

# Authoritarian Leadership and Unethical Pro-Organizational Behavior: Mediating Role of Moral Disengagement

Kemeng Zhu

School of Management, Shang Hai University, 99 Shang Da Street, Shanghai 200444, China

E-mail of the corresponding author: m18817671880@163.com

## Abstract

This study aims to examine how authoritarian leadership influences unethical pro-organizational behavior via moral disengagement. We use 398 valid samples from 10 companies to test our theoretical model. The subjects have certain work experience and are distributed in all walks of life. Results show that authoritarian leadership is positively related to unethical pro-organizational behavior and this positive relationship is partially mediated by moral disengagement. Besides, power distance orientation moderates the strength of mediated relationship between authoritarian leadership and unethical pro-organizational behavior via moral disengagement.

**Keywords:** authoritarian leadership, unethical pro-organizational behavior, moral disengagement

## 1. Introduction

Previous studies indicate that unethical behaviors of employees in the organization are often motivated by revenging organizations or colleagues (Matherne and Litchfield, 2012). However, Umphress (Umphress et al., 2010) found that employees may also violate the norms of social ethics for the purpose of maintaining the interests of organization and its members, which is called unethical pro-organizational behavior. Unethical pro-organizational behavior, or UPB, is highly concealed and potentially harmful behavior (May et al., 2015). Although considerable studies explore the causes of unethical pro-organizational behavior from the perspective of leadership, few of them pay attention to the influence of Chinese character based leadership style on employees' unethical pro-organizational behavior. Paternalistic leadership is proved to be a Chinese character based leadership style (Cheng et al., 2003). Paternalistic leadership includes three dimensions: benevolence, morality, and authoritarianism. Among three dimensions, authoritarian leadership is the most prevalent style in Chinese business organizations. Authoritarian leadership emphasizes authority and control, and requires high performance for subordinates. Subordinates are highly likely to behave unethically under the pressure of leadership control and high performance requirements. Therefore, this paper selects authoritarian leadership as an independent variable and tries to examine the relationship between authoritarian leadership and unethical pro-organizational behavior in the context of Chinese culture.

Studies find that, though moral disengagement, individuals can escape from the control of self-regulatory function and justify their unethical behaviors (Chen et al., 2016). As a result, we assume that under the pressure of authoritarian leadership, subordinates may initiate the mechanism of moral disengagement to justify his unethical behavior in order to meet the performance requirements. Power distance orientation refers to the extent of the individual's acceptance of the unequal distribution of power in the organizations and institutions (Dorfman and Howell, 1988). Research shows that cultural differences in power distance have a moderating influence on voice (Brockner et al., 2001). Besides, empirical research calls for more attention to the effects of individual-level cultural value orientations (such as power distance orientation) on reactions to leaders (Kirkman et al., 2009). Therefore, we choose power distance orientation as the moderator.

## 2. Theory and Hypotheses

### 2.1 Authoritarian leadership and unethical pro-organizational behavior

Unethical pro-organizational behavior refers to the behavior that is beneficial to the organization or its members but violates social universal values (Umphress and Bingham, 2011). It contains two aspects: first, it is unethical, which is illegal in nature or violates social moral standards, including commission and omission; second, it is pro-organizational, which is neither described in the job description nor directed by superiors. It is a spontaneous behavior, intending to help the organization or its members (Umphress et al., 2010).

Paternalistic leadership consists of three dimensions: authoritarian leadership, benevolent leadership, moral leadership. Authoritarian leadership emphasizes absolute authority, and subordinates must obey the leader unconditionally (Redding, 1990; Silin, 1976). Farh and Cheng (Farh and Cheng, 2000) generalized the characteristics of authoritarian leadership, mainly reflecting in the following aspects: authority and control, underestimation of subordinate competence, image building, didactic behavior. The didactic behavior emphasizes high performance and the leader will scold the underperforming subordinates (Cheng et al., 2000).

