

# ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND UNETHICAL PRO-ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF MORAL DISENGAGEMENT

Zhiyong Han, Dong Yang\*

*School of Business Administration, Anhui University of Finance and Economics*

---

## ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore the role of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in managing unethical pro-organizational behavior (UPB). Drawing on self-perception theory and moral disengagement theory, we hypothesize that OCB predicts UPB through the mediation of moral disengagement. Data were obtained from 262 individuals. Results indicated that OCB had significant effect on UPB. Moreover, it is found that OCB also had an effect on moral disengagement. Strong relationship was found between moral disengagement and UPB. Finally, results indicated that moral disengagement had a mediating effect between OCB and UPB. Theoretical and practical implications of these findings are discussed.

**Keywords:** organizational citizenship behavior, unethical pro-organizational behaviors, moral disengagement

## 1. INTRODUCTION

There is an increased interest in unethical conduct in the workplace, defined as behavior contrary to accepted moral norms of society (Treviño *et al.*, 2006). In addressing unethical conduct in the workplace, previous studies have identified numerous factors on individual- (e.g., gender, values), team- (e.g., ethical atmosphere, ethical leadership), and organization-level (e.g., organizational goals, culture) that help explain why employees engage in unethical conduct (Jones and Kavanagh, 1996; Kish-Gephart *et al.*, 2010; Kulik *et al.*, 2008; Mayer *et al.*, 2010; Schweitzer *et al.*, 2004; Treviño *et al.*, 1998). Interestingly, though most research work has focused on unethical behaviors that aim to benefit the self (Kish-Gephart *et al.*, 2010; Moore and Gino, 2013; Thau *et al.*, 2015; Treviño *et al.*, 2014), Employees commonly engage in unethical behavior to serve the interests of the organization, e.g., financial fraud, cheating customer, concealing the information to the public (Ashforth and Anand, 2003; Umphress *et al.*, 2010). Such behavior has been defined as unethical pro-organizational

---

Received: 06/2018; Revised: 06/2020; Accepted: 07/2020

\* Correspondence: School of Business Administration, Anhui University of Finance and Economics; No. 962, Caoshan Rd., Longzihu Dist., Bengbu City, Anhui Province 233030, China.

E-mail: yangdong@aufe.edu.cn

behavior (UPB) referring to actions that are intended to promote the effective functioning of the organization or its members and violate core societal values, mores, laws, or standards of proper conduct (Umphress and Bingham, 2011). This concept not only expands the connotation and extension of the concept of unethical behavior, but also navigates business ethics research into new areas. Consequently, a growing number of scholars have begun to study the phenomena of UPB (Chen *et al.*, 2016; Gino *et al.*, 2013; May *et al.*, 2015; Miao *et al.*, 2013; Thau *et al.*, 2015)

In an effort to contribute to this emergent field, this study explores how organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) contributing to the organization (OCBO) impacts employees' UPB through moral disengagement. In doing so, we attempt to make two main contribution to the existing organizational literature. First, though prior research has found that organizational identification (Chen *et al.*, 2016; Umphress and Bingham, 2011), the positive relationship of mutual benefit (Umphress *et al.*, 2010) and risk of social exclusion (Thau *et al.*, 2015) does promote UPB, it is not until in our research that evidence of the link between OCB and UPB has been fully discovered.

Second, based on social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), this paper explain the effect of OCB and UPB from the perspective of moral disengagement. Considerable work have shown that moral disengagement has a mediating effect between locus of control, moral identity, empathy, trait cynicism, and envy (Detert *et al.*, 2008; Duffy *et al.*, 2012; McFerran *et al.*, 2010; Shepherd *et al.*, 2013) and unethical behavior. However, whether it likewise mediates the effects of more antecedents of unethical behavior, such as OCB, remains an open question. A similar work has shown that moral disengagement mediates relationship between organizational identification and UPB (Chen *et al.*, 2016). Thus, this paper expect to reveal the intricate mechanism concerning the relationship between OCB and UPB.

At present, a growing number of scholars have begun to study the factors that make employees engage in UPB. Beneficial as UPB, such as bribery, falsifying document, lying to customers and so on, may be to the organization in the short term, it will harm the reputation and legal interest of organization in the long term. In recent years, governments have taken legal actions against companies whose employees engage in unethical behaviors in the workplace. Thus, more and more organizations are taking steps to identify and reduce unethical behavior by employees in the workplace. This paper explores the effects of a key underlying mechanism of UPB as well as evidence that explains why and how employees engage in UPB (Treviño *et al.*, 2014; Umphress and Bingham, 2011). The findings of this study should also enable organizations to regulate their employees away from the UPB.

