

## Research on the Mechanism of University Teachers' Evasive Counterproductive Work Behavior

Xiuna Dong<sup>1\*</sup>, Hongbo Li<sup>1</sup>, Qi He<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Management, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, China;

<sup>2</sup> Management School, Hainan University, Haikou, China

(Received September 1 2022, accepted December 1 2022)

**Abstract:** College teachers' Evasive Counterproductive Work Behavior is characterized by breach of psychological contract, covert confrontation and passive obedience, which will bring potential costs and harm to social development. Understanding the formation mechanism of college teachers' Evasive Counterproductive Work Behavior is of crucial to control its occurrence. Based on the theory of self-determination, this study constructs a regulated mediation model to verify the negative effect of performance wage perception on college teachers' Counterproductive Behavior by assigning fair perception; Self-efficacy has a positive moderating effect on the negative effect of performance wage perception and distributive justice perception, and self-efficacy has a positive moderating effect on the intermediary effect of distributive justice perception between performance wage perception and evasive counterproductive work behavior. The results of the empirical study have practical reference value for preventing effective teachers from avoiding Counterproductive Work Behavior and improving the merit pay system in colleges and universities.

**Keywords:** College teachers; merit pay perception; evasive counterproductive behavior; distributive justice perception; self-efficacy.

### 1 Introduction

Evasive Counterproductive, as a wide range of workplace behavior, which is usually a workplace bias behavior [1] intended by an employee that damages the interests of an organization, colleague, or customer. Due to its characteristics of intentional, resistance and default, it is often closely associated with negative emotions and even hostile behaviors [2] [3], which is highlighted by non-compliance with operating norms and negative work. For example, SHOSS [4] have pointed out that employees have lost billions of dollars in anti-productive practices such as theft or loss of efficiency. Counterproductive behavior of organizations, however, is not all obvious because of the high power distance between leaders and employees. Employees leaders in order to avoid subsequent punishment or blame, more inclined to take invisible revenge or avoid ways to implement Counterproductive behavior, such as sabotage, passive work. The Academic research on the influencing factors of this has been relatively mature, but there is still a lack of governance and exploration of the Evasive Counterproduction Behavior mechanism of college teachers. As a special group contributing to social development, the rational and rigorous personality characteristics of college teachers and their self-respect and self-strengthening status require them to restrain their own words and deeds, and to adopt covert resistance such as Evasive Counterproductive Behavior are also more in line with their group characteristics. As for its deep degree of concealment and long duration, it will have a great negative impact on the development of universities and even social development. Therefore, it is of great significance to explore the antecedent variables and formation mechanism of Evasive Counterproductive Work Behavior for maintaining individual work enthusiasm and promoting the healthy development of colleges and universities.

As one type of Counterproductive Behavior, Evasive Counterproductive Production Behavior refers to accept tasks on the surface, but in the actual work with absenteeism, early leave, passive work, out of work, idle and other negative state to deal with work tasks. The core is the behavior of superficial acceptance but not active action after cognitive imbalance, which is a kind of passive obedience, mainly derived from the implementation of merit pay [5]. According to its

\*Corresponding author. E-mail address: 307059816@qq.com

representation, it can be further divided into Proximity Counterproductive Work Behaviors and Evasive Counterproductive Work Behaviors [6]. Among them, Proximity Counterproductive Behavior is negative confrontation, the concept of which implies direct rejection of the task arrangements, and employees will explain their resistance by stealing property, spreading rumors or malicious competition. Since this behavior often intuitively shows hostile behavior, it is more likely to be perceived by leaders or colleagues, and further induce conflict and confrontation. Instead, Evasive Counterproductive Work Behavior is based on accepting the task arrangements, but its essence is passive obedience under the inert state.