Intensifying market competition causes tremendous pressure to organizations, and organizations then decompose the pressure to leaders. In turn, leaders pass a part of pressure to their employees and set high appraisal target. Previous studies have shown that high performance requirements from leaders often motivate

employees to achieve targets (Locke and Latham, 2006). But it also has side effects. For example, employees may be pressured and commit unethical behaviors to meet high performance requirements or even hard-to-reach goals (Schweitzer et al., 2004). Due to limited resources and ability, employees often feel powerless in face of high performance requirements. Once the goal is not met, the employee may be reprimanded by the leader, which can lead to great psychological burden and negative self-evaluation. Studies point out that performance appraisal is a double-edged sword, and high performance appraisal can cause great psychological pressure to employees (Kay and Mayer, 1965). However, seeking a positive self-image and establishing a positive self-concept is an instinct. In order to meet high performance requirements of the authoritarian leader and avoid negative self-evaluation, employees may "find another way" and take improper means to attain what the leader expects when necessary. Thus, authoritarian leadership may be an important incentive for employees to conduct unethical behaviors. Therefore, we put forward the hypothesis:

H1: Authoritarian leadership has a positive impact on unethical pro-organizational behavior.

### *2.2 The mediating role of moral disengagement*

Bandura put forward the concept of moral disengagement according to the social cognitive theory (Bandura et al., 1996). Moral disengagement refers to the fact that some of the unethical behaviors performed by individuals conflict with the self-control mechanism, thus forming a sense of guilt. In this way, in order to reduce cognitive conflict, individuals will redefine unethical behaviors and pass on the responsibilities of immoral behavior to victims. According to social cognitive theory, moral disengagement comprises a set of cognitive justification mechanisms that allow an individual to commit unethical acts while disengaging from the moral norms and self-sanctions.

One of the preconditions for the role of moral disengagement is that moral transgressors are not inherently immoral. They are stimulated by the situation (Kish-Gephart et al., 2014). When an employee's superior leader is an authoritarian leader who demands high performance, that is, the situation of high performance requirement provides a reasonable premise for employees to conduct unethical behaviors. Employees look on high performance requirements as organizational requirements. In order to achieve performance goals and maintain organizational interests, any unethical behaviors that are beneficial to the organization will be considered reasonable. In this case, employees' self-monitoring mechanism will temporarily lapse, and they will initiate some mechanism of moral disengagement to justify their actions. For example, through moral defense, employees would think that the unethical behaviors were done for the company, and they had to do it in order to achieve the performance goals. Through displacement of responsibility, employees would argue that highly competitive market system requires the survival of the fittest. They would argue that committing unethical behaviors is one of the choices for the market to eliminate the vulnerable groups. When moral disengagement mechanism starts, employees are not guilty of wrongdoing. Instead, they will increase the frequency of committing unethical behaviors for the sake of so-called organizational interests, especially unethical pro-organizational behaviors. Therefore, we put forward the hypothesis:

H2: Moral disengagement mediates the positive relationship between authoritarian leadership and unethical pro-organizational behavior

### *2.3 The moderating role of power distance orientation*

Previous research on the power distance orientation tends to focus on the national culture perspective, while this paper is based on the individual perspective. The employees' power distance orientation refers to the degree of acceptance towards unequal power distance in the organization (Hofstede, 1980). In the framework of Hofstede, east Asian culture represented by China and India scores high in power distance orientation. The European American culture represented by the United Kingdom and the United States scores low in power distance orientation. Chinese culture has always emphasized the importance of respect for seniority and priority in rank. Low status individuals must be obedient and respectful of individuals with high status. And because of "official standard" thought, people have formed a default attitude towards unequal distribution of power in society and organization. Although the rapid development of economy and culture has diluted the concept of hierarchy since ancient times, the acceptance of the phenomenon of unequal power has been integrated into the modern enterprise organization.

