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Abstract. Based on the integrated perspectives of social learning theory and affect event theory, the paper discusses the impact mechanism of responsible leadership on employee green behavior. Questionnaire survey on 317 employees from many enterprises in Shandong Province and Shanghai in this paper, it is found that responsible leadership has a positive effect on employee green behavior, and moral reflectiveness plays a complete mediating role between responsible leadership and employee green behavior. Empathy moderates the negative relationship between moral reflectiveness and employee green behavior such that moral reflectiveness has a weaker negative effect on employee green behavior when employees' empathy is higher. Furthermore, empathy moderates the mediating effect of moral reflectiveness between responsible leadership and employee green behavior, the mediating effect of moral reflectiveness is weaker when empathy is higher. The results of this paper provide a new perspective for understanding how responsible leadership stimulates employee green behaviors, and have important practical significance for strengthening the environmental protection behaviors of organizations.

1. Literature review and research hypothesis

1.1. Employee Green Behavior
"Green behavior", also known as "environmentally friendly behavior, pro-environmental behavior", refers to a series of behaviors that promote environmental protection (Unsworth et al., 2013). Stem (2000) defines it as a behavior that reduces harm to the natural environment. Individuals and organizations that purchase green products, recycle resources, and reduce waste generation are considered green behaviors. Later, some scholars introduced green behavior into the work field of employees, and on this basis developed the concept of green behavior of employees (Ones & Dilchert, 2012), and believed that the realization of organizational sustainability goals is inseparable from the support of employees' green behavior. Ones & Dilchert (2012) defines employee green behavior as a series of environmental behaviors that employees demonstrate in order to achieve an organization's environmental sustainability. Practice has proved that employees' green participation behavior not only promotes the healthy development of employees' physical and mental health, meets their work tasks or their environmental protection intentions (Tuzzolino & Armandi, 1981; Bauer & Aimansmith, 1996), and at the same time achieves environmental performance and helps organizational development. Aspects are also effective.
Studies have shown that after the green behavior of employees is stimulated, the organization's energy costs will be reduced (Carrico & Riemer, 2011). Moreover, the green behavior of employees will establish a good image of the company to a certain extent, enhance the reputation and competitive advantage of the company, and have a positive impact on the long-term development of the company (Brammer & Pavelin, 2006; Arora & Henderson, 2007).

1.2. Responsible Leadership and Employee Green Behavior

Since the green behavior of employees has been put forward, some scholars have studied its antecedents from many levels. At the individual level of employees, Ajzen et al. (1991) demonstrated that employees' attitude toward environmental protection is positively affecting their green behavior, and Bissing-Olson et al. (2013) pointed out in the study that positive emotions encourage employees to take more Green behavior; at the social level, Wang Jing (2017) studies its impact on employees' green behavior based on social and cultural perspectives such as traditional Chinese Confucian values, while Ashkanasy et al. (2011) point out that social environmental protection will encourage employees to actively implement green behaviors; At the organizational level, Norton et al. (2014) examined the impact of organizational support on employee green behavior, and Graves et al. (2013) validated the impact of organizational environmental policies on employee green behavior. In addition, the attitudes and behaviors exhibited by employees in the workplace are influenced by many factors, and leaders play an important role. Robertson and Barling (2013) found that green transformational leadership can influence employees to make more green behaviors in the workplace. In the same year, Graves et al. (2013) also confirmed the relationship between green transformational leadership and subordinate green behavior, and further revealed the interaction between transformational leadership and autonomy motivation. Subsequent research has found that both moral and spiritual leaders can promote the green behavior of their subordinates (Zhang Jialiang & Liu Jun, 2016; Afsar et al., 2016).

