact on the organization. Some anti-production behaviors are dominant, and managers often find them in time to minimize their damage to the organization. However, a large number of employees' anti-production behaviors are quite hidden and difficult to be perceived by others. Such behaviors often do not cause too much immediate harm, but they are a hidden danger to the long-term healthy development of the organization. Significant

economic losses to the organization. Therefore, managers in an organization cannot be laissez-faire because of the concealment or non-immediacy of anti-production behavior. Facing the anti-production behavior within the organization, strengthening management, and actively taking measures are the key to solving the problem. This study provides a detailed analysis of the three main research variables of CPM leadership behavior, work values and anti-production behavior, which helps organizations or organizations to deepen their understanding and improve their leadership behavior and employee work (Xiong et al. 2020). The importance of values is to open up new ideas for avoiding and reducing anti-production behaviors, and to provide some inspiration for the internal management of enterprises. In the organization, a good relationship between the superior and the subordinates has become a key factor in mobilizing the enthusiasm of employees, reducing employee turnover, and promoting the continuous achievement of organizations and enterprises. However, in the enterprise, when the manager formulates the system and deals with the enterprise problem, the different opinions or treatments given by the leaders to different employees may affect the enthusiasm of the employees, resulting in discouragement, boredom, reduced work efficiency and even anti-production behavior (Shaffer et al. 2020).

References

- [1] Altunoğlu, A. E., & Gürel, E. B. B. (2015). Effects of leader–member exchange and perceived organizational support on organizational innovation: the case of denizli technopark. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 175-181.
- [2] Aquino K., Freeman D., Reed I. A., et al. (2009). Testing asocial-cognitive model of moral behavior: The interactive influence of situations and moral identity centrality. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 97 (1): 123-141.
- [3] Aquino, K., and Reed, A. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83 (6): 1423-1440.
- [4] Ashforth, B. E., & Anand, V. (2003). The normalization of corruption in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 25(19), 1-52.
- [5] Ashforth, B. E., et al. (2013). Extending the expanded model of organizational identification to occupations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43 (12): P. 2426 - 2448.
- [6] Bakker, A. B. (2005). Flow among music teachers and their students: the crossover of peak experiences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(1), 26-44.
- [7] Bakker, A. B., and Demerouti, E. (2007). The job requirements-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 22 (3), 309-328.
- [8] Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., Boer, E. D., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2003). Job demands and job resources as predictors of absence duration and frequency. *Journal of Vocational*

- Behavior*, 62(2), 341-356.
- [9] Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., De Boer, E., and Schaufeli, W. B. (2003). Job demands and job resources as predictors of absence duration and frequency. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62 (2), 341-356.
- [10] Bandura A. (1977). *Social learning theory*, Oxford, England: Prentice-Hall.
- [11] Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist*, (44), 1175-1184.
- [12] Bar-On, R., Brown, J. M., Kirkcaldy, B. D. & Thome, E. (2000). P. Emotional expression and implications for occupational stress: application of the Emotional quotient Inventory (EQ-i). *Personality & Individual Differences*, 28 (6), 1107-1118.
- [13] Bateman T. S., Organ D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier, The relationship between influence and employee "citizenship". *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
- [14] Baumeister, R. F., et al. (2006). Self-regulation and personality: How interventions increase regulatory success, and how depletion moderates the effects of traits on behavior. *Journal of Personality*, 74 (6), 1773-1802.
- [15] Belle, N., & Cantarelli, P. (2017). What causes unethical behavior? a meta-analysis to set an agenda for public administration research. *Public Administration Review*, 77(3), 327-339.
- [16] Bennett R. J., Robinson S. L. (2000). The Development of a Measure of Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85 (3): 349-360.
- [17] Bennett R.J. & Robinson S.L. (1995). A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behavior: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (2): 555-572
- [18] Blasi, A. (1983). Moral cognition and moral action: a theoretical perspective. *Developmental Review*, 3(2), 178-210.
- [19] Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Transaction Publishers.
- [20] Bowling N A, Beehr T A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the Victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 998-1012.
- [21] Bowling, N. A., & Gruys, M. L. (2010). Overlook issues in the conceptualization and measurement of Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20 (1), 54-61

