

Impact Of Senior Management Governance On Migration Workplace Behavior In The Food Processing Industry: Mediating Role Of Business Ethics Decision-Making

Rongfang Wang¹, Kanakarn Phanniphong², Wenjin Cheng³

Abstract:

This study investigates the impact of senior management governance on workplace deviance behavior in the food processing industry. Employing business ethics decision-making as the mediating variable, a theoretical model is constructed to elucidate the relationships among senior management governance, ethical decision-making, and workplace deviance behavior in the food processing industry. China's food processing sector serves as the focal point for the survey, with 544 sample data subjected to empirical analysis. The findings indicate that: 1. Senior management governance significantly positively influences business ethics and has a noteworthy negative impact on egoistic decision-making. 2. Within the realm of business ethics, utilitarian decision-making exerts a negative inhibitory effect on workplace deviance behavior in the food processing industry, while self-interest decision-making demonstrates a significant positive effect. 3. Business ethics decision-making plays a pivotal mediating role between senior management governance and workplace deviance behavior in the food processing industry. In other words, senior management governance operates by fostering business ethics decision-making, thereby effectively mitigating deviant behavior in the food processing industry. This study broadens the application scope of senior management governance and ethical decision-making, enhancing the literature on workplace deviance behavior. It provides a practical foundation and theoretical guidance for the food processing industry to optimize internal governance, address ethical challenges, enhance behavioral performance, and cultivate a community of social responsibility.

Key Words: Senior management governance; Business ethics decision-making; Workplace deviance behavior; Food processing industry.

1. Introduction

Negative or deviant behavior in the workplace has become a crucial area of research (Basharat et al., 2⁰²³). Existing studies indicate that in the globalized and liberal business

^{1*2} Chakrabongse Bhuvanarth International Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies (CBIS), Rajamangala University of Technology Tawan-ok, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand.

³ Henan University of Economics and Law, Henan, 450046, China.

environment, workplace deviance behavior is on the rise, encompassing actions such as theft, fraud, deception, absenteeism, and delays. These negative deviations not only impede the adherence to enterprise standards, norms, and rules but also inflict serious financial and reputational consequences on organizations, constituting unacceptable behavior (Yesiltas & Gurlek, 2020; Yildiz et al., 2015; Rogoan, 2009; Peterson, 2002). Among these behaviors, food fraud, particularly in the food processing industry, which is closely linked to public health, garners the most attention. Instances such as the horse meat scandal in Europe, palm oil issues in Ghana (Pierina & Maria, 2021), and gutter oil incidents in China (Soon & Liu, 2020; Lu & Wu, 2014) highlight the gravity of the situation. The Food Processing Industry Association of the United States (Grocery Manufacturers Association, GMA) estimates that adulteration events cause losses ranging from 2% to 15% of annual revenue for enterprises of different sizes. Globally, food fraud results in an annual loss of \$10 billion to \$15 billion, accounting for about 10% of commercial food sales (Spink & Moyer, 2011). Furthermore, food safety incidents pose a significant threat to human health, with the World Health Organization (WHO) estimating approximately 600 million cases of diseases and 31 foodborne hazards leading to 420,000 deaths annually (World Health Organization, 2015). Existing literature often attributes foodborne disease outbreaks to the poor behavior of food handlers (Ncube et al., 2020; McIntyre et al., 2013). However, some scholars argue that the food safety orientation of leaders is a crucial prerequisite for prohibiting and promoting the food safety voice of employees (Yu et al., 2021).

The existing literature lacks a clear explanation of the key factors influencing food fraud and seldom analyzes the internal relationships among related factors (Niu et al., 2021). Therefore, exploring the key factors affecting the food processing industry, such as food fraud, is of great guiding significance to enrich the theoretical literature on food and behavior and enhance the behavioral performance of the food processing industry. Dai (2014), the father of quality management, once pointed out that "quality arises in the boardroom, only senior management can make the decision to ensure quality." Thus, is senior management governance the key factor leading to the deviant behavior of the food processing industry? How does the level of senior management governance act on the deviant behavior of the food processing industry? Do different tendencies of ethical decisions play a mediating role between senior management governance and corporate deviant behavior? Addressing these questions, this paper selects senior management governance as the independent variable to study its impact on workplace deviance behavior in the food processing industry and explores the mediating role of business ethics decision-making.