Pless and Maak combine two different research areas of social responsibility and leadership, and propose the concept of responsible leadership. They believe that leaders are inseparable from direct stakeholder, customer, supplier, peer, family, community and other stakeholder networks. In order to mobilize different stakeholders to collaborate and work for a common vision, responsible leaders and stakeholders within and outside the organization maintain a mutual trust and collaborative responsibility behavior to achieve a common business vision (Maak & Pless, 2006). Studies have shown that leaders have a positive relationship between environmental behavior and subordinate environmental behavior (Robertson & Barling, 2013), because leaders' behavior reflects their values, and by example, leaders pass their values to followers. A mechanism (Dragoni, 2005; Yaffe & Kark, 2011). In order to build strong relationships with leaders (Aguilera et al., 2007), employees may strive to express similar values because leadership-follower value consistency promotes higher quality leadership-follower relationships (Krishnan, 2002). According to the theory of social learning (Bandura, 1986), subordinates work by observing, imitating and internalizing the values of leaders to guide their own behaviors and thus achieve the replication of leadership behavior. Learning theory emphasizes that role models can enhance individual learning behavior. Responsible leadership, as an example of the role of employees, often communicates with stakeholders inside and outside the organization in an inclusive and open mind, exchanges information and opinions with each other, which enables employees to have a high degree of trust and recognition, and actively imitate the behavior of leaders. If followers see their leaders' ideal decisions to seek balance in their business processes, they are more likely to think that leadership is a responsible leadership with a positive attitude, and they will continue to learn the attitudes and behaviors of leaders. The behavioral process of responsible leadership arises from the interaction of society and is a phenomenon involving ethics. Leaders promote the long-term development of the organization by paying attention to social responsibility and business ethics. Highly responsible leaders place great emphasis on the needs of different stakeholders and demonstrate a strong sense of responsibility in balancing their respective interests. This approach conveys a sense of responsibility through social learning mechanisms and allows subordinates to produce behaviors that are beneficial to the organization. Responsible leaders care about the interests of stakeholders inside and outside the
organization and fulfill corporate social responsibility, which enhances employees' perception of corporate social responsibility and encourages employees to participate in corporate social responsibility activities (Voegtlin et al., 2012), for example, engaging employees in green behaviors, responding corporate social responsibility call. Therefore, this paper proposes the following assumptions:

H1: Responsible leadership can positively influence the green behavior of employees.

1.3. The mediating role of moral reflectiveness

According to the definition of Reynolds (2008), moral reflectiveness refers to the individual differences in the number of morally guided reflections in people's daily life, and is the intentional process in which individuals regularly think about moral issues in their daily lives. Moral reflectiveness is a conscious, self-controlled process (Haidt, 2001), a process by which individuals regulate their behavior. Studies have shown that moral reflectiveness and responsibility are positively correlated (Becker, 1998), and Kim et al. (2014) also confirm that moral reflectiveness is more likely to occur in those who are responsible. Responsible leaders play a role model in the construction of corporate social responsibility meaning, and subordinates are influenced by it, and subtly understand the importance of corporate social responsibility (Wen Peng, Xia Ling & Chen Cheng, 2016), making themselves want to practice Social responsibility and moral reflectiveness may be the process by which employees regulate their behavior under the spur of responsibility.

According to the emotional event theory, the moral behavior of the leader may affect the employee's emotional state and induce the employee's moral identity. When an employee faces the leadership and the ethical atmosphere created by the leader, he unconsciously inspires inner morality and helping others (Walumbwa et al., 2012). Responsible leaders actively fulfill their social responsibilities and focus on business ethics, sharing their vision and coordinating responsible behaviors of all parties, focusing on the impact of companies and their employees on the organization's external stakeholder groups (including society and the environment), creating responsible The organizational culture follows the triple bottom line of social, environmental and economic interests (Pless & Maak, 2011). Employees are influenced by it and generate positive ethical emotions, which gives employees a more positive sense of social responsibility.

Moral reflectiveness may be the process by which employees dictate their behavior with a sense of responsibility. At work, responsible employees often perform their duties by trying to meet the organization's expectations of role performance (Barrick et al., 2002). However, in addition to completing tasks, responsible employees will participate and insist on doing the right thing for the organization. Employees may reflect on the impact of their workplace behavior on environmental sustainability and make extra efforts to do what they think morally correct behavior. Emotional event theory not only emphasizes the impact of events on people's attitudes, but further points out that emotions can help motivate individuals to act in subsequent work, that is, some behaviors of people at work are positive responses to certain events. Green behavior is considered a moral manifestation of the individual's prosocial value, and employees work to achieve ethical or prosocial behavior (Kim et al., 2014). In other words, the green behavior of employees is related to their own moral reflectiveness, which is influenced by responsible leadership. Therefore, this paper proposes the following assumptions:

H2: Employee's moral reflectiveness plays a mediating role in responsible leadership and employee green behavior.