The theory of analyzing Counterproduction Behavior is mainly the self-determination theory. The individual usually have some selective activities independently according to the motivation of behavior, the stronger motivation the individual has, the more willing he is to work hard, while having the higher the expectation of a fair return [7]. But in the actual working situation, teachers do not completely follow their inner preferences to determine their work behavior, and the external environment, such as merit pay, will also have an impact on teachers behavior [8]. Generally speaking, the implementation of performance-related pay is beneficial to motivating teachers to pursue task performance that can be easily identified and controlled by the organization [9] [10], but the lack of fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation will give teachers a negative mood [28], which happens to be the main inducement of Counterproductive Work Behaviors [12]. According to this research, to some extent, merit pay perception will have a certain impact on Evasive Counterproductive Work Behavior. When teachers' perception of merit pay and fairness of performance appraisal are reduced, they will have negative emotions towards work and organization, reduce their motivation in teaching and scientific research, and thus produce Evasive Counterproductive Behaviors, which will ultimately affect work behavior performance.

The mechanism of Counterproductive Work Behavior and its effects involve many factors, which are mainly reflected in the organizational level and the individual level. Based on the social exchange theory and organizational identity theory, Zhang Aiqing et al. [13] found that the reduction of Counterproductive Work Behaviors is due to the enhancement of organizational identity brought by the strengthening of internal corporate social responsibility. Guo Wenchen et al. [14] found that Counterproductive Work Behaviors would decrease as the sense of organizational support and organizational fairness increases. BOLLMANN et al. [15] carried out research from the perspective of social cognitive perspective and found that the organizational atmosphere emphasizing relationships could strengthen positive social relations and inhibit self-interested behaviors, thus reduce counterproductive behaviors. From the perspective of influencing factors at the individual level, Wei Wu et al. [16], from the perspective of self-control, found that negative emotions have a positive impact on Counterproductive Work Behaviors. The stronger the individual negative emotions, the more obvious the anti-production behavior of the employees are. FIDA et al. [17] found that self-efficacy alleviated the relationship between stressors and negative emotions, as well as the relationship between stressors and Counterproductive Behaviors. Xia Jingbo et al. [18] studied 103 college teachers and found that Counterproductive Work Behavior was closely related to the perceived fairness of performance appraisal. Academic misconduct is also a common manifestation of Counterproductive Work Behavior.

## 2 Research Hypothesis

### 2.1 The impact of perceived merit pay on Evasive Counterproductive Work Behavior of university teachers

Implement merit pay, performance evaluation will cause the imbalance of perception employees, leading to employee anxiety in emotional responses, and then produce different points to the production behavior [19], especially when employees do not recognise the performance evaluation process and results, but the organization still closely links merit pay with performance evaluation results. It will more stimulate employees' Counterproductive Work Behaviors [20].

Performance pay perception is the psychological feeling generated after comparing the degree of personal work involvement and the feedback behavior obtained through performance pay [21]. When employees are not satisfied with the performance appraisal results of the organization, unfair perception can arise [22], which to some extent will seriously affect their work enthusiasm, reduce their internal motivation, and even consciously implement counterproductive behaviors that damage the interests of the organization. For the special group of college teachers, when they are not satisfied, they will have evasive counterproductive behaviors such as absenteeism, negative coping, teaching disengagement, academic misconduct and so on. This is not only detrimental to the normal operation of colleges and universities, but also greatly reduces the production efficiency of colleges and universities, and affects the task performance and peripheral performance of colleges and universities.

Therefore, hypothesis 1: Merit pay perception of college teachers is negatively correlated with Evasive Counterpro-

ductive Work Behavior.