## 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

### 2.1 OCB

Since Smith *et al.* (1983) coined the notion of OCB, a growing number of research have established OCB as a fundamental construct in organizational behavior (Organ, 1977; Organ *et al.*, 2011; N. P. Podsakoff *et al.*, 2009). OCB has been defined as “a kind of extra-role behavior beyond job descriptions that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Scholars have long focused on a number of potential benefits of OCBs, e.g., receiving help from others or better performance appraisals (Lyons and Scott, 2012; Whiting *et al.*, 2008). Behavior that targets the organization as a whole is called OCBO (Williams and Anderson, 1991) which promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1997). Today, as organizations compete in a more dynamic and uncertain environment in which OCBO are highly valuable (Zhou and Hoever, 2014).

## 2.2 UPB

UPB includes two core components. Firstly, UPB is unethical behavior that does not comply with legal and acceptable core social values and norms, for examples, intentional silence on products hazards, or avoidance to inform consumers about product defects. Secondly, employees engage in UPB with the intent of benefiting the organization or members of the organization without superiors commanding. The motifs of UPB may vary from altruistic to selfish. However, Umphress *et al.* (2010) argue that even apparently altruistic UPB cannot be completely separated from other unethical behaviors that are labelled “self-centered” because behaviors benefiting the organization also enables the individuals to profit themselves.

At the same time, Umphress and Bingham (2011) have made three boundary conditions on the concept of UPB. First of all, UPB is conducted with an intentional purpose, rather than by mistakes or unintended negligence. Secondly, as long as an unethical behavior is intended to benefit the organization or organizational members, it is classified as UPB regardless of actual outcome. Finally, unethical behaviors on personal gains are not considered to be in the category of UPB.

## 2.3 The relationship between OCB and UPB

OCB is an employee behavior that contributes to “the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance” (Organ, 1997). Studies have identified a number of potential benefits for individuals who engage in more OCB compared to others, e.g., receiving help from others or better performance appraisals, achieving an affiliative endeavor, facilitating social cohesiveness and building reciprocal ties among coworkers (Halbesleben and Wheeler, 2015; Lepine and van Dyne, 2001; Lyons and Scott, 2012; Whiting *et al.*, 2008). While previous studies have shown OCB as a powerful predictor of job satisfaction, job performance, quit intention and promotion (N. P. Podsakoff *et al.*, 2009; Wu *et al.*, 2005), scholars nowadays have begun to study OCB’s detrimental effects on performance and long-run career outcomes for individuals (Bergeron, 2007; Koopman *et al.*, 2016; Rapp *et al.*, 2013; Rubin *et al.*, 2013).

Even so, OCB’s potential impact on UPB has received little empirical attention. In this article, we will study OCB as an antecedent of UPB. Many acts which are viewed more favorably than egocentric behaviors (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986; Penner *et al.*, 2005) bring some benefit to the organization; moreover, these acts are also based on organizational norms or a narrow interpretation of utilitarianism (Audi, 2007). Umphress *et al.* (2010) argue that neither the local ethical norms nor the utilitarian criterions are adequate. A true ethical pro-organizational act must also meet ethical standards at the societal level, referred to as “hyper norms” (Warren, 2003). OCB is almost always positive in nature due to its moral praiseworthiness. Indeed, scholars have described positive behavior like OCB as being morally praiseworthy when it is spontaneous and unexpected, self-initiated, oriented toward the needs of others, and enacted without an expectation of reward or praise (Bar-Tal *et al.*, 1980; Batson, 1987; Krebs, 1970; Rostan, 2005). In particular, if employees’ OCBs benefit others or the organization with altruistic motives (e.g., OCBO), OCBs can even be more praiseworthy morally. According to self-perception theory, once individuals establish a fixed perception of themselves through reviewing their previous behaviors, consistency of behavior tends to be maintained and subsequent behavior will thus be influenced (Bem, 1972). Because OCBO is spontaneous and enacted without an expectation of reward or praise, it can help employees to maintain their moral identity in line with social moral standards. Moreover, moral identity promotes the pro-social tendency of individuals (e.g., engaging in voluntary activities, charities and other activities), and reduces the tendency of individuals to engage in deception, aggression, retaliation and other antisocial acts (Reed *et al.*, 2007),

Furthermore, some pro-social behaviors, such as informing customers of products' possible hazards, may, in the short term, hurt the interests of the organization, but will promote the long-term benefits for the organization (e.g., the improved corporate image). Scholars also confirmed that the unethical behavior of employees in the workplace affects the company's reputation and public trust, easy lawsuits (Graham *et al.*, 2015; Orlitzky *et al.*, 2003), and even hinders the sustainable development of enterprises (Grant and Visconti, 2006). Therefore, employees who are constantly engaged in OCB may gradually form a stable moral standard beyond needs of the organization with less unethical behavior. Meanwhile, more behaviors in compliance with social values are conducted to benefit long-term interests of the organization. On this basis, it is safe to draw our first hypothesis as follows:

**H<sub>1</sub>:** There is negative relation between OCB and UPB.

## 2.4 The mediating effect of moral disengagement

According to social cognitive theory, moral disengagement comprises a set of cognitive justification mechanisms that allow an individual to commit unethical acts while disengaging from the moral norms and self-sanctions that ordinarily inhibit such acts (Bandura *et al.*, 1996; Detert *et al.*, 2008). In particular, Bandura *et al.* (1996) have identified three broad cognitive mechanisms through which moral disengagement occurs. The first is to reconstrue unethical acts so as to make them appear amoral, less immoral or even respectable. The second is to obscure or distort both responsibility for and the consequences of such conduct. And the third is to devalue the target of unethical conduct. Because these different mechanisms all aim to justify morally suspicious acts, studies have operationalized moral disengagement as a single overarching concept (Bandura *et al.*, 1996; Detert *et al.*, 2008; Duffy *et al.*, 2012).