Employees with high power distance orientation tend to accept inequality of the upper and lower status. They think subordinates should always follow the demands of their superiors. When an employee's supervisor is an authoritarian leader who emphasizes high performance, satisfying leader's performance demand will be considered as the responsibility of the employee. Therefore, employees will plead any unethical behaviors and rationally transfer the responsibility of immoral behaviors to members outside the organization. Similarly, supervised by authoritarian leadership, employees with high power distance orientation will naturally increase the possibility of implementation of unethical behaviors, especially when this kind of behavior is beneficial for the organization. On the contrary, employees with low power distance orientation tend to think that there is not

much difference in status between superiors and subordinates, and they are eager to have equal interpersonal communication and psychological exchange with leaders (Hofstede, 1980). When faces with a leader who deliberately widens the power distance, low power distance orientation staff would clearly perceive the unequal status between them. He will have negative emotions and voluntarily reduce his willingness to engage in social exchange with the leader. Therefore, when the leader gives a difficult performance task particularly which requires immoral behavior, employee who has low power distance orientation will be likely to reject the task psychologically. They will go their own way, act on their own moral control systems. And they do not pass the buck by breaking their own moral control system because of performance pressure. In addition, authoritarian leaders emphasize unconditional obedience and often deliberately conceal their own thoughts, which can also cause dissatisfaction among employees with low power distance orientation. The social exchange between the two is reduced, and so is the willingness of employees to reward leaders or organizations. Hence, employees are significantly less likely to reward organizations by implementing unethical behaviors. Therefore, we put forward the hypotheses:

H3: power distance orientation moderates the strength of the positive relationship between authoritarian leadership and moral disengagement, so that the relationship will be stronger for people who are higher, rather than lower, in power distance orientation.

H4: power distance orientation moderates the strength of the positive relationship between authoritarian leadership and unethical pro-organizational behavior, so that the relationship will be stronger for people who are higher, rather than lower, in power distance orientation.

### 3. Methods

#### 3.1 Sample and procedure

Before issuing the questionnaires, we conducted professional translation of relevant foreign language scales to ensure the reliability of the application in the localization environment of China by using back-translation procedure (Brislin, 1970). We have distributed 500 questionnaires and made sure that the questionnaires are only used for academic purpose. Each response is strictly confidential. After eliminating invalid questionnaires such as lack of information and logical contradiction, we have collected 398 valid questionnaires from financial, transportation, real estate and other industries (a response rate of 79.60 percent). 57.29 percent of the subjects are female, 54.02 percent are between 26 and 35 years. Of the participating subjects, the mean working tenure is 3.39 years ( $SD=2.79$ ), 66.33 percent of participants are undergraduate or above.

#### 3.2 Measures

3.2.1 Authoritarian leadership. We use five items from the Paternalistic leadership scale developed by Cheng et al. (2000) to measure authoritarian leadership in our study. A sample item is "He or she independently decided on all matters of the department". Respondents complete the measures using a 7-point Likert scale (1 strongly disagree, 7 strongly agree). In current study, the Cronbach's alpha is 0.81.

3.2.2 Moral disengagement. Moral disengagement is measured with the three-item short form measurement (Chen et al., 2016). A sample item is: "It would be ok to be misleading to protect my company's interests". In current study, the Cronbach's alpha is 0.90.

3.3.3 Power distance orientation. We use a four-item scale developed by Farh et al. (2007) to capture power distance orientation. A sample item is: "A respected leader is very important to me". Cronbach's alpha for this scale is 0.81.

3.3.4 Unethical pro-organizational behavior. We use six-item scale developed by Umphress et al. (2010) to measure Unethical pro-organizational behavior. A sample item is: "If it would help my organization, I would misrepresent the truth to make my organization look good". The Cronbach's alpha is 0.91.

3.3.5 Control variables. We control five demographic variables of subordinates because prior studies indicate that these variables may influence unethical pro-organizational behavior: social desirability bias, gender (1=male, 2=female); age (1=25 years or under, 2=26-30 years, 3=31-35 years, 4=36-40 years, 5=41-45 years, 6=over 45 years); tenure (1=1 year or less, 2=1-3 years, 3=3-5 years, 4=5-10 years, 5=more than 10 years); education (1=high school or below; 2=junior college; 3=undergraduate; 4=postgraduate or above).