## 2.2 The intermediary role of allocating fair perception

In terms of strengthening intrinsic motivation, the individual's perception of distributive justice is the key link, which refers to the individual's perception after associating salary with performance. The distributive justice of the organization represents the positive attitude of the organization towards employees, which has an important impact on the sense of accomplishment of employees. Employees will compare their input and results, and make internal judgments about whether they are treated fairly by the organization, and are more sensitive to the perception of fairness of monetary rewards [19]. KHAN et al. [23] analyzed the influence of employees' Counterproductive Behaviors when they envied their colleagues' returns higher than their input, and concluded that employees' perception of low-level distributive justice is mainly the result of social comparison. SOLTIS et al. [24] analyzed employees' dimission intention based on social network theory, they found that employees with low perception of distributive justice usually expressed strong dissatisfaction with those who did not get enough return and tried to find alternative opportunities. Lambert et al. [25] found that there was a significant negative correlation between distributive justice and employee burnout and dimission tendency. Faced with low distributive justice perception, employees' burnout and dimission tendency would gradually increase. Employees with dimission intention will reduce task performance and organize civic behavior, and improve Counterproductive Work Behavior [26]. CAMPBELL et al. [27], after closely linking performance pay with performance evaluation results, found that when employees had disputes over performance pay, it might be because the perception of distribution fairness of employees was reduced, thus stimulating their Counterproductive Work Behaviors. The lack of fair distribution will inevitably destroy the the individuals intrinsic motivation. When they cannot release through normal channels, they will wait for an opportunity to seek revenge from the organization in a hidden way [28].

Therefore, hypothesis 2: College teachers' perception of distributive justice plays an intermediary role in the relationship between performance pay perception and Evasive Counterproductive Work Behavior.

## 2.3 Regulatory effect of self-efficacy

Based on social cognitive theory, self-efficacy is an individual's overall cognition to self ability, and it can basis by influencing the individual cognitive, psychological motivation and emotional state of adjusting the behavior of the individual, is self system plays a role as the core power factor [24]. It also has an impact on the objective external environment and is a key factor connecting the external environment and individual behavior [29]. Self-efficacy can have a positive impact on individual decision-making behaviors. Individuals with a high sense of self-efficacy can fully grasp and use information in the decision-making process, which can be used as a basis for rational decision-making [30]. For teachers' different levels of self-efficacy, pay-for-performance perception and the relationship between the fair distribution of perception is also different, low self-efficacy of inadequate teachers for their own self-confidence, easily influenced by outside factors such as merit pay, distributive justice perception significantly reduced when produces averse counterproductive behavior; However, teachers with high self-efficacy have positive cognition of themselves, can fully mobilize resources to actively face challenges and effectively exert their potential to complete tasks. [31] [32] In other words, when college teachers have higher self-efficacy, even if they have strong dissatisfaction with performance pay perception, strong psychological ability can support positive psychological cognition.

Therefore, hypothesis 3: Self-efficacy has a positive regulatory effect on the relationship between perceived merit pay and perceived distributive justice.

Based on the above assumptions, this study constructed a "regulated mediation effect model". The perception of distributive justice is the mediating variable of perceived pay for performance affecting teachers' Counterproductive Work Behavior, and self-efficacy significantly moderates this mediating effect. When teachers' self-efficacy level is high, the effect of perceived performance pay on perceived distributive justice is greater, that is, the effect of perceived performance pay on teachers' avoidant counterproductive behavior is more transmitted through perceived distributive justice. On the contrary, if the level of self-efficacy of teachers is low, the effect of perceived performance pay on perceived distributive justice is smaller, that is, the effect of perceived performance pay on teachers' Evasive Counterproductive Behavior is less transmitted through the perception of distributive justice.

Hypothesis 4: Self-efficacy has a positive regulatory effect on the mediating effect between the perceived distributive justice, the perceived performance related pay and the evasive counterproductive work behaviors. When the level of self-efficacy is high, the mediating effect of perceived distributive justice is stronger.

### 3 Research Design

#### 3.1 Scale Design

In the questionnaire designed in this paper, all questions are from the maturity scale used in the literature that has carried out empirical analysis. Refer to the opinions and suggestions of experts and professors from human resource business management area. And the scale is tested and improved through pre-survey. The answers of all the questions were coded according to the 5-level Likert scale, in which 1 is strongly disagree, 2 is disagree, 3 is uncertain, 4 is agree, and 5 is strongly agree.