A few points are worth noting about the moral disengagement theory (Bandura *et al.*, 1996) before applying it to the relationship between OCB and UPB. Bandura and colleagues (Bandura 1999; Bandura *et al.*, 1996) argue that individuals have a self-regulating and monitoring system. As a part of this system, the majority of people will develop their own moral standards. When the self-regulating mechanism is during normal operation, unethical behavior will be blocked, because people normally will feel guilty or tormented when they are violating their own moral standards.

Furthermore, according to self-perception theory, individuals produce a fixed perception of themselves through reviewing their previous behaviors, consequently, they tend to maintain consistency of behavior and influence subsequent behavior (Bem, 1972). If previous behaviors of individuals are largely consistent with societal norms, they intend to maintain consistency of behavior, such as OCBO that are in compliance with core societal values, mores or laws.

Based on this view, we suggest that when employees continue to engage in OCB and form the personal standards of ethical behavior, they can reduce the possibility of moral disengagement. Moreover, people with stronger moral disengagement are more prone to conduct UPB. This paper proposes that moral disengagement in general might mediate the effect of OCB on UPB. Therefore, we propose the second hypothesis:

**H<sub>2</sub>:** Moral disengagement mediates the negative relationship between OCB and UPB.

## 3. METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Sample and date

The study sample consisted of 262 individuals living in China. Respondents work in different

sectors such as banking and insurance, medicine, teaching, service, and so on. Three hundred questionnaires were distributed and 262 have been returned for a response rate of 89%. Data were collected by convenience sampling. About 60% of the respondents were male. The sample includes a wide age range. About 88% of the respondents were between the ages 20–40. Sixty percent of the samples have a bachelor's and/or master's degree. Their work experience varies from 1 to 30 years. With about 82% of working for 1–15 years in their respective organizations. Some of the questionnaires were distributed by authors and others were distributed by key persons who had easy access to the respondents. These key persons were given some information about the procedure of the study. Questionnaires were answered and returned directly to the authors via e-mail or by hand.

### 3.2 Measures

This study involves three variables and the demographic variables of the employees, and the three variables were measured by 5-point Likert scales (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). All measures, which were collected concurrently with the matrix task (along with demographic information, including participants' age, gender, education and tenure), were presented in Chinese. The original English scales were translated into Chinese using translation and back-translation procedures (Brislin, 1986).

### 3.3 OCB

OCB was assessed using the 9-item measure developed by Lin (1992). This scale has been shown to demonstrate good reliability ( $\alpha = 0.87$ ) in an industrial company (Zhang and Luo 2015). Sample items are, "I won't gain my own interests through position power and I will work hard to promote company image, and actively participate in the relevant activities." The OCB questionnaire is divided into the following two dimensions: (1) general obedience, including five items; (2) active, including four items. These two dimensions reflected the OCBO, and the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for this scale was 0.93.

### 3.4 UPB

UPB was assessed using the six-item measure developed by Umphress *et al.* (2010). Sample items are, "If it would help my organization, I would misrepresent the truth to make my organization look good," and "If it would help my organization, I would exaggerate the truth about my company's products or services to customers and clients." The Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for this scale was 0.89.

### 3.5 Moral disengagement

Moral disengagement was assessed with the eight-item scale developed by Moore *et al.* (2012). Sample items are, "It is okay to spread rumors to defend those you care about" and "People shouldn't be held accountable for doing questionable things when they were just doing what an authority figure told them to do." The Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for this scale was 0.86.

### 3.6 Control variables

As prior research has shown that demographic characteristics may influence the extent to which individuals engage in unethical behavior (Erdogan and Liden, 2002), we have controlled the effects of demographic characteristics. Age, tenure and education were measured as dichotomous variables. To measure age, the following categories were utilized: 1 = "20–30," 2 = "31–40," 3 = "41–50," 4 = "51–60." To measure tenure, the following categories were utilized: 1 = "less than 1 year," 2 = "1–5 years," 3 = "6–10 years," 4 = "11–15 years," 5 = "16–20 years," 6 = "21–25 years," and "7 = 26–30 years."