### 4. Results

#### 4.1 Confirmatory factor analysis

We use AMOS 21.0 to test the discriminant validity of variables, and the results are shown in table I. The three-factor model combines authoritarian leadership with power distance orientation into one factor. The two-factor model combines authoritarian leadership, power distance orientation and moral disengagement into one factor. The one-factor model combines four variables into one factor. As we can see, the fitting results of the four-factor model ( $\chi^2/df = 2.764$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $RMSEA = 0.067$ ,  $CFI = 0.963$ ,  $TLI = 0.949$ ) are better than three-factor model ( $\chi^2/df = 6.736$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $RMSEA = 0.120$ ,  $CFI = 0.872$ ,  $TLI = 0.835$ ), two-factor model ( $\chi^2/df = 14.946$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,

RMSEA=0.187, CFI=0.678, TLI=0.598) and one-factor model( $\chi^2/df = 18.794$ ,  $p < 0.001$  RMSEA=0.212, CFI=0.581, TLI=0.488). Therefore, this indicates that four variables have good discriminant validities.

Table 1. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Model	$\chi^2$	df	$\chi^2/df$	RMSEA	CFI	TLI
four-factor model	132.664	48	2.764	0.067	0.963	0.949
three-factor model	343.531	51	6.736	0.120	0.872	0.835
two-factor model	792.151	53	14.946	0.187	0.678	0.598
one-factor model	1014.863	54	18.794	0.212	0.581	0.488

#### 4.2 Descriptive statistics and correlations

Table II reports the means, standard deviations and correlations of variables in this study. Authoritarian leadership has a significant positive correlation with moral disengagement ( $r=0.23$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and unethical pro-organizational behavior ( $r=0.48$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Besides, moral disengagement is significantly correlated to unethical pro-organizational behavior ( $r=0.60$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

Table 2. Means, SDs and Correlations among Study Variables

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9.
1. SDB	4.82	0.83	-								
2. Gender	1.57	0.50	0.01	-							
3. Age	1.97	1.03	0.21**	-0.05	-						
4. Tenure	2.46	1.15	0.26**	-0.04	0.73	-					
5. Education	2.75	0.98	0.05	0.13*	0.25**	0.36**	-				
6. AL	4.44	1.22	0.21**	-0.05	0.06	0.08	0.19**	-			
7. MD	4.05	1.53	0.27**	0.00	-	-	0.02	0.23**	-		
8. PD	4.71	1.19	0.15**	0.11*	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.32**	0.15**	-	
8. UPB	3.44	1.49	0.50**	-0.08	-	-	0.03	0.48**	0.60**	-	-
					0.05	0.11**				0.22**	

Notes:  $n=398$ ; SDB=social desirability bias, AL=authoritarian leadership, MD=moral disengagement, , PD=power distance orientation

UPB=unethical pro-organizational behavior; Significant at : \* 0.05 and \*\* 0.01 levels.

#### 4.3 Hypotheses test results

As for hypothesis testing, we use hierarchical regression method. Table III shows the results of hierarchical regression analysis. Model 1 to 4 takes moral disengagement as the dependent variable, and model 5 to 10 takes unethical pro-organizational behavior as the dependent variable. The results show that authoritarian leadership is positively related to UPB after controlling the demographic variables ( $\beta=0.49$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Hence, H1 is supported. According to the procedures recommended by Baron and Kenny (1986), model 2 suggests that authoritarian leadership is significantly related to moral disengagement ( $\beta=0.24$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Model 7 suggests that moral disengagement is positively related to unethical pro-organizational behavior ( $\beta=0.48$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). When authoritarian leadership and moral disengagement are put into the regression equation simultaneously, the influence of authoritarian leadership on unethical pro-organizational behavior is significantly reduced ( $\beta=0.39$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and moral disengagement still significantly influences unethical pro-organizational behavior ( $\beta=0.43$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) showed by model 8. The results indicate that the relationship between authoritarian leadership and unethical pro-organizational behavior is partially mediated by moral disengagement. Thus, H2 is supported.