2. Literature Review

In the existing literature, various terms related to workplace deviance behavior share similarities, such as deviant work behavior (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), ant productive work behavior (Hollinger & Clark, 1983), unethical behavior in the workplace (Kaptein, 2008), workplace deviation behavior (Mo & Shi, 2017; Gruys & Sackett, 2003), organizational misconduct (Vardi & Wiener, 1996), etc. Akanksha Malik et al. (2021) contend that these terms fall within the same behavioral domain. Among these, Bennett & Robinson (2003) proposed the most widely acknowledged definition of workplace deviance behavior, characterizing it as any voluntary act that breaches the significant norms of the organization, thereby jeopardizing the well-being of the organization, its members, or both. This paper adopts this concept to define workplace deviance behavior in the food processing industry. Regarding the measurement of workplace deviance behavior, scholars often categorize it from the perspective of a one-dimensional or multidimensional

dimension. However, the most commonly used classification is the purposeful two-dimensional classification, distinguishing between individual and organizational deviant behaviors (Yesiltas & Gurlek, 2020; Di et al., 2019; Bennett & Robinson, 2000).

Senior executives, namely the senior management personnel of the company, serve as the core of the corporate governance system, bridging the gap between corporate governance and management. Considering the governance characteristics of Chinese companies, evaluation is conducted based on the three dimensions of the appointment and removal system, implementation guarantee, and incentive and restraint (Li et al., 2005). The strength and appropriateness of the implementation of the internal control system by senior management directly impact the effectiveness of the company's internal control (Xu, 2019). According to Li (2019), from the perspective of corporate governance, this paper defines senior management governance in the food processing industry as the institutional arrangement wherein, under the premise of management and ownership, enterprise senior managers adhere to a set of formal or informal, internal, or external systems or mechanisms. This coordination aims to balance the interests between the company and all stakeholders, ensuring sound decision-making to ultimately safeguard the interests of the entire company. Among these senior managers are those with decision-making authority over the production and operation of the company, ranking above the deputy general manager.

Pennsylvania State University's organizational behavior ethics pioneer Trevino (2006) asserts that enterprise ethics behavior involves the judgment of good and evil within the social or organizational environment. She emphasizes that researching enterprise bad behavior that touches the moral bottom line also falls under the category of enterprise ethics behavior. Hunt (1986) describes corporate ethical behavior as a process wherein managers at the enterprise level make moral judgments and decisions in response to ethical dilemmas, leading to corresponding behaviors. Liu (2011) defines food ethics as the moral value embedded in the food itself and its operational processes, reflecting a distinct ethical spirit inherent in food. Wu et al. (2006) argue that a decision qualifies as ethical when it involves ethical issues based on fundamental ethical norms, the decision maker possesses free will, awareness of ethical problems, and the ability to make judgments and take actions, and people can make judgments of "ethical" or "unethical" on the decision result. In the context of this paper, Business ethics decision-making pertains to the ethical tendencies and behaviors of decision makers when confronted with ethical dilemmas in the management process of the food processing industry. Business ethics encompasses various ethical philosophies, including teleology and obligation. This study primarily focuses on the two decision-making orientations within teleology: egoism and utilitarianism (Dui, 2021; Wiki, 2021; Wang et al., 2017; Reidenbach, 1990).

According to principal-agent theory, within an enterprise system that separates ownership and management, both the principal and the agent aim to maximize their own interests. Information asymmetry, prevalent in such systems, poses the risk of opportunistic behavior due to the information advantage of the agent. This information asymmetry leads

to conflicts of interest between the principal and the agent, impacting the internal governance quality of the enterprise (Li et al., 2022; Wu et al., 2017). Other studies highlight the significant impact of organizational structure on ethical decision-making. In centralized organizations, decision-making power is concentrated in the hands of senior managers, making it challenging to eradicate unethical behavior due to few formal rules (Liu et al., 2014). Molz (1998) suggests that the separation of the board of directors and the general manager enhances corporate supervision effectiveness. Trevino & Youngblood (1990) argue that an organization's salary structure significantly influences the ethical behavior decisions of its members and the oversight of colleagues' unethical behavior. Literature by Mishina & Dykes (2010) and Bazerman & Tenbrunsel (2011) delves into organizational goal establishment, performance evaluation, and the impact of reward distribution procedures on enterprise and individual decisions. Mishina & Dykes et al. (2010) suggest that in high-performance enterprises, managers often believe that failure behavior can bring higher profits. Bazerman & Tenbrunsel (2011) underscore the importance of setting goals and incentives, understanding the negative impact of benefits on decisions, questioning handovers, or outsourcing decisions, and maintaining the right to participate in decisions. Based on these considerations, this paper proposes the following Hypotheses:

H1: Senior management governance It has a positive effect on utilitarian decision-making.