For performance pay perception data, in order to better express performance pay perception, this paper adopts the performance pay perception scale developed by HENEMAN, GREENBERGER & STRASSER (1988) [33]. It consists of four items and is fine-tuned according to the work situation of the respondents. The questions are as follows: If I perform well in my job, my salary will be increased; Good performance will give me a raise; The best performers in the organization I work for get the biggest relative pay increases; Pay rises for good and bad performers seem to vary widely.

Regarding the perception of distribution fairness, this paper adopts the distribution fairness scale developed by PRICE & MUELLER (1986) [34] as the scale of distribution fairness perception, including four items: Feel fair when comparing your efforts to the rewards you get; Feel fair when comparing the responsibilities you take on and the rewards you get; Feel fair when you compare the stress you're under with the rewards you're getting; Feel fair when you compare the rewards you get for doing a good job.

In terms of avoidant counterproductive work behaviors, this paper adopts the counterproductive work behavior scale developed by Ferris [35] et al., which classifies approach and avoidance counterproductive work behaviors. Questions 1-8 are for proximity, Questions 9-12 are for the avoidance type.

In terms of self-efficacy, the Chinese version of the Self-efficacy Questionnaire (GSES) developed by Zhang Jianxin and SCHWARZER [36] was adopted. It consists of 10 questions. After expert translation and back translation, part of the repeated questions are combined to form a questionnaire containing 6 questions. See the attachment for details.

#### 3.2 Sample and questionnaire collection

According to the formal investigation, domestic colleges and universities are divided into three regions in North China, central China and south China. In each region, at least 1 comprehensive university, 1 humanities and social science university, 1 science and technology university, and 1 medical university are selected. At the same time, the level of universities should be considered, so as to ensure that there are samples from junior colleges, provincial colleges and subordinate colleges. Finally, 12 universities were selected as respondents. The survey was conducted in three times, covering a period of 6 months, and the data were collected by filling in questionnaires online.

A total of 320 questionnaires were collected, including 277 valid questionnaires. Of the three returned questionnaires were sorted and matched, and the information incomplete or contradictory was eliminated. The effective questionnaire response rate was 86.56%. The descriptive statistics of the samples are shown in Table 1.

### 4 Empirical Analysis

#### 4.1 Reliability and Validity

Firstly, exploratory factor analysis was carried out 4 factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1 were generated without rotation, and 64.593 variation of the interpretation equation was accumulated. The maximum variance contribution rate of the common factor was 34.461%, which was lower than the empirical standard value of 40.000%, indicating that there was no serious common method deviation problem and the discriminant validity was good. Factor loading matrix extracts 4 principal components, which is consistent with the number of variables set in this study. Table 2 shows the confirmatory factor analysis. The results show that the goodness of fit indexes of the four-factor model all meet the standards and are superior to other competitive models. The results show that the validity of the distinction between variables is good, and the validity of the structure of the questionnaire data is verified, which can be used for hypothesis testing.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of samples

variable	category	samples	percentage
Gender	male	101	36.46%
	female	176	63.54%
sub-total		277	100%
Job title	primary	16	5.78%
	middle	175	63.18%
	senior	86	31.04%
sub-total		277	100%
monthly income	5000 and under	0	0%
	5001-8000	3	1.08%
	8001-11000	60	21.66%
	11001-14000	172	62.09%
	More than 14000	42	15.17%
sub-total		277	100%
age	30 and under	18	6.5%
	31-40	57	20.58%
	41-50	103	37.18%
	51-60	55	19.86%
	61 and above	44	15.88%
sub-total		277	100%
Teaching age	5 and under	67	24.19%
	6-10	114	41.16%
	11-15	63	22.74%
	16-20	23	8.3%
	21 and above	10	3.61%
sub-total		277	100%
discipline background	science and engineering	96	34.66%
	humanities and social sciences	93	33.57%
	medical	65	23.47%
	rest	23	8.3%
sub-total		277	100%
education background	Undergraduate and below	8	2.89%
	Master	46	16.61%
	doctoral	223	80.5%
sub-total		277	100%