To measure education, the following categories were utilized: 1 = “less than high school diploma,” 2 = “technical secondary school diploma,” 3 = “junior college diploma,” 4 = “bachelor,” 5 = “master,” 6 = “doctor.” Gender was controlled through the use of a dummy variable (1 = male, 2 = female).

#### 4. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The data analysis was conducted in two steps. First, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was undertaken using AMOS 21.0 to test the discriminant validity of the multiple-item measures used in the study. Second, hierarchical regression analysis was used to test the study hypotheses.

Table 1 presents the results of CFA. A test for common method variance was conducted using Harman’s recommendations. A one-factor model was compared to that of the proposed three-factor model. Comparison of goodness-of-fit indices showed that the one-factor model was significantly worse than that of the three-factor model,  $\Delta\chi^2(17) = 1,744.90$ ,  $p < 0.01$ . These results suggest that common method variance (CMV) is not a serious threat to the findings of this research (P. M. Podsakoff *et al.* 2003). In addition, we compared the goodness-of-fit indices of the three-factor model with that of two-factor model (combining OCB and moral disengagement into one factor). Again, the indices of the two-factor model were significantly worse,  $\Delta\chi^2(16) = 1,069.71$ ,  $p < 0.01$ , suggesting the three-factor model fitted the data best.

The means, standard deviations, correlations, and reliability coefficients of study variables are presented in Table 2.

Hierarchical regression analysis was taken to test the two hypotheses mentioned in previous sections. Its findings are shown in Table 3.

As shown in Table 3, Model 2 revealed that when the control variables were entered into the regression, only gender was significantly related to UPB, in other words male and female managers differ in engaging in unethical behavior benefiting the organizations that employ them

In Model 1 and Model 3, regression analyses revealed that OCB was negatively related to both moral disengagement ( $\beta = -0.19$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and UPB ( $\beta = -0.29$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). We also found that moral

**Table 1. Result of confirmatory factor analysis**

Model	$\chi^2$	<i>df</i>	IFI	CFI	RMSEA
Three-factor model	388.73	213	0.95	0.95	0.06
Two-factor model (moral disengagement and OCB combined)	1,458.44	229	0.67	0.67	0.14
One-factor model	2,133.63	230	0.49	0.49	0.18

Source: This study.

Note: IFI: incremental fit index; CFI: comparative fit index; RMSEA: root-mean-square error of approximation.

**Table 2. Descriptive statistics, correlations and reliability coefficients of study variables**

Variable	Mean	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3
1. OCB	3.80	0.65	(0.93)		
2. Moral disengagement	2.09	0.66	-0.20**	(0.86)	
3. UPB	2.34	0.79	-0.33**	0.62**	(0.89)

Source: This study.

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the coefficient  $\alpha$ .

\*\* $p < 0.01$ .



**Table 3. Results of hierarchical regression analyses with UPB and moral disengagement**

Dependent variable	Moral disengagement		UPB		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Control variable					
Gender	-0.17**	-0.28**	-0.22**	-0.16**	-0.13**
Age	-0.10	-0.08	-0.10	-0.02	-0.04
Tenure	0.20*	0.07	0.12	-0.04	0.01
Education	0.16**	0.01	0.01	-0.09	-0.08
Independent variable					
OCB	-0.19**		-0.29**		-0.19**
Moral disengagement				0.60**	0.57**
<i>F</i>	6.45**		9.72**	36.43**	34.29**
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.112	0.081	0.160	0.416	0.447
$\Delta R^2$				0.256**	0.287**

Source: This study.

Note: 1. *n* = 262.

2. Model 1: moral disengagement = gender + age + tenure + education; Model 2: UPB = gender + age + tenure + education; Model 3: UPB = gender + age + tenure + education + OCB; Model 4: UPB = gender + age + tenure + education + moral disengagement; Model 5: UPB = gender + age + tenure + education + OCB + moral disengagement.

\**p* < 0.05, \*\**p* < 0.01.

disengagement was positively related to UPB ( $\beta = 0.60$ ,  $p < 0.01$ , Model 4). When both OCB and moral disengagement were included in the model (Model 5), the effect of moral disengagement remained significant ( $\beta = 0.57$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), while that of OCB was evidently diminishing ( $\beta = -0.19$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Therefore,  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  were supported.

Although the three-step procedure described above (Baron and Kenny, 1986) is one common method of assessing statistical mediation, indirect effects tests require the calculation of compound coefficients, which are not normally distributed (Shrout and Bolger, 2002). To account for nonnormal sampling distributions of indirect relations, we thus reexamined the predicted linkages (OCB  $\rightarrow$  moral disengagement  $\rightarrow$  UPB) through the bootstrapping approach for testing indirect effects (5,000 resamples) (Mackinnon *et al.*, 2004). Consistent with our first test, results of this follow-up test revealed that the indirect effect of OCB on UPB via moral disengagement was significant,  $\beta = 0.13$ ,  $SE = 0.05$ , 95% bias-corrected confidence interval (CI) = [-0.23, -0.02], excluding zero. Besides, after controlling for moral disengagement, OCB was still related to UPB,  $\beta = 0.22$ ,  $SE = 0.06$ , 95% bias-corrected CI = [-0.34, -0.11], excluding zero. Taken together, the above analyses test thus indicated that moral disengagement partly mediated the relationship between OCB and UPB.