- [22]Chen Niya, Zhong Jinghong, Zhou Bingbing, Hong Qingyu, Fan Mengting. (2017). Relations between Moral Identity and Internet Altruistic Behavior of College Students: Mediating Role of Optimism. *Journal of Nanjing University of Traditional Chinese Medicine (Social Science Edition)*, 18 (04), 233-237.
- [23]Cheng Gang.(2009). *The structure of counterproductive behavior of employees and its relationship with equity perception and organizational citizenship behavior*, M. A. Thesis. Chongqing, University of Xinan.
- [24]Cheng Qi, Zhao Huanhuan, Guo Dexuan, Xu Yan, Ke Yannan, Zhang Heyun. (2016). The influence of family upbringing on adolescents ;social behavior: the mediating role of Moral Identity. *Special Education in China*, (12), 41-48.
- [25]Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A.(2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: a meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 92(4),909.
- [26]Coyle P T, Foti R.(2015). If you're not with me you're...? Examining prototypes and cooperation in leader–follower relationships. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 22(2),161 -174.
- [27]Coyle, P. T., & Foti, R.. If you're not with me you're. ? examining prototypes and cooperation in leader-follower relationships. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*.
- [28]Dai Xiaoli. (2016). *Prediction of Employee Performance by Leader-Members Exchange Relations and Team-Members Exchange Relations*. Master's Degree Thesis. Shanghai: East China Normal University,
- [29]Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241-1255.
- [30]Damon, W. (2004). *The moral advantage: how to succeed in business by doing the right thing*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 174.
- [31]Dansereau Jr F, Graen G, Haga W J. A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 1975, 13 (1): 46-78.
- [32]De Jonge, J. & Dormann, C. (2003). The DISC model: Demand-induced strain compensation mechanisms in job stress. *Occupational stress in the service professions*, 43-74.
- [33]De Jonge, J., and Dormann, C. (2006). Stressors, resources, and strain at work: a

- longitudinal test of the triple-match principle. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (6), 1359
- [34] Demerouti, E., Geurts, S. A., Bakker, A. B., and Euwema, M. (2004). The impact of shift work on work - home conflict, job attitudes and health. *Ergonomics*, 47 (9), 987-1002.
- [35] Dienesch R. M. & Liden R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*. 11 (3), 618-634.
- [36] Ding Xiuling, Li Wenjie, (2011). A comparative study of the antecedent variables of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counter productive Work Behavior. *Journal of Nanjing University of Finance and Economics*. (3), 30-35
- [37] Du Hong, Wang Chongming. (2002). Research and Application Prospect of Leader-Member Exchange Theory. *Journal of Zhejiang University (Social Science Edition)*, 32 (6), 73-80
- [38] Duan Lusheng. (2008). *Research on the relationship between work resources, personal resources and work engagement*, M. A. Thesis. Henan: Henan University
- [39] Duffy, M.K., Ganster, D.C., and Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of management Journal*, 45 (2), 331-351.
- [40] Ernest H. O. B., R. F. Donelson and S. O. B. Allison. (2010). Bad apples or bad barrels: An examination of group and organizational-level effects in the study of counter productive work behavior. *Group & Organization Management*, 36 (1), 39-69.
- [41] Fan Jingjing. (2008). Research on the Impact of Work Stress on Counterproductive Work Behavior of Knowledge Workers. Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications.
- [42] Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., & Heller, D. (2009). Organizational supports and organizational deviance: the mediating role of organization-based self-esteem. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 108(2), 279-286.
- [43] Fida R, Paciello M, Tramontano C, et al. (2014). An Integrative Approach to Understanding Counterproductive Work Behavior: The Roles of Stressors, Negative Emotions, and Moral Disengagement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130 (1), 131-144
- [44] Ford, L. R., & Seers, A. (2006). Relational leadership and team climates: pitting differentiation versus agreement the leadership quarterly, 17,258-270.
- [45] Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive Work Behavior (cwb) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 291-309.