1.4. The regulation of empathy

Batson pointed out that empathy is an individual difference in interpersonal communication that involves feelings and thoughts of others, including cognitive empathy and emotional empathy. Cognitive empathy involves the ability of individuals to deal with problems from the perspective of others, and emotional empathy is the emotional response when sensing the needs of others (Batson, 2008). Through these cognitive and emotional components, empathy stimulates the help of those in need (Batson & Shaw, 1991). Therefore, empathy is associated with ethical behavior. For example, existing literature has demonstrated that empathy and morality are separated (Detert et al., 2008), related to
customer ethical behavior (Verbeke & Bagozzi, 2002) and moral decision making (Dietz & Kleinlogel, 2014). Therefore, considering its relevance to ethics in the organizational environment, this paper predicts that empathy may play a regulatory role in the process of responsible leadership and moral reflectiveness affecting employees' green behavior.

Highly empathetic individuals are those who are able to stand in the hands of those in need, and thus experience an alternative reaction that affects what happens to another person (Batson, 2008). Studies have shown that employees can empathize with people outside the organization who need help (Muller et al., 2014). This suggests that employees who are affected by what happens outside of the organization will be particularly sensitive to the social responsibility activities of their organizations and leaders, as corporate social responsibility focuses on improving the welfare of the various external stakeholders who need help (Turker, 2009). In this case, highly empathetic employees may need less moral reflectiveness to conduct prosocial behavior, but will be more directly affected by responsible leadership, respond to corporate social responsibility calls, consciously participate in corporate social responsibility activities, and engage in employee green behavior. Based on this, this paper proposes the following assumptions:

H3: Empathy negatively regulates the relationship between moral reflectiveness and employee green behavior. Specifically, this relationship has a weaker impact on highly empathetic employees and a stronger impact on low empathy employees.

For employees, their leaders have higher power and status, making them easy to learn and imitate. Responsible leaders lead by example, subtly let subordinates understand the importance of corporate social responsibility, induce employees' moral identity, and stimulate their inner moral emotions. In the process, employees may reflect on the impact of their actions on the environment. For high-caliber employees, in the interaction with responsible leaders, it is easier to think about the problem from the perspective of others, they will be easier to understand and recognize the concept and behavior of leadership. Responsible leaders focus on balancing the needs of various stakeholders in the process of achieving organizational goals, focusing on communicating with them and acting as a model. Highly empathetic employees will trust leaders and follow the leadership's pace to conduct green and green behaviors. At the same time, low empathy employees will not feel too strong because of this feeling of empathy. After being influenced by the leader's corporate social responsibility activities, they may not directly implement responsible environmental behavior, but are subject to the moral and ethical atmosphere of the organization. Infection, self-responsibility is enhanced, and then the impact of one's behavior on the environment is reflected. Under this moral reflectiveness, employees' green behavior is carried out. Therefore, this paper proposes the following assumptions:

H4: Empathy and Responsibility Responsible Leaders influence the indirect effects of employees' green behavior through moral reflectiveness. Specifically: this indirect relationship has a stronger impact on low empathy employees and a weaker impact on high empathy employees.

In summary, the theoretical model of this study is shown in Figure 1.
2. Research methods

2.1. Research samples and processes
This research surveyed a number of enterprises in Shandong Province and Shanghai through the questionnaire star platform. The research time was January 2019, involving financial, education, IT, manufacturing and other industries. This study, through the setting of the answer conditions, constrains the identity of the respondent, age, work experience and other conditions, only for the enterprise personnel who are working. Whether there are a large number of consecutive identical options in the reverse item and the answering result in the empathy are used as the screening basis, and invalid questionnaires such as incomplete information are deleted to ensure the validity of the questionnaire. A total of 351 questionnaires were issued in this study, and 317 valid questionnaires were obtained. The effective questionnaire ratio was 90.57%. Among them, 162 were males, accounting for 51.10%; 155 were females, accounting for 48.90%, and the proportion of males and females was balanced. In terms of age, mainly employees after 90 years, 142 people under 25 years old, accounting for 44.79%; 69 people aged 26-30, accounting for 21.77%; 67 people aged 31-40, accounting for 21.14%; 41-50 There are 31 people, accounting for 9.78%, and 8 people over 50 years old, accounting for 2.52%. In terms of academic qualifications, there are undergraduate and research qualifications, 134 graduate students and above, accounting for 42.27%; 135 undergraduate students, accounting for 42.59%; 22 in high school and below, accounting for 22.6.94%. In terms of working years, there are mainly people who work within the company for 3 years, 118 people within 1 year and less, accounting for 37.22%; 82 people in 1-3 years, accounting for 25.87%; 26 people in 3-5 years, accounting for 8.20%; 50 people in 5-10 years, accounting for 15.77%; 41 people over 10 years, accounting for 3.15%.