## 5. DISCUSSION

OCB has “undeniably positive aspects, and investigations of OCB typically emphasize and highlight these positive features” (Bolino *et al.*, 2013, p. 542). A great much research has also investigated beneficial effects of OCB (Halbesleben and Wheeler, 2015; Lepine and van Dyne 2001; Lyons and Scott, 2012; Whiting *et al.*, 2008), but few scholars has focused on the linkage with OCB and UPB. Therefore, in our opinion, an appropriate question is “what impacts does OCB have on UPB and in what way?”

Accordingly, we embedded our works to investigate the relationship between OCB and UPB. In this

study, we restricted the research on OCB which may influence UPB in workplace settings, and focused on consequences of OCB benefiting organization instead of individual. Consistent with our hypotheses, we found a negative relationship between OCB and UPB, and that the relationship was mediated by moral disengagement. The data showed that employees with stronger OCB are less likely to engage in UPB via moral disengagement. Our findings has a number of theoretical implications. First, this study revealed that employees with higher levels of OCB are less likely to engage in UPB than those with low levels of OCB. In recent years, scholars have questioned the prevailing viewpoint that OCB is beneficial, instead arguing that OCB may have a harmful effect on perform, long-run career, job satisfaction and affective commitment (Bergeron, 2007; Koopman *et al.*, 2016; Rapp *et al.*, 2013; Rubin *et al.*, 2013). Although studies have shown that OCB may has both the positive and negative consequences, few scholars paid attention to the linkage between OCB and unethical behavior, in particular, UPB. Our goal in the current study was to investigate how OCB may impact on employees' UPB.

By confirming OCB's positive effects on employees' probabilities to engage in UPB, our study obtained a richer picture of the effects that OCB impacts on employees' unethical behavior. On one hand, this study highlighted the importance of OCB which is initiative, a kind of extra-role behavior beyond job descriptions and not recognized by the formal reward system. On the other hand, this paper was the first of its kind exploring the relationship between OCB and UPB. Previous studies have mostly focused on unethical behaviors motivated by self-interest (Greenberg, 2002; Kish-Gephart *et al.*, 2010; Reynolds, 2006; Thau *et al.*, 2015), and indicated that the major source of unethical conduct is self-serving motives and behaviors. However, in recent years, scholars have paid attention to the pro-organizational motives of unethical behavior (May *et al.*, 2015; Thau *et al.*, 2015; Umphress and Bingham, 2011; Umphress *et al.*, 2010). Moreover, previous studies have found that organizational identification enhances the propensity of employees to engage in UPB (Chen *et al.*, 2016). This paper have shown that OCB has a negative effect on UPB, which expanded the research that related pro-organizational behaviors to UPB.

Second, this study also elucidated the psychological mechanism through which OCB relate to UPB. It is important to build the mediating mechanism, explaining how OCB influences UPB. When employees engage in OCB which is beneficial to organization, their personal moral standards are gradually eroded and reconstructed; therefore, employees engaging in high-level OCB may have a low-level moral disengagement. Being consistent with other studies (Miao *et al.*, 2013), our research also found that moral disengagement is positively related to UPB. Since moral disengagement partly mediates between OCB and UPB, further work is needed to explore other mediating mechanism.

A third and final contribution of this study is that it attributes the reduction of UPB to the reinforcement of OCB. For a pro-organizational act to be truly ethical, it also has to meet ethical standards at the societal level, referred to as "hyper norms" (Warren, 2003). Previous studies have found that UPB relate to positive attitudes and behavior, such as organizational identification (Chen *et al.*, 2016; Umphress and Bingham, 2011). Moreover, studies suggested that ethical leadership has an inverted u-shaped (curvilinear) relationship with UPB (Miao *et al.*, 2013). Although, scholars has focused the antecedents of UPB (May *et al.*, 2015; Miao *et al.*, 2013; Thau *et al.*, 2015; Umphress *et al.*, 2010), but less attention has paid to underlying psychological processes and the intergroup perspective that pro-organizational behavior may meet ethical standards at societal level. The present study showed how OCB helps to reduce UPB, a kind of negative act for society at large. In addition, unlike previous studies that paid excessive attention to incompatibility of pro-organizational and pro-societal behavior, this study presented a view that OCB may reduce the propensity of employees to engage in UPB without going against the interests of the organization. In a sense, our research focused on both the pursuit of the interests of the organization and that of the society.