Table 2: Confirmatory factor analysis

Model	Variables	$\chi^2/df$	GFI	NFI	IFI	CFI	RMSEA
1	4 variables perceived performance related pay self-efficacy perceived distributive justice evasive counterproductive work behaviors	2.082	0.905	0.862	0.923	0.922	0.063
2	3 variables perceived performance related pay + self-efficacy perceived distributive justice evasive counterproductive work behaviors	4.058	0.803	0.725	0.778	0.775	0.105
3	2 variables perceived performance related pay + self-efficacy + perceived distributive justice evasive counterproductive work behaviors	7.097	0.676	0.512	0.55	0.545	0.149
4	1 variable perceived performance related pay + self-efficacy + perceived distributive justice + evasive counterproductive work behaviors	9.7	0.59	0.329	0.353	0.347	0.178

Table 3: Correlation analysis

No		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	C1	1.635	0.482	-								
2	C2	2.253	0.553	-0.061	-							
3	C3	3.913	0.637	-0.009	0.114	-						
4	C4	3.181	1.128	-0.052	.490***	-0.049	-					
5	C5	2.26	1.031	-0.02	.202**	0.012	.415***	-				
6	perceived performance related pay	3.576	0.828	-0.06	0.027	-0.061	0.057	0.054	0.886			
7	perceived distributive justice	3.007	0.73	-0.005	-0.09	-0.104	-0.021	-0.018	.183***	0.761		
8	evasive counterproductive work behaviors	3.271	0.844	0.054	.148*	-0.012	0.102	-0.015	-.176**	-.295***	0.828	
9	self-efficacy	2.827	0.633	-0.051	0.068	-0.055	0.018	0.065	0.035	.184***	-.129*	0.778

Table 4: Main effects and indirect effects

	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI
Direct effect of X on Y	-.1274	.0599	-.1452	-.0905
Indirect effect(s) of X on Y	-.1525	.0228	-.1036	-.0161

### 4.2 Describe of the statistics and correlation analysis

To investigate the relationship between perceived distributive justice and perceived Counterproductive Work Behaviors and self-efficacy preliminarily, the correlation between variables was first analyzed (see Table 3). The results show that the correlation coefficient between perceived performance related pay and Evasive Counterproductive Work Behaviors is -0.176 and it is significant. The correlation coefficient between perceived performance related pay and perceived distributive justice is 0.183 and it is significant. The correlation coefficient between perceived distributive justice and Evasive Counterproductive Work Behaviors is -0.295 and significant. The correlation coefficient between perceived distributive justice and self-efficacy is 0.184 and it is significant. The correlation coefficient between Evasive Counterproductive Work Behaviors and self-efficacy was -0.129 and it is significant. The results of correlation analysis preliminarily verify the theoretical hypothesis of this paper.

### 4.3 Main effect and indirect effects

In order to test the theoretical hypothesis of the relationship between perceived distributive justice, perceived performance related pay and Evasive Counterproductive Work Behaviors, SPSS's Process plug-in was used for data processing. The test results show that the direct effect was -0.127 and the 95% confidence interval CI = [LLCI = -0.145, ULCI = -0.091], with no 0 in the interval and the direct effect reached a significant level, so hypothesis 1 is true. The indirect effect is -0.153 and the 95% confidence interval CI = [LLCI = -0.104, ULCI = -0.016]. The interval does not contain 0 and the indirect effect reaches a significant level, so hypothesis 2 was valid (Table 4).