H2: Senior management governance has a negative effect on Self-interest decision-making.

In the theory of utilitarianism, it posits that an act is deemed correct if it brings the best benefit to the majority of people. On the other hand, self-interest asserts that an act is correct if it brings the maximum benefit to a specific individual (Ferrell et al., 2011). Utilitarian decision-making, guided by the perspective of maximizing benefits for the largest number of people, emphasizes the harmonization of conflicts of interests between oneself and others. Enterprises influenced by utilitarian decision-making not only pursue economic interests but also prioritize responding to social pressures and engaging with the social environment. They actively explore various avenues to meet the needs of both internal and external stakeholders, garnering support, shaping a positive image, cultivating a favorable reputation, and mitigating various business risks (Zhu et al., 2014). Olsen et al. (2014) note that utilitarianism, along with concepts of rights, fairness or justice, and virtue, can provide further insights into the ethical risk dilemmas related to food safety.

On the contrary, the perspective of self-interest decision-making prioritizes actions that lead to the greatest interest for the enterprise, focusing on the maximization of its own interests without immediate concern for the benefit to the public or society. Under the influence of self-interest decision-making, enterprises may neglect the protection of consumers' rights and environmental interests, resulting in dissatisfaction among external stakeholders and exposing the enterprise to significant public breach risks (O'Rourke A, 2003). Based on these considerations, the following hypotheses are posited:

H3: Utilitarian decision-making has a negative effect on workplace deviance

H4: Self-interest decision-making has a positive effect on the workplace deviance

Regarding ethical decisions within an organization, Jones (1991) asserts that many decisions made by managers are ethical in nature, even though managers may not always be aware of the ethical factors embedded in their decisions. Given that executives typically hold influential decision-making roles within companies, they play a crucial role in shaping the company's strategy and should be held accountable for unethical behavior (Meng et al., 2018). In the market environment, organizations aiming for long-term development must strike a balance between their pursuit of profit and the societal needs. Integrating ethics and responsibility into enterprise decision-making becomes imperative (Ferrell, 2011). Payne & Joyner (2006) argue that successful corporate executive teams should prioritize utilitarian decisions and their corresponding outcomes. Moreover, in partnership with stakeholders, enterprises should view themselves not merely as holders of private property for shareholders but as a community of interests. This perspective involves an obligation to make decisions and take actions in alignment with social goals and values, striving to maximize benefits for all stakeholders in governance (Letza, S., 2004). In conclusion, the hypothesis is that:

H5: Business ethics decision-making has a significant mediating effect between Senior management governance and Workplace deviance behavior

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Conceptual Framework

In the above literature review, the researchers have explored the conceptual connotations of the independent variable, Senior management governance, the dependent variable, Workplace deviance behavior, and the mediating variable, Business ethics decision-making. We have discussed the relationships between these variables. Building upon the aforementioned hypotheses, this paper proposes a conceptual framework (Figure 1):



Figure 1 Conceptual model and hypothesis

3.2 Scales of Variables

This study is based on the highly accepted maturity scale in the existing literature, Among them: Senior management governance adopts the Li (2005) appointment and removal system, implementation guarantee, incentive and restraint three-dimensional measurement scale; Business ethics decision-making is based on the scale system of Reidenbach & Robin (1990), Design the measurement indicators from the two dimensions of utilitarian decision and egoistic decision; Workplace deviance behavior Based on the Robinson & Benett (2000) organizational orientation and interpersonal orientation dual factor behavior scale, Draw lessons from the Ruth et al (2021) The food fraud vulnerability Assessment (FFVA) scale, Kaptein (2008) Unethical behavior scale and non-ethical behavior scale of Fu (2013). In order to reduce the deviation caused by social claims, especially increase social behavior scale, evaluate Ideal Response Balance Scale (BIDR Scale) compiled by Paulhus (1991). In addition, this paper sets three demographic characteristics of gender, education and working life, and the organizational form, employees, main business category and years of establishment as control variables.