2.2. Measurement Tools
This study used the mature scale measurement variables widely used at home and abroad, and the questionnaire items were all scored using the Likert5 point scale. 1 means "completely disagree" and 5 means "completely agree". The higher the number, the higher the degree of approval.

Responsible Leadership: The scale developed by Voegtlin (2011) consists of five items. The measurement items include "My superiors will indicate that they are aware of the interests of stakeholders." "My superiors will fully consider the decision-making results for the stakeholders. The influence of the person" and so on. In this study, the scale's consistency reliability coefficient was 0.891.

Moral reflectiveness: Using the scale developed by Reynolds (2008), there are five items, such as "I often think about whether my decision is morally meaningful" and "I think it is meaningful to pay attention to ethics". In this study, the scale's consistency reliability coefficient was 0.892.

Empathy: Using Dietz and Kleinlogel (2014) to reduce the Davis (1983) scale, including 10 items, one of which is reversed, such as "sometimes, I am more difficult to put myself in the ground." Thinking for others", "When I am dissatisfied with others, I usually try to think about them from their perspective" and so on. In this study, the scale's consistency reliability coefficient was 0.855.

Employee Green Behavior: Using the Voluntary Green Behavior Scale developed by Kim et al. (2014), the scale is a one-dimensional structure with six items. Examples such as "I will avoid unnecessary printing to save paper", "I will use a personal cup instead of a disposable cup" and so on. The consistency reliability coefficient of this scale in this study was 0.817.

Regarding the control variables, this study used the gender, age, and working years of the employees as control variables.

3. Empirical analysis results

3.1. Confirmatory factor analysis
This study examines the relationship between responsible leadership, moral reflectiveness, empathy, and employee green behavior. Before the hypothesis test, the confirmatory factor analysis is first performed, and the discriminant validity between the variables is used. To evaluate. The results of the
evaluation are shown in Table 1: The fit between the observed data and the four-factor model is very good ($X^2=342.38$, $df=446$; RMSEA=0.07, CFI=0.94, TLI=0.94). In addition, the other three alternative models were evaluated in this study. The results show that the fitting index of the four-factor model is significantly better than other surrogate models, indicating that the variables measured in this study have good discriminant validity.

Table 1. Confirmatory factor analysis results

| Model                                                                 | $X^2$  | df | RMSEA | SRMR | CFI  | TLI  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|----|-------|------|------|------|
| Four factors (Responsible Leadership + Responsibility + Moral reflectiveness + Employee Green Behavior) | 342.38 | 146 | 0.07  | 0.06 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Three factors (moral reflectiveness and empathy are combined into one factor) | 473.58 | 149 | 0.08  | 0.05 | 0.91 | 0.89 |
| Three factors (responsible leadership and moral reflectiveness combined into one factor) | 873.56 | 149 | 0.12  | 0.08 | 0.79 | 0.76 |
| Two factors (responsible leadership and moral reflectiveness are combined into one factor) | 946.38 | 151 | 0.13  | 0.08 | 0.77 | 0.75 |
| Single factor (all variables combined into one factor) | 1108.93 | 152 | 0.14  | 0.09 | 0.73 | 0.70 |

3.2. Descriptive statistical analysis

The mean, standard deviation and correlation between variables between the variables are shown in Table 2. It can be seen from the analysis results that responsible leadership is significantly correlated with moral reflectiveness ($r=0.50$, $P<0.01$), which is significantly correlated with employee green behavior ($r=0.49$, $P<0.01$), and moral reflectiveness is significantly related to employee green behavior ($r = 0.56$, $P < 0.01$).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and related analysis results of each variable

| Variable                  | M   | SD  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   |
|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1 Gender                  | 1.49| 0.50|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 2years old                | 2.02| 1.13| -0.22**|     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 3years of service         | 2.39| 1.44| -0.19**| 0.73**|     |     |     |     |     |
| 4responsible leadership   | 3.73| 0.81| 0.02| -0.05| 0.03|     |     |     |     |
| 5Moral reflectiveness      | 3.96| 0.76| 0.12*| 0.02| 0.04| 0.50**|     |     |     |
| 6employee green behavior  | 3.87| 0.77| 0.16**| 0.05| 0.08| 0.49**| 0.56**|     |     |
| 7empathy                  | 3.96| 0.65| 0.15**| 0.03| 0.08| 0.50**| 0.73**| 0.69**|     |