## 6. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

In addition to these theoretical contributions, our research has several practical implications as well. First, the linkage between OCB and UPB we document suggests that organizations may make use of OCB to reduce their employees' UPB. Organizations that value OCB may benefit from selecting on individual differences that make employees less likely to engaging in UPB that may harm the organization's reputation and legal standing in the long-term. Managers, therefore, ought to recognize that individual differences will affect the propensity of employees engaging in UPB. Furthermore, organizations need to establish clear standards and procedures to evaluate unethical behavior. Punishment should be implemented to reduce unethical behavior, even when they may seem beneficial to the organization for the time being. Meanwhile, organizations need to be aware of the dual nature of punishment, the appropriate level of punishment should be evaluated to protect the feelings of employees, especially when unethical behaviors benefit the organization in short term.

Second, in order to reduce opportunities for employees to face moral dilemmas, organizations should integrate ethics and values into the societal core values, and also need to Consider the difference among countries. Moreover, ethical values should be reflected in the organizational culture, code of conduct and employees' performance appraisal. Employees who comply with ethical values of their organizations will therefore reduce to the propensity of engaging in UPB.

Finally, this paper found that moral disengagement has positive effect on UPB. Employees who exercise low levels of moral disengagement are therefore less likely to conduct UPB. Managers should pay more attention to improving employees' moral identification of organization. Moreover, training courses on ethical should be designed to improve the moral Sensitivity of behavior conducted in the workplace.

## 7. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Of course our study has several limitations that should be acknowledged and inform future research directions. First, our data were collected from a single set of respondents. Although, our study showed that the common method bias was not a real concern, we cannot absolutely exclude the possibility of common method bias. In addition, in consideration of social desirability effects, respondents could have magnified the quality of OCB while underreported the frequency of UPB and moral disengagement. In future, multiple respondents could be used to measure employees' OCB and UPB.

Second, although we have tested mediating mechanisms for concerning the effects of OCB on UPB, other processes may also influence these effects. For example, positive effect could exert mediating effects on UPB. Previous research found that positive effect mediated the effects of OCB and job satisfaction and affective commitment (Koopman *et al.* 2016). Investigating how positive affect, job satisfaction or affective commitment may influence UPB would be a fruitful endeavor.

Finally, our study used a sample of employee from different sectors in China. Although different organizations have different ethical climate, we did not explore the impact of ethical climate on moral disengagement and UPB. Future research might investigate ethical climate' moderating effects on moral disengagement or UPB.

## 8. COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the Declaration of Helsinki in 1964 and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Study was funded by the Humanities and Social Sciences Research Fund of Anhui Province Department of Education (SK2017A0849), Pilot Project of Comprehensive Reform of Human Resources Management Specialty in Anhui Province (2015zy023), and Pilot Project of Comprehensive Reform of Human Resources Management Specialty in Anhui University of Finance and Economics (aczzyhgg201501).

## REFERENCES

- Ashforth, B. E. and Anand, V., 2003, The normalization of corruption in organizations, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 25, 1-52. doi:10.1016/S0191-3085(03)25001-2
- Audi, R., 2007, Can utilitarianism be distributive? Maximization and distribution as criteria in managerial decisions, *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 17(4), 593-611. doi:10.5840/beq20071741
- Bandura, A., 1986, *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Bandura, A., 1999, Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3(3), 193-209. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0303\_3
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V. and Pastorelli, C., 1996, Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(2), 364-374. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.364
- Baron, R. M. and Kenny, D. A., 1986, The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173-1182. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.51.6.1173
- Bar-Tal, D., Raviv, A. and Leiser, T., 1980, The development of altruistic behavior: empirical evidence, *Developmental Psychology*, 16(5), 516-524. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.16.5.516
- Batson, C. D., 1987, Prosocial motivation: is it ever truly altruistic? *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 20, 65-122. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60412-8
- Bem, D. J., 1972, Self-perception theory, *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 6, 1-62. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60024-6
- Bergeron, D. M., 2007, The potential paradox of organizational citizenship behavior: good citizens at what cost? *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1078-1095.
- Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., Turnley, W. H. and Harvey, J., 2013, Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(4), 542-559. doi:10.1002/job.1847
- Brief, A. P. and Motowidlo, S. J., 1986, Prosocial organizational behaviors, *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 710-725. doi:10.2307/258391
- Brislin, R. W., 1986, The wording and translation of research instrument, in *Field Methods in Cross-Cultural Research*, edited by Lonner, W. and Berry, J., Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, 137-164.
- Chen, M., Chen, C. C. and Sheldon, O. J., 2016, Relaxing moral reasoning to win: how organizational identification relates to unethical pro-organizational behavior, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(8), 1082-