After determining the original scale, this study follows the standard translation and translation process into the scale of Chinese context, forming initial scale after qualitative analysis, using social statistics software for reliability and validity analysis, and eliminate and delete does not conform to the standard, finally form a formal questionnaire with good reliability and validity. The formal questionnaire covered the cover language, confidentiality statement and Senior management governance 11 items, Business ethics decision-making 6 items, Workplace deviance behavior 13 items and social recognition of 4 items and 10 demographic basic indicators. The above constitutes the subject content of the questionnaire in this study.

The questionnaire was designed using the form of Likert's Five Scaling Method and administered as an electronic questionnaire. Likert's Five Scaling Method can intuitively obtain the personal attitude order level of the respondents to the subject item, which is simple and easy to operate. It is a commonly used scale form in social investigation research (Neuman, 2011), in which 1 point indicates the weakest level, and 5 points indicates the strongest level.

3.3 Sample Selection and Data Collection

In this study, food processing enterprises in Henan Province, China were selected from farmers above the provincial level Industrialization leading enterprises, the sampling adopts stratified sampling and cluster sampling. In the first step, the overall sample size is determined according to the list of leading enterprises in agricultural industrialization above the provincial level officially released by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs of the Chinese Government. There are 534 food processing industries, The specific distribution is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Distribution of overall samples of enterprises to be selected

City	n	City	n	City	n
ZZ	34	XX	39	NY	42
KF	20	JZ	36	SQ	59
LY	17	PY	24	XY	81
PDS	21	XC	13	ZK	35
AY	21	LH	27	ZMD	38
HB	8	SMX	13	JY	6
Total	534				

The second step is to determine the stratification of the sample size of each region; The third step is subdivided according to the GB/T 4754-2017 "National Economy Industry Classification" standard released by China Bureau of Statistics; In the fourth step, the survey samples (the number of total samples / clusters in each city) are calculated, totaling 67 cases. The specific distribution is shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Distribution of the survey enterprise samples to be selected

City	No. of cluster bodies	No. of samples that are drawn	City	No. of cluster bodies	No. of samples that are drawn	City	No. of cluster bodies	No. of samples that are drawn
ZZ	8	4	XX	8	5	NY	7	5
KF	8	3	JZ	8	4	SQ	8	7
LY	8	2	PY	8	3	XY	8	10
PDS	7	3	XC	7	2	ZK	8	4
AY	8	3	LH	8	3	ZMD	8	5
HB	7	1	SMX	8	2	JY	7	1
Total		15	subtotal		19	Total		33
Amount to		67						

The fifth step was to issue questionnaires to 67 survey enterprises through online survey platforms. It took 40 days to issue and collect questionnaires, and a total of 561 online questionnaires were obtained. Excluding non-compliant questionnaires such as incomplete answers and short answer time, a total of 544 valid questionnaires were obtained, and the effective recovery rate of the questionnaire was 97%. All samples are made of cross-sectional data.

3.4 Research Methods

The combination of qualitative research and quantitative research is adopted, among which qualitative research methods include literature sorting and in-depth interview; quantitative research method adopts questionnaire method, quantitative analysis tools mainly use social statistical software for descriptive statistical analysis, reliability and validity analysis, correlation analysis, regression analysis, etc. The comprehensive use of the above analysis methods is conducive to standardized, scientific and rigorous exploration of the relationship between variables, and test whether the hypothesis is established.

4. Data Analysis

4.1 Descriptive statistical analysis

The demographic indicators of the survey results: in terms of gender, there are more men than women; in terms of educational qualifications, college degree is the largest, followed by bachelor's degree and other levels; in terms of working years, most of the industry worked for 6-10 years, followed by 0-5 years, and 64% of the sample worked for less than 10 years. Specific distribution is shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Distribution of the basic information of the samples

		n	%
Gender	Male	294	54%
	Female	250	46%
Educational Background	Junior college below	135	25%
	junior college	234	43%
	undergraduate course	154	28%
Professional Years	postgraduate	21	4%
	0-5 Years	169	31%
	6-10 Years	177	33%
	11-15 Years	88	16%
	16-20 Years	48	9%
	More than 20 years	62	11%