3.3. Hypothesis testing

(1) Responsible leadership and employee green behavior

Through the above correlation analysis, it can be concluded that there is a positive correlation between the change-responsible leadership and the employee's green behavior. To further investigate the relationship between the two, this study was validated using the hierarchical regression method of Baron and Kenny (1986). It can be seen from Table 3 that after controlling for gender, age, and working years, responsible leaders have a significant positive impact on employee green behavior (model 2, $\beta = 0.51$, $p<0.01$), and hypothesis 1 is verified.

(2) The mediating role of moral reflectiveness

As can be seen from Table 3, responsible leaders have a significant positive impact on employee green behavior (model 2, $\beta=0.51$, $p<0.01$). After adding moral reflectiveness, the influence coefficient of responsible leaders on employee green behavior (model 3, $\beta=0.30$, $p<0.01$) is small but still significant, and moral reflectiveness on employee green behavior (model 3, $\beta=0.41$, $p<0.01$) has a
significant positive impact and meets the conditions of partial mediation. Therefore, moral reflectiveness reflects the positive relationship between the intermediary responsible leaders and the green behavior of employees, and Hypothesis 2 is verified.

Table 3. Results of hierarchical regression analysis

| variable                      | Employee green behavior |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
|                               | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 | Model 5 |
| Control variable              |         |         |         |         |         |
| Gender                        | 0.20**  | 0.19**  | 0.14**  | 0.14**  | 0.15**  |
| Age                           | 0.00    | 0.08    | 0.06    | 0.06    | 0.08    |
| Working years                 | 0.08    | 0.00    | 0.00    | -0.01   | -0.01   |
| Independent variable          |         |         |         |         |         |
| Responsible Leadership        | 0.51**  | 0.30**  | 0.19**  | 0.19**  |         |
| Mediator variable             |         |         |         |         |         |
| Moral reflectiveness           | 0.41**  | 0.21**  | 0.18**  |         |         |
| Moderator                     |         |         |         |         |         |
| Empathy                       | 0.43**  | 0.45**  |         |         |         |
| Interaction term              |         |         |         |         |         |
| Moral reflectiveness × Empathy| -0.08*  |         |         |         |         |

In order to improve the statistical effect and further verify the mediating effect of moral reflectiveness, this study used the Bootstrap method of Preacher and Hayes (2004) to test with Mplus7.0. As can be seen from Table 4, when the number of samples is 5000, the mediation effect of moral reflectiveness between responsible leaders and employees' green behavior is significant, and the 95% confidence interval does not contain zero. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 is further verified.

Table 4. Bootstrap analysis of personal-organization matching mediation effects

| Effect                                          | Estimate | S.E. | Est./S.E. | P-Value | 95% confidence interval |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------|------|-----------|---------|-------------------------|
| Responsible Leadership → Employee Green Behavior| 0.26**   | 0.08 | 3.15      | 0.00    | [0.10,0.43]             |
| Responsible Leadership → Moral reflectiveness   | 0.53**   | 0.09 | 6.23      | 0.00    | [0.36,0.70]             |
| Moral reflectiveness → Employee Green Behavior   | 0.44**   | 0.09 | 5.06      | 0.00    | [0.26,0.62]             |
| Responsible Leadership → Moral reflectiveness → Employee Green Behavior | 0.23** | 0.06 | 3.75      | 0.00    | [0.12,0.37]             |

Note: N=317, *p<0.05, **p<0.01

(3) The regulation of empathy
As can be seen from Table 3, Model 5 incorporates both responsible leadership, moral reflectiveness, empathy, and moral reflectiveness and empathy. The results of hierarchical regression showed that the moral reflectiveness and empathy interactions significantly negatively affected the employee's green
behavior (model 5, $\beta=0.08$, $p<0.05$), and the interaction effect was significant. In order to further test the regulatory role of moral reflectiveness, this study used the research method of Preacher et al to draw a regulatory effect map. Figure 2 shows the negative adjustment effect of empathy in the process of moral reflectiveness affecting employees' green behavior: for employees with low empathy, moral reflectiveness has a stronger influence on green behavior, while for employees with higher empathy in this sense, the impact of this relationship is weak. In summary, Hypothesis 3 is supported.