1096. doi:10.1037/apl0000111

- Detert, J. R., Treviño, L. K. and Sweitzer, V. L., 2008, Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: a study of antecedents and outcomes, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 374-391. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.374
- Duffy, M. K., Scott, K. L., Shaw, J. D., Tepper, B. J. and Aquino, K., 2012, A social context model of envy and social undermining, *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(3), 643-666. doi:10.5465/amj.2009.0804
- Erdogan, B. and Liden, R. C., 2002, Social exchanges in the workplace: a review of recent developments and future research directions in leader-member exchange theory, in *Leadership*, edited by Neider, L. and Schriesheim, C., Information Age, Greenwich, CT, 65-114.
- Gino, F., Ayal, S. and Ariely, D., 2013, Self-serving altruism? The lure of unethical actions that benefit others, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 93, 285-292. doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2013.04.005
- Graham, K. A., Ziegert, J. C. and Capitano, J., 2015, The effect of leadership style, framing, and promotion regulatory focus on unethical pro-organizational behavior, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126(3), 423-436. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1952-3
- Grant, R. M. and Visconti, M., 2006, The strategic background to corporate accounting scandals, *Long Range Planning*, 39(4), 361-383. doi:10.1016/j.lrp.2006.09.003
- Greenberg, J., 2002, Who stole the money, and when? Individual and situational determinants of employee theft, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 985-1003. doi:10.1016/S0749-5978(02)00039-0
- Halbesleben, J. R. B. and Wheeler, A. R., 2015, To invest or not? The role of coworker support and trust in daily reciprocal gain spirals of helping behavior, *Journal of Management*, 41(6), 1628-1650. doi:10.1177/0149206312455246
- Jones, G. E. and Kavanagh, M. J., 1996, An experimental examination of the effects of individual and situational factors on unethical behavioral intentions in the workplace, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(5), 511-523.
- Kish-Gephart, J. J., Harrison, D. A. and Treviño, L. K., 2010, Bad apples, bad cases, and bad barrels: meta-analytic evidence about sources of unethical decisions at work, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), 1-31. doi:10.1037/a0017103
- Koopman, J., Lanaj, K. and Scott, B. A., 2016, Integrating the bright and dark sides of OCB: a daily investigation of the benefits and costs of helping others, *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(2), 414-435. doi:10.5465/amj.2014.0262
- Krebs, D. L., 1970, Altruism: an examination of the concept and a review of the literature, *Psychological Bulletin*, 73(4), 258-302. doi:10.1037/h0028987
- Kulik, B. W., O'Fallon, M. J. and Salimath, M. S., 2008, Do competitive environments lead to the rise and spread of unethical behavior? Parallels from Enron, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83(4), 703-723. doi:10.1007/s10551-007-9659-y
- Lepine, J. A. and van Dyne, L., 2001, Peer responses to low performers: an attributional model of helping in the context of groups, *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 67-84.
- Lin, S. C., 1992, *Compensation Equity, Procedural Justice and Organizational Commitment*, *Organizational Citizenship Behavior*, Master's thesis, National University of Political Science, Taipei.
- Lyons, B. J. and Scott, B. A., 2012, Integrating social exchange and affective explanations for the receipt of help and harm: a social network approach, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117(1), 66-79. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.10.002
- Mackinnon, D. P., Lockwood, C. M. and Williams, J., 2004, Confidence limits for the indirect effect: distribution of the product and resampling methods, *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39(1), 99. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr3901\_4
- May, D. R., Chang, Y. K. and Shao, R., 2015, Does ethical membership matter? Moral identification and its

- organizational implications, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(3), 681-694. doi:10.1037/a0038344
- Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M. and Greenbaum, R. L., 2010, Examining the link between ethical leadership and employee misconduct: the mediating role of ethical climate, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(1), 7-16. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-0794-0
- McFerran, B., Aquino, K. and Duffy, M., 2010, How personality and moral identity relate to individuals' ethical ideology, *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20(1), 35-56. doi:10.5840/beq20102014
- Miao, Q., Newman, A., Yu, J. and Xu, L., 2013, The relationship between ethical leadership and unethical pro-organizational behavior: linear or curvilinear effects? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116(3), 641-653. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1504-2
- Moore, C., Detert, J. R., Klebe Treviño, L. K., Baker, V. L. and Mayer, D. M., 2012, Why employees do bad things: moral disengagement and unethical organizational behavior, *Personnel Psychology*, 65(1), 1-48. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01237.x
- Moore, C. and Gino, F., 2013, Ethically adrift: how others pull our moral compass from true north, and how we can fix it, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 33, 53-77. doi:10.1016/j.riob.2013.08.001
- Organ, D. W., 1977, A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction-causes-performance hypothesis, *Academy of Management Review*, 2(1), 46-53. doi:10.2307/257604
- Organ, D. W., 1988, *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
- Organ, D. W., 1997, Organizational citizenship behavior: it's construct clean-up time, *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85-97. doi:10.1207/s15327043hup1002\_2
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M. and Podsakoff, N. P., 2011, Expanding the criterion domain to include organizational citizenship behavior: implications for employee selection, in *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, edited by Zedeck, S., American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, 281-323.
- Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L. and Rynes, S. L., 2003, Corporate social and financial performance: a meta-analysis, *Organization Studies*, 24(3), 403-441. doi:10.1177/0170840603024003910
- Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A. and Schroeder, D. A., 2005, Prosocial behavior: multilevel perspectives, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 365-392. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070141
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M. and Blume, B. D., 2009, Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: a meta-analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122-141. doi:10.1037/a0013079
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y. and Podsakoff, N. P., 2003, Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- Rapp, A., Bachrach, D. G. and Rapp, T., 2013, The influence of time management skill on the curvilinear relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and task performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(4), 668-677. doi:10.1037/a0031733
- Reed, A., II., Aquino, K. and Levy, E., 2007, Moral identity and judgments of charitable behaviors, *Journal of Marketing*, 71(1), 178-193.
- Reynolds, S. J., 2006, Moral awareness and ethical predispositions: investigating the role of individual differences in the recognition of moral issues, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 233-243. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.233
- Rostan, S., 2005, Understanding extraordinary moral behavior in children and adolescents, in *Education, Arts, and Morality: Creative Journeys*, edited by Wallace, D. B., Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York, NY, 103-120.
- Rubin, R. S., Dierdorff, E. C. and Bachrach, D. G., 2013, Boundaries of citizenship behavior: curvilinearity