Observe the basic situation of the results of this survey: in terms of the form of enterprise organization, limited liability companies are the most, followed by joint-stock companies, and few other samples. The number of employees in enterprises is less than 300 employees, and the sample size of enterprises with more than 1,000 employees is too small. In terms of the main business categories of enterprises, various industries are distributed, indicating that the sample coverage is comprehensive. In terms of enterprise establishment years, 5-15 years is the most, followed by others. In terms of the departments of the governance organization, 83% of the sample chose the managers, indicating that the managers are the main body of internal governance; the board of directors, board of shareholders and board

of supervisors are distributed, indicating that the governance system of food processing enterprises is relatively sound. The specific distribution is shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4 Distribution of basic information of the sample units

Title	Metric	n	%
Type	State-owned enterprises	10	1.8%
	collective enterprise	12	2.2%
	Limited (Liability) company	337	62%
	Joint-stock company	82	15.1%
	Foreign investment / Hong Kong, Macao, and Taiwan investment enterprises	4	0.7%
	Sole proprietorship enterprise	72	13.2%
	Others	27	5%
	Annual average number of employees	<300 persons	391
	<1,000 persons	113	21%
	More than 1,000 persons	40	7%
Industry category	Grain grinding	116	21%
	Edible vegetable oil processing	31	6%
	feed processing	12	2%
	Livestock and poultry slaughtering and meat processing	28	5%
	fish processing	8	1.5%
	Processing of vegetables, fruits, and nuts	80	15%
	Egg processing	8	1.5%
	Other organizations	261	48%
Established years	Under 5 years	155	29%
	5-15 Years	220	40%
	15-25 Years	114	21%
	More than 25 years	55	10%
What departments does the governance institutions of your enterprise include?	Board of shareholders	310	57%
	Board of directors	305	56%
	The manager	452	83%
	Board of supervisors	196	36%
	Supervisor	212	39%

4.2 Direct effect test

This study used regression analysis to explore the relationship between variables and test hypotheses. Table 5-7 below illustrates the description of assumptions, the relationship between variables to be tested, Beta coefficient, T value, P-value, and test results; Figure 2-4 shows the residual histogram and normal probability map (P-P map) of the three models,

which are used to evaluate the autocorrelation of sample data and the effect of model building. It can be seen from the figure that the values in the histogram of the model are normally distributed; the cumulative probability observed in the normal probability plots (P-P plots) is placed on the horizontal axis, and the expected cumulative probability is placed on the vertical axis indicates that the model has no significant deviation, the standardized residual is normally distributed, and the scatter is on the straight line or near the straight line, indicating that the variables are basically linear, and the model has good effect.

Model 1 examined the relationship between Senior management governance (SMG) and utilitarian decision-marking. Beta coefficient $0.526 > 0$, indicating a positive correlation between the two, T value 14.384, and the significance P value is less than 0.05, indicating a significant relationship, so H1 is supported. Model 2 tested the relationship between Senior management governance (SMG) and Self-interest decision-marking. Beta coefficient -0.5080 , indicating a negative correlation between the two, T value -13.735 , and significance P value less than 0.05, which indicates a significant relationship, so H2 is supported. Model 3 examined the relationship between utilitarian decision-marking, Self-interest decision-making and Workplace deviance behavior (WDB), Beta coefficient between utilitarian decision-marking and deviance behavior -0.4540 , T value -13.459 , Significant P-value was less than 0.05, It shows that there is a significant negative relationship between the two; So H3 is supported.; The Beta coefficient between egoistic decisions and deviant behavior $0.371 > 0$, A T value of 11.013, Significant P-value was less than 0.05, It shows that the two have a significant positive relationship; So H4 is supported.

Table 5 regression analysis of Senior management governance and utilitarian decision- making

Table 6. Regression analysis of Senior management governance and Self-interest

Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	St. Error	Beta	t		Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	0.702	0.218		3.214	0.001		
Senior management governance	0.818	0.057	0.526	14.384	0.000	1.000	1.000

decision-making

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	St. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
2	(Constant)	4.713	0.178		26.498	0.000		
	Senior management governance	-0.636	0.046	-0.508	-13.735	0.000	1.000	1.000

Table 7 Utilitarian decision-marking, Self-interest decision-making and Workplace deviance behavior regression analysis

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	St. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
3	(Constant)	2.748	0.143		19.183	0.000		
	Self-interest decision-making	0.349	0.032	0.371	11.013	0.000	0.865	1.155
	Utilitarian decision-making	-0.344	0.026	-0.454	-13.459	0.000	0.865	1.155

4.3 Effect test of mediating variables

Table 5 below is a test of the mediation effect, Based on the results of the regression analysis, The independent variable Senior management governance significantly affected the ethical decision of the mediating variable and the behavior of the dependent variable, The ethical decision-marking of the mediating variable has a significant influence on the deviant behavior of the dependent variable; And when the mediating variable ethical decision is introduced, The absolute values of the regression coefficients were decreased, The influence of the independent variable Senior management governance on the deviant behavior of the dependent variable, The mediating effect can therefore be considered significant, So H5 is supported.