### 4.4 Regulatory effects and regulated mediating effects

For the low level of self-efficacy, the indirect effect of perceived performance related pay on perceived distributive justice is not significant (The effect value is 0.0942, and the confidence interval at 95% confidence level is [-0.0336,0.2221], including 0); for the high level of self-efficacy, the indirect effect of perceived performance related pay on perceived distributive justice is significant (The effect value is 0.2641, and the confidence interval at 95% confidence level is [0.1093, 0.4188], not including 0). Therefore, self-efficacy plays a significant regulating role between perceived performance related pay and perceived distributive justice, and hypothesis 3 was verified (Table 5).

Table 5: Regulatory effects

Regulatory variables	perceived distributive justice			
	Effect	SE	95% confidence level	
low level of self-efficacy	.0942	.0649	-.0336	.2221
middle level of self-efficacy	.1791	.0533	.0742	.2841
high level of self-efficacy	.2641	.0786	.1093	.4188

Table 6: The regulated mediation effects

Regulatory variables	Evasive Counterproductive Work Behaviors			
	Effect	SE	95% confidence level	
low level of self-efficacy	-.1301	.0233	-.0853	.0064
middle level of self-efficacy	-.1572	.0230	-.1102	-.0201
high level of self-efficacy	-.1843	.0365	-.1695	-.0249

For low level of self-efficacy, the indirect effect of perceived performance related pay on Evasive Counterproductive Work Behaviors is not significant through the mediating effect of perceived distributive justice (The effect value is -0.1301, and the confidence interval under 95% confidence level is [-0.0853, 0.0064], including 0). For high level of self-efficacy, the indirect effect of perceived performance related pay on Evasive Counterproductive Work Behaviors is significant through the mediating effect of perceived distributive justice (The effect value is -0.1843, and the confidence interval under 95% confidence level is [-0.1695, -0.0249], not including 0). Therefore, hypothesis 4 was verified (Table 6).

The further correlation analysis of the variables shows that the direct effect between performance wage perception, distribution fairness perception and avoidance of counterproduction behavior is -0.127, The indirect effect is -0.153, Therefore, the negative effect of the performance wage perception is significant on the Evasive Counterproduction Work Behavior, and the distribution fair perception of the college teachers plays a significant intermediary role between the performance wage perception and the Evasive Counterproduction Work Behavior; For low levels of self-efficacy, The indirect effect of performance wage perception on distribution fairness perception is not significant (effect value of 0.0942) but for high levels of self-efficacy. The indirect effect of performance wage perception on evasive inversion behavior is significant through the mediation effect of fair perception of distribution (the effect value is -0.1843). In conclusion, it is known that self-efficacy has a positive regulatory effect on the mediation effect of distribution fairness perception between performance wage perception and Evasive Counterproductive Work Behavior.

## 5 Conclusion

The results of this research show that: First, the perception of merit pay has a negative impact on the Evasive counterproductive Behavior of college teachers through the mediating effect of the perception of distribution justice; Second, self-efficacy of college teachers positively moderates the relationship between perceived merit pay and perceived distributive justice, and self-efficacy indirectly moderates perceived merit pay through perceived distributive justice to Evasive Counterproductive Work Behaviors of college teachers.

The Evasive Counterproductive Work Behaviors (such as absenteeism, malevolent dismissal, teaching disprofessionalism, academic misconduct, etc.) of Chinese university teachers in the workplace and their governance are related to the physical and mental health development of university teachers. It is of great significance for colleges and universities to scientifically implement the management of performance pay and give full play to the positive role of merit pay by effectively creating and using self-efficacy to promote the positive role of performance pay and making teachers with high self-efficacy have a higher perception of distribution fairness with the improvement of merit pay perception. Universities should actively help teachers develop a sense of self-efficacy through various forms of encouragement, reward, training, and interaction, and improve the positive relationship between the perception of performance wages and the perception of fairness in distribution, so as to avoid the occurrence of teachers counterproductive behaviors, and better Give full play to the role of teachers in establishing morality, cultivating people, preaching and receiving careers.