- and context in the citizenship and task performance relationship, *Personnel Psychology*, 66(2), 377-406. doi:10.1111/peps.12018
- Schweitzer, M. E., Ordóñez, L. and Douma, B., 2004, Goal setting as a motivator of unethical behavior, *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 422-432. doi:10.2307/20159591
- Shepherd, D. A., Patzelt, H. and Baron, R. A., 2013, "I care about nature, but ...": disengaging values in assessing opportunities that cause harm, *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(5), 1251-1273. doi:10.5465/amj.2011.0776
- Shrout, P. E. and Bolger, N., 2002, Mediation in experimental and nonexperimental studies: new procedures and recommendations, *Psychological Methods*, 7(4), 422-445. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.7.4.422
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W. and Near, J. P., 1983, Organizational citizenship behavior: its nature and antecedents, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653
- Thau, S., Derfler-Rozin, R., Pitesa, M., Mitchell, M. S. and Pillutla, M. M., 2015, Unethical for the sake of the group: risk of social exclusion and pro-group unethical behavior, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(1), 98-113. doi:10.1037/a0036708
- Treviño, L. K., Butterfield, K. D. and McCabe, D. L., 1998, The ethical context in organizations: influences on employee attitudes and behaviors, *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 8(3), 447-476. doi:10.2307/3857431
- Treviño, L. K., den Nieuwenboer, N. A. and Kish-Gephart, J. J., 2014, (Un)Ethical behavior in organizations, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 635-660. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143745
- Treviño, L. K., Weaver, G. R. and Reynolds, S. J., 2006, Behavioral ethics in organizations: a review, *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 951-990. doi:10.1177/0149206306294258
- Umphress, E. E. and Bingham, J. B., 2011, When employees do bad things for good reasons: examining unethical pro-organizational behaviors, *Organization Science*, 22(3), 621-640.
- Umphress, E. E., Bingham, J. B. and Mitchell, M. S., 2010, Unethical behavior in the name of the company: the moderating effect of organizational identification and positive reciprocity beliefs on unethical pro-organizational behavior, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(4), 769-780. doi:10.1037/a0019214
- Warren, D. E., 2003, Constructive and destructive deviance in organizations, *Academy of Management Review*, 28(4), 622-632. doi:10.2307/30040751
- Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M. and Pierce, J. R., 2008, Effects of task performance, helping, voice, and organizational loyalty on performance appraisal ratings, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 125-139. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.125
- Williams, L. J. and Anderson, S. E., 1991, Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors, *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617. doi:10.1177/014920639101700305
- Wu, X., Wu, Z. and Zhang, D., 2005, New perspectives in organizational citizenship behavior research, *Advances in Psychological Science*, 13(2), 211-218.
- Zhang, T. and Luo, J. D., 2015, Organizational citizenship behavior in Guanxi circles, *Chinese Journal of Management*, 12(10), 1442-1449.
- Zhou, J. and Hoever, I. J., 2014, Research on workplace creativity: a review and redirection, *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 333-359. doi:10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091226

# 組織公民行為與不道德親組織行為： 道德推脫的仲介作用

韓志勇 楊棟\*

安徽財經大學工商管理學院

## 摘要

本研究旨在探討組織公民行為與不道德的親組織行為的關係。基於自我認知理論和道德脫離理論，我們假設組織公民行為通過道德脫離的仲介作用來預測不道德親組織行為。根據對262名員工實證分析，結果表明，組織公民行為對不道德親組織行為有顯著影響。此外，研究還發現組織公民行為對道德脫離也有影響，道德脫離與不道德親組織行為之間也有很強的關係，道德脫離仲介了組織公民行為與不道德親組織之間的關係。最後論文討論了研究發現的理論和實踐意義。

**關鍵詞：**組織公民行為、不道德親組織行為、道德推脫