Table 5. Test of the mediating effect

		Dependent variable: ethical decision-making	Dependent variable: deviant behavior	
		M1	M2	M3
argument	Senior management governance	0.091**	-0.818***	-0.808***
metavariable	Ethical decision			-0.111*
	R square	0.013	0.482	0.488
	F	7.097	504.854	257.646
	P	0.008	0.000	0.000

p<0.05, * p<0.01,** p<0.001,***

5. Conclusion

5.1 Conclusion

In this study, a theoretical model was constructed to examine the relationships between Senior management governance, ethical decision-making, and Workplace deviance behavior in the food processing industry. The survey focused on China's food processing sector, with 544 questionnaires collected for empirical analysis. The research findings are as follows: Senior management governance exhibits a significant positive impact on utilitarian decision-making in business ethics, while showing a notable negative effect on Self-interest decision-making. Within the realm of business ethics, utilitarian decision-making exerts a negative inhibitory effect on Workplace deviance behavior in the food processing industry, whereas Self-interest decision-making demonstrates a significant positive effect. Business ethics decision-making plays a substantial mediating role between Senior management governance and Workplace deviance behavior in the food processing industry. Specifically, Senior management governance can effectively reduce deviant behavior in the food processing industry by promoting Business ethics decision-making.

5.2 Discussion

The existing literature highlights the significance of both internal and external governance in influencing the illicit behavior of enterprises (Meng et al., 2018). Senior management governance, as a component of corporate internal governance, directly impacts the operational performance and ethical orientation of a company. Zhu (2022) emphasizes that immoral behavior within a company is essentially the immoral behavior of senior executives, who are considered the "moral compass" of the organization and the decision-makers advocating fairness and principles. Ethical leaders, through the establishment of ethical behavior examples and the implementation of reward and punishment systems, can effectively communicate clear ethical standards and values to employees, thereby inhibiting the occurrence of non-ethical behavior among staff (Trevino et al, 2000). This highlights

the interconnected relationship between Senior management governance, Business ethics decision-making, and Workplace deviance behavior.

Additionally, the fraud triangle theory proposed by AICPI (2002) explains the causes of corporate violations with three elements: Incentive, Opportunity, and Rationalization. Applied to the food processing industry, management driven solely by economic interests may foster illegal motives. When there are loopholes in external supervision or internal management, the perceived opportunity for wrongdoing increases. Under the combination of motivation and opportunity, management may use self-rationalization to justify irregularities and deviant behavior, resembling opportunistic behavior in the principal-agent theory. Thus, the lack of Senior management governance and effective internal and external supervision mechanisms can create an environment conducive to deviant behavior in the food processing industry. At the enterprise level, establishing robust internal Senior management governance mechanisms, operational management structures, and supervision mechanisms can effectively promote the legal and transparent operation of the company. At the industry level, the food industry should advocate for ethical practices throughout the entire supply chain, promoting a moral ethos as an informal constraint alongside legal regulations. Enhancing the digital traceability system and improving the readability of label system information are essential. Governments should leverage their public rights to standardize market access thresholds, enhance food vulnerability supervision systems, increase the costs of deviant behavior in the food processing industry, and ensure the healthy order of market competition.

Finally, the food industry, given its responsibility for the safety of public health and sustainable development, should adopt a corporate social responsibility approach. Donaldson & Deng (2001) propose connecting various industries, companies, and economic systems into a moral community, emphasizing the importance of a deeper and more common "contract" for corporate social responsibility. Existing literature suggests that stronger managerial awareness of social responsibility leads to more responsible enterprises regarding food safety and fraud. Strict adherence to social responsibility can contribute to a decrease in illegal behaviors (Zhang, 2015), underscoring the imperative to build a moral community within the food processing industry.