![Figure 2. Empathy for moral reflectiveness and employee green behavior](image)

(4) Adjusted mediation model test
This study validates the regulatory effect of empathy on the mediating effect of moral reflectiveness through the Bootstrap test of Preacher and Hayes (2004). The conditional indirect effect of the manipulated variable at high and low values is directly obtained by the operation. The high and low values of the manipulated variable are increased by one standard deviation and one standard deviation based on the mean. From the results shown in Table 5, it can be seen that when the employee's empathy is high, the indirect effect of responsible leadership on the green behavior of employees through moral reflectiveness is 0.06 (95% CI = [-0.01, 0.13]), 95% The confidence interval includes 0, indicating that its indirect effect is not significant; when the employee's moral identity is low, the indirect effect of responsible leadership's report on ethical issues through moral reflectiveness is 0.11 (95% CI = [0.05, 0.18]), 95% The confidence interval does not include 0, indicating that its indirect effect is significant. In addition, it can be seen that the judgment index of the empathy to the indirect effect of responsible leadership on the green behavior of employees through moral reflectiveness is -0.04 (95% CI = [-0.09, -0.01]), the 95% confidence interval does not include 0, indicating that the mediation effect of regulation is significant, and hypothesis 4 is verified.

| Regulatory variable | level | mean | effect | Boot SE | 95% CI   |
|---------------------|-------|------|--------|---------|----------|
|                     |       |      |        |         | Low      | High     |
| Empathy             | Low(-1 SD) | 2.97 | 0.11   | 0.03    | 0.05, 0.18 |
|                     | High(+1 SD) | 4.18 | 0.06   | 0.04    | -0.01, 0.13 |
|                     |       | -0.04 | 0.02    | -0.09, -0.01 |

4. Conclusion Research and Discussion
Based on the perspective of social learning theory and emotional event theory, this study explores the intermediary mechanism and adjustment mechanism of responsible leadership affecting employees' green behavior. Overall, all the hypotheses of this study were well supported, answering how responsible leaders influence employees' green behaviors, under what circumstances they have a greater impact on
green behavior, and the psychological pathways for different types of employees to implement green behaviors. What are the differences and so on.

4.1. Research conclusions and theoretical significance
First, the paper examines the direct relationship between responsible leadership and subordinate green behavior. Employee green behavior can effectively improve the organization's environmental performance and achieve long-term development of the organization. Kim et al. (2014) have suggested that green behavior will be magnified in the interpersonal interaction of the organization, and leadership will undoubtedly play a vital role. Although transformational leadership and ethical leadership promote employee environmental behavior, they lack the element of "social responsibility". Responsible leaders emphasize social responsibility, ethics and relationships with stakeholders. The social environment is the benefit. One of the related parties. As a public welfare behavior to promote social well-being, responsible behavior has a more direct impact on subordinates, prompting them to take actions that are beneficial to the environment and resources. This study also proves this view through data. The results show that responsible leaders are positively affecting employees' green behaviors, and the results of this study are consistent with relevant research conclusions. Similar to the results of Xing Wei et al. (2017), this study further confirms that leaders play a key role in shaping the green will and behavior of their subordinates. When leaders are seen as role models for ethics and responsibility, subordinates are more willing to fulfill their social responsibilities and implement environmental behaviors. In addition, this study expands the interpretative mechanism between responsible leaders and subordinates' green behaviors, responding to Norton and other scholars' calls for attention to some leadership styles that are closely related to green ideas, and helps to explore the unique value of responsible leadership behavior.