## Acknowledgments

We are very grateful to the financial support provided by the General Project of Philosophy and Social Science Research in Jiangsu Universities Fund under Grant 2020SJA2067 Special topic of the counselor work research committee of Jiangsu Institute of Higher Education Fund under Grant 21FYHZD011 Jiangsu Education Science 14th Five-Year plan Fund under Grant X-b/2021/03 Research topic of higher education teaching reform in Jiangsu University Fund under Grant 2021JGZD019.

## References

- [1] FIDA R, PACIELLO M, TRAMONTANO C, FONTAINE RG, BARBARANELLI C. (2015). 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.
- [2] DWIVEDI, UMESH C, KUMARI, SONY, H R. (2015). Nagendra Model of Yoga Intervention in Industrial Organizational Psychology for Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal*, 24(2): 119-124.
- [3] MAN HOU, MINJUAN WU. (2018). A study on the relationship between paternalistic leadership and counterproductive work behavior of new generation employees from the perspective of value rationality. *Journal of Leadership Science*, 34(32): 46-48.
- [4] SHOSS ML, JUNDT DK, KOBLER A, REYNOLDS C. (2016). Doing Bad to Feel Better? An Investigation of within and Between-Person Perceptions of Counterproductive Work Behavior as a Coping Tactic. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 137(3): 571-587.
- [5] PEDIDIKAN M. (2018). The Influence Of Headmaster's Supervision And Achievement Motivation On Effective Teachers. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 7(6): 44-49.
- [6] XIANGYUAN SHI, TIANYI ZHANG, WEI XU. (2019). Structure and measurement of counterproductive work behavior of college teachers. *Journal of Changsha University of Science and Technology*, (02): 105.
- [7] SCHOEN JL. (2015). Effects of Implicit Achievement Motivation, Expected Evaluations, and Domain Knowledge on Creative Performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(3): 319-338.
- [8] NG TW, LUCIANETTI L. (2016). Goal Striving, Idiosyncratic Deals, and Job Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(1): 41-60.
- [9] XIANYA WANG, SHENG LIN, LIYUN CHEN. (2014). The mechanism of challenge-impeding research stressors on research performance– The mediating role of research anxiety and achievement motivation. *Science of Science and science and Technology Management*, 35(3): 23-30.
- [10] BELLE N. (2015). Performance-Related Pay and the Crowding Out of Motivation in the Public Sector: A Randomized Field Experiment. *Public Administration Review*, 75(2): 230-241.
- [11] KIM J. (2016). Impact of Performance Appraisal Justice on the Effectiveness of Pay-For-Performance Systems after Civil Service Reform. *Public Personnel Management*, 45(2): 148-170.
- [12] CHIRUMBOLO A. (2015). The Impact of Job Insecurity on Counterproductive Work Behaviors: The Moderating Role of Honesty/Humility Personality Trait. *The Journal of Psychology*, 149(6): 554-569.
- [13] ZHE WANG, AIQING ZHANG. (2019). The influence of internal corporate social responsibility on employee counterproductive work behavior–Mediating organizational identity and mediating idealistic moral standards. *Journal of Economic Management*, 41(8): 130-146.
- [14] WENCHEN GUO, JING YANG, JIA FU. (2015). The Influence of perceived organizational support and perceived organizational justice on counterproductive work Behavior mediated by organizational cynicism. *Journal of management*, 2(4): 530-537.
- [15] BOLLMANN G, KRINGS F. (2016). Work group Climates and Employees Counterproductive Work Behaviors: A Social-Cognitive Perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(2): 184-209.
- [16] WU WEI, CHANGYANG HUANG, QIN ZHANG. (2019). The effect of negative emotions on organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior: a Self-control perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(12): 146-158.
- [17] FIDA ROBERTA, PACIELLO MARINELLA, TRAMONTANO CARLO, BARBARANELLI Claudio, FARNESE MARIA LUISA. (2015). "Yes, I Can": the Protective Role of Personal Self-efficacy in Hindering Counterproductive Work Behavior Under Stressful Conditions. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 28 (5) : 479-99.
- [18] JINGBO XIA, HONGXIANG XU, TONGPING KE. (2015). Empirical study on the relationship between perceived justice of performance appraisal and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Oriental Enterprise Culture*, (06): 130-131+133.
- [19] SHUSONG ZHAO, DONGPING YU. (2009). Employee counterproductive behavior caused by performance appraisal and its control. *Human resource development in China*, (11): 36-38.
- [20] PUSTAKA, DAFTAR ET AL. (2015). Effect Of Remuneration And Achievement Motivation To Be Sar Center Employee Performance Industries Results Plantation Makassar.
- [21] JINGTAO FU. (2014). The influence of perceived performance pay on employees' counterproductive work behavior-The Mediating Effect of Perceived Distributive justice (conference) 9th (2014) China Management An-