5.3 Limitation

In interpreting the results, it is crucial to acknowledge the potential limitations of the study: Multiple Factors Influencing Deviant Behavior: Workplace deviance behavior in the food processing industry is likely influenced by various factors such as big five personality traits, organizational ethics atmosphere, market competition environment, etc. This study, focusing on Senior management governance and Business ethics decision-making as variables, may not encompass all relevant factors. Consequently, the data analysis may deviate from the actual situation, affecting the precision and accuracy of the conclusions. Limitations in Sample Size and Design: The study faces constraints regarding the number and scope of samples. The cross-sectional design of the questionnaire may not fully capture

the dynamic relationships between sample representativeness and research variables, potentially limiting the depth and comprehensiveness of the interpretation of statistical analysis results. Self-Report Bias: The questionnaire relies on a self-reporting method, which can introduce biases such as social desirability. Participants may be hesitant to admit certain behaviors and might choose scores aligned with social expectations. Despite the inclusion of items assessing social desirability, complete elimination of this phenomenon cannot be guaranteed. Furthermore, the application of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) in enterprise activities has transformed the business environment. Future research should explore how these technologies influence corporate governance and potentially give rise to new forms of Workplace deviance behavior. Recognizing the impact of industry characteristics on deviant behavior is essential, and more research scales should be designed to reflect the uniqueness of different industries accurately. In summary, while the current study contributes valuable insights, researchers should be mindful of these limitations and consider them in the interpretation of results. Future investigations should strive for a more comprehensive understanding of Workplace deviance behavior by incorporating additional influential factors and industry-specific characteristics.

REFERENCES

- Akanksha, M., Shuchi, S. & Sanjay, G. (2021). A Qualitative Review of 18 Years of Research on Workplace Deviance: New Vectors and Future Research Directions, *Human Performance*. DOI: 10.1080/08959285.2021.1948548.
- Basharat, R., Sylvie, S. & Alia, A. (2023). A Scoping Review and Qualitative Investigations to Develop a Workplace Deviance Typology, *Deviant Behavior*, 44:6, 857-875. DOI: 10.1080/01639625.2022.2106908.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2003). The past, present, and future of workplace deviance research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (247–281). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349-349. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349.
- Di, S., G., Scrima, F., & Parry, E. (2019). The effect of organizational culture on deviant behaviors in the workplace. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(17), 2482-2503. DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2017.1326393.
- Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the Dimensionality of Counterproductive Work Behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(1), 30–42. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2389.00224.
- Hollinger, R.C., & Clark, J.P. (1983). *Theft by Employees*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Hunt, S.D., & Vitell, S. (1986). A general theory of marketing ethics. *Journal of Macro-marketing*, 6(1), 5-16. DOI: 10.1177/027614678600600103.
- Kaptein, M. (2008). Developing a measure of unethical behavior in the workplace: A stakeholder perspective. *Journal of Management*, 34(5), 978-1008. DOI: 10.1177/0149206308318614.
- Li, W. A., Hao, C., Cui, G. Y. Zheng, M. N. Meng, Q. K. (2019). 40 years of corporate governance

- research: context and outlook. *Foreign Economy and Management*, 41(12), 161-185.
- Liu, H. L. (2011). Analysis of food ethics construction. *Theoretical Guide*, (02), 67-69.
- Malik, A., Sinha, S., & Goel, S. (2021). A Qualitative Review of 18 Years of Research on Workplace Deviance: New Vectors and Future Research Directions. *Human Performance*, DOI: 10.1080/08959285.2021.1948548.
- Mo, S. & Shi, J. (2017). Linking Ethical Leadership to Employee Burnout, Workplace Deviance and Performance: Testing the Mediating Roles of Trust in Leader and Surface Acting. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 144(2), 293–303. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-015-2821-z.
- Niu, L., Chen, M., Chen, X., Wu, L., & Tsai, F. S. (2021). Enterprise Food Fraud in China: Key Factors Identification from Social Co-governance Perspective. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 9, 752112. DOI: 10.3389/fpubh.2021.752112.
- Peterson, D. K. (2002). Deviant workplace behavior and the organization's ethical climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(1), 47–61. DOI: 10.1023/A:1016296116093.
- Pierina, V. & Maria, S. (2021). Food frauds: Global incidents and misleading situations. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 114, 424–442. DOI: 10.1016/j.tifs.2021.06.010.