Secondly, this paper finds that moral reflectiveness plays a partial intermediary role between responsible leadership and employee green behavior. Responsible leadership can enhance the moral reflectiveness of subordinates, and moral reflectiveness can promote the green behavior of employees. In the previous research on responsible leadership, the research on the theory of social learning and the theory of emotional events to explore the psychological mechanism of responsible leadership affecting employees is relatively scarce. According to the research in this paper, the reason why employees increase green behavior is that the responsible leadership behavior has set a good role model, prompting subordinates to imitate and implement environmentally beneficial behaviors, which is also the performance of employees' prosocial behavior; In terms of employees, they are influenced by leadership social responsibility, reflect on their impact on environmental sustainability in the workplace, and make extra efforts to engage in behaviors that they believe are morally correct. Green and green behaviors are what they do to achieve prosocial behavior. Work hard. Using moral reflectiveness as a mediator to explain the green behavior of employees helps to uncover the "black box" between responsible leaders and employees' green behavior, enriching the research on green behavior.

Finally, this study proposes and tests that empathy not only plays a negative role in the relationship between moral reflectiveness and employee green behavior, but also plays a role in regulating the indirect effect of responsible leadership on employees' green behavior. As mentioned in the previous article, employees are allowed to stand on the other side's position to think about problems and to identify the situation or predicament of others and to achieve empathy. Therefore, employees with high empathy may be more directly affected by responsible leadership, consciously participate in corporate social responsibility activities, and conduct green behaviors of employees, thus requiring less moral reflectiveness to conduct prosocial behavior. The low empathy employees will not feel too strong because of this feeling of empathy. After being infected by the moral and ethical atmosphere created by responsible leaders in the organization, they will enhance their sense of responsibility and reflect on their own environmental impact. Under the ethical reflection, the green behavior of employees. As a more important personal psychological trait, empathy has not been paid attention to in the academic circles, and there are few related studies. This study selects empathy as a regulatory variable, and discusses responsible leadership from the perspective of leadership style and individual traits. The influence of green behavior is not only conducive to clarifying the boundary conditions of responsible
leadership's mechanism of action on employees' green behavior, but also further promoting individual traits and green behavior research.

4.2. Practical significance
This study found that responsible leaders can increase the green behavior of their subordinates. Then, the organization should further enhance the manager's sense of social responsibility and foster more responsible leadership. In implementing specific management measures, companies need to pay special attention to whether candidates have a strong sense of social responsibility and a strong sense of environmental protection when recruiting or internally promoting leaders, in order to select those who truly become responsible leaders. In addition, enterprises should promote social responsibility leadership for leaders at all levels through systematic training systems and programs.

At the same time, this paper finds that responsible leaders will cause employees to reflect on morality by transmitting a sense of responsibility, and encourage employees to conduct pro-social ethical behavior. The results show that managers should play a role model role in the construction of corporate social responsibility meaning, abide by stricter ethical standards, pay attention to the interests of all stakeholders, stimulate employees' sense of social responsibility, induce employees' moral identity, and subjectively I want to practice the concept of environmental protection.

In addition, although this paper verifies the influence of empathy and negative thinking on the green behavior of employees, it also negatively regulates the responsible mechanism of leadership—ethical reflection—employee green behavior, but it does not mean that the organization should be more choices for low empathy employees, but more choices to match low empathy employees with responsible leaders, while training and guiding, to create a moral and ethical atmosphere in the organization, to maximize the impact of responsible leadership. For employees with high empathy in the organization, responsible leaders play a role in demonstrating to make consistent environmental behaviors driven by empathy.

4.3. Research limitations and future prospects
The research and future improvements can be mainly reflected in the following aspects: First, the research data comes from a single sample, and all variables are from self-assessment of enterprise personnel. Although the analysis shows that there is no serious homology problem in this study data, future research should use multi-source data as much as possible, and can use the leader-employee pairing sample to collect data, and second, the measurement of responsible leadership. Although the responsible leadership scale used in this paper is a mature and widely used scale in other studies, there are still some limitations. For example, the survey in this article is an employee's response to the superior responsible leadership, but the employees' understanding of the objects included in their superior "stakeholders" is different, especially for employees with different positions and different natures of work. Differences may result in bias in responsible leadership measurements. Third, this study explores the impact of moral reflectiveness and empathy on responsible employees' green behaviors. The results show that although both promote green behavior, interactions can have a significant negative impact. In the end, what is the difference between the two, how can we better promote green behavior, and in the future, we can study the deep-level mechanism of action from more perspectives on the basis of this research.
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