- nual Conference-Proceedings of the Conference on Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management, 11-14.
- [22] CAMPBELL DJ, CAMPBELL KM, CHIA HB. (1998). Merit Pay, Performance Appraisal and Individual Motivation: An Analysis and Alternative. *Human Resource Management*, 37(2): 131-146.
- [23] KHAN AK, QURATULAIN S, BELL CM. (2014). Episodic Envy and Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Is More Justice always good? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(1): 128-144.
- [24] SOLTIS SM, AGNEESSENS F, SASOVOVA Z, LABIANCA G. (2013). A Social Network Perspective on Turnover Intentions: The Role of Distributive Justice and Social Support. *Human Resource Management*, 52(4): 561-584.
- [25] MCCLELLAND D C. (1967). *The achieving society*. New York: The Free Press, 36-61.
- [26] YONG WAN, LIRONG LONG, WEI HE. (2014). The influence of performance pay on employees' breakthrough creativity and progressive creativity. *Journal of psychology*, 46(12): 1880-1896.
- [27] IGALENS J, ROUSSEL P. (1999). A Study of the Relationships between Compensation Package, Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(7): 1003-1025.
- [28] KIM S. (2016). Perceived Organizational Support As a Mediator Between Distributive Justice and Sports Referees Job Satisfaction and Career Commitment. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 1-19.
- [29] MINOR, JAMES R. (2015). An Experimental study on the effect of a participatory merit pay design process on perceptions of merit pay. *Dissertations & Theses C Gradworks*.
- [30] KAILI ZHANG, NINGYU TANG, KUI YIN.(2018) The relationship between turnover intention and behavior performance: The moderating effect of self-efficacy and proactive personality[J].
- [31] KIM S, MONE MA, SUNGHOON K. (2008). Relationship among Self-Efficacy, Pay-For-Performance Perceptions and Pay Satisfaction: A Korean Examination. *Human Performance*, 21(3): 158-179.
- [32] ERIC G.LAMBERT, ET AL. (2010). The relationship among distributive and procedural justice and correctional life satisfaction, burnout, and turnover intent:An exploratory study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38 (1): 7-16.
- [33] HENEMAN RL, GREENBERGER DB, STRASSER S. (1988). The Relationship between Pay-For-Performance Perceptions and Pay Satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(4): 745-761.
- [34] PRICE J, MUELLER C. (1986). *Absenteeism and Turnover among Hospital Employees*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 52-53.
- [35] REESHAD S D, Holly L, Howard M W, et al. (2009). A withinPerson Approach to Work Behavior and Performance: Concurrent and Lagged Citizenship-Counterproductivity Associations and Dynamic Relationships with Affect and Overall Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(5): 1051-1066.
- [36] ZHANG J X, SCHWARZER R. (1995). Measuring Optimistic Self-beliefs: A Chinese Adaptation of the General Self-efficacy Scale. *Psychologia*, 38(3): 174-181.