- [46] Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive Work Behavior (cwb) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 291-309.
- [47] Frederick Winslow Taylor. (1910). *Principles of Scientific Management*. Juli, Hu Suyun. Sichuan: Sichuan People ;s Publishing House, 2017
- [48] Fried, Y., & Ferris, G. R. (2010). The validity of the job characteristics model: a review and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(2), 287-322.
- [49] Fu, W. and S. P. Deshpande. (2012). Antecedents of organizational commitment in a Chinese construction company. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109 (3): 301-307.
- [50] Ge Xiao, Chen Weimin. (2019). The impact of perceived organizational support on Counterproductive Work Behavior of new generation employees. *China's collective economy*, (15), 122-124.
- [51] Gerstner C. R. & Day D. V. (1997). Meta-analysis review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82 (6), 827-844.
- [52] Gino F., et al. (2011), Unable to resist temptation: How self-control depletion promotes unethical behavior. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 115 (2), 191-203.
- [53] Gino, F., J. Gu, and C. B. Zhong. (2009). Contagion or restitution? When bad apples can motivate ethical behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45 (6): P. 1299-1302.
- [54] Gino, F., S. Ayal & D. Ariely (2009). Contagion and differentiation in unethical behavior. *Psychological Science*, 20 (3): P. 393-398.
- [55] Goleman, D. (1998) *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- [56] Gong Changyu. (2009). An Analysis of Moral Socialization. *Ethical Studies*, (6), 50-54
- [57] Gonzalez-Navarro Pilar, Zurriaga-Llorens Rosario, Tosin Olateju Adekunle, Llinares-Insa Luca I. (2018). Envy and Counterproductive Work Behavior: The Moderation Role of Leadership in Public and Private Organizations. *International Journal of research and public health*, 15 (7).
- [58] Graen G B, Scandura T A, Graen M R. (1986). A field experimental test of the moderating effects of growth need strength on productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 484-491.

- [59] Graen G B, Scandura T A, Graen M R. A. (1986). field experimental test of the moderating effects of growth need strength on productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71 (3), 484-491.
- [60] Graen G B, Scandura T A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. *Research in organizational behavior*.
- [61] Graen G, Novak M A, Sommerkamp P. (1987). The effects of leader —member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment mode. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 30(1), 109 -131.
- [62] Graen G, Novak M A, Sommerkamp P.(1982). The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 30 (1): 109-131.
- [63] Graen G.B. & Uhi-Bien M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6 (2): 219-247.
- [64] Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9(4), 175-208.
- [65] Graen G B, Cashman C J. (1975). *A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A development approach*. In: H J G, L LL. Ed. Leadership frontiers. Kent State University Press: Kent, 143-166.
- [66] Greenbaum, R. L., M. B. Mawritz & G. Eissa. (2012). Bottom-line mentality as an antecedent of social undermining and the moderating roles of core self-evaluation and conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97 (2): 343-359.
- [67] Gruys M. L., Sackett P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of Counterproductive Work Behavior. *International Journal of selection and assessment*, 11 (1): 30-42.
- [68] Harper D. (1990). Spotlight Abuse, Save Profits. *Industrial Distribution*, 79 (3): 47-51.
- [69] Harris, K.J., Wheeler, A.R., and Kacmar, K.M. (2009), Leader-member exchange and empowerment: direct and interactive effects on job satisfaction, turnover intentional performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20 (3), 371-382.
- [70] Herzberg, F., Mausner, B, & Snyderman , B.(1959) *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley.
- [71] Hitlan, R.T. & Noel, J. (2009). The influence of workplace exclusion and personality on Counterproductive Work Behaviors: An interactionist perspective. *European Journal of Work an Organizational Psychology*, 18 (4), 477-502.

- [72]Hobfoll S. E. (2002). Social and psychological resources and adaptation. *Review of General Psychology*, 6, 307-324.
- [73]Hobfoll S. E., Johnson R. J., Ennis N. & Jackson A. P. (2003). Resources loss, resources gain and emotional outcomes among inner city women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 632-643.
- [74]Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources. A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44 (3): P. 513.
- [75]Hollander E P. (1978). *Leadership dynamics: A practical guide to effective relationships*. New York: Free Press.
- [76]Hollinger R. C., Clark J. P. (1983). Deterrence in the workplace: Perceived certainty, perceived severity, and employee theft. *Social forces*, 62 (2): 398-418.
- [77]Hongdan Zhao, Zhenglong Peng, Geoff Sheard. (2013). Workplace ostracism and hospitality employees Counterproductive Work Behaviors: The joint moderating effects of proactive personality and political skills. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33, 219-227
- [78]Howell, J.M. & Hall-Merenda, K.E. (1999). The ties that bind: The impact of Leader-Member exchange, transformation and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 84 (5), 680
- [79]Huang Gui.(2010). Emphasis on why dedicated enterprises can not achieve their wish - Reflections on the Exchange Relations between State-owned Enterprises and Employees. *Management World*, 11, 105-113
- [80]Huang Youli, Ding Fang. (2007). An Empirical Study on the Relationship between Internal and External Controlling Personality Traits and Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Dalian University of Technology*, 28 (3): 34-37.
- [81]Huang, J., et al. (2016). Cross over of burn out from leaders to followers: A longitudinal study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25 (6): 849-861.
- [82]Hull, C.L.(1943). *Principles of behavior*. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.