H3 suggests that power distance orientation positively moderates the positive relationship between authoritarian leadership and moral disengagement. Based on model 2, model 3 puts power distance orientation into the regression equation, and the results show that power distance orientation has no significant influence on moral disengagement ( $\beta=0.09$ , ns). Based on model 3, model 4 puts interaction term of authoritarian leadership and power distance orientation into the regression equation, and the results show that interaction term has significant influence on moral disengagement ( $\beta=0.19$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). It means that power distance orientation significantly and positively moderates the relationship between authoritarian leadership and moral disengagement. Thus, H3 is supported. In the same way, model 9 adds power distance orientation into the

regression equation based on model 6, and the results show that power distance orientation has no significant influence on unethical pro-organizational behavior ( $\beta=0.05$ , ns). Model 10 adds interaction term of authoritarian leadership and power distance orientation into the regression equation, and the results show that interaction term has significant influence on moral disengagement ( $\beta=0.11$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Thus, H4 is supported.

Table 3. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting MD and UPB

Variable	MD				UPB					
	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8	M9	M10
SDB	-	-0.42**	-0.41**	-0.42**	-	-	-	-	-	-0.74**
Gender	0.51**				0.91**	0.74**	0.67**	0.56**	0.73**	
Age	0.00	0.02	-0.01	0.03	-0.20	-0.17	-0.20	-0.18	-0.18	-0.16
Tenure	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.13	0.12	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.12	0.14
Education	0.01	-0.08	-0.08	-0.13	-0.07	-0.11	-0.04	-0.08	-0.11	-0.14
AL	-0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	-0.07	0.03	-0.07	0.01	0.03	0.03
MD		0.24**	0.22**	0.21**		0.49**		0.39**	0.48**	0.47**
PD			0.09	0.10			0.48**	0.43**		
AL*PD				0.19**					0.05	0.06
R <sup>2</sup>	0.08	0.11	0.12	0.16	0.26	0.41	0.49	0.58	0.41	0.43
$\Delta R^2$	0.08**	0.03**	0.00	0.05**	0.26**	0.15**	0.23**	0.32**	0.15**	0.02**

Notes: n=398; SDB= social desirability bias, AL=authoritarian leadership, MD=moral disengagement, PD=power distance orientation, UPB=unethical pro-organizational behavior; Significant at : \* 0.05 and \*\* 0.01 levels.

## 5. Conclusion and implications for management

### 5.1 Conclusion

In the context of Chinese culture, this paper examines the influence mechanism of authoritarian leadership on unethical pro-organizational behavior. Through empirical research, we confirm the inferences. First, authoritarian leadership has a positive influence on unethical pro-organizational behavior, and the relationship is mediated by the moral disengagement. Second, the power distance orientation not only positively moderates the relationship between authoritarian leadership and moral disengagement, but also positively moderates the relationship between authoritarian leadership and unethical pro-organizational behavior.

### 5.2 Theoretical implications

There are three theoretical contributions of this research. First, this study expands the research on the antecedent variables of unethical pro-organizational behavior in the context of Chinese culture. At present, some Chinese scholars have studied the causes of the unethical pro-organizational behavior from the perspective of leadership. However, the research from the perspective of paternalistic leadership is still scarce. Paternalistic leadership is one of the best ways to embody the characteristics of Chinese leadership, and the authoritarian leadership is a universal represent of Chinese leadership. Based on the foundation soil of paternalistic leadership, we find that authoritarian leadership is an important inducement to the unethical pro-organizational behavior in the context of Chinese culture.

Second, based on the theory of social cognition, we find that the relationship between authoritarian leadership and unethical pro-organizational behavior is partially mediated by moral disengagement. Stimulated by a specific situation, employees will initiate moral disengagement mechanism (Duffy, et al., 2012). When an authoritarian leader sets high performance goals, employees may justify unethical behavior because of the double pressure of performance and authority. In turn, it is "reasonable" to shift the responsibility to the organization and other stakeholders to implement unethical pro-organizational behavior. This indicates that the situation stimulation is an important factor, which results in the initiation of moral disengagement mechanism.

Third, this study discusses the moderating effect of power distance orientation. Power distance orientation is an important characteristic variable of individual culture. In the context of Chinese culture, the research of power distance orientation has certain representativeness. This study finds that power distance orientation moderates the relationship between authoritarian leadership and unethical pro-organizational behavior. For those who have higher power distance orientation, they believe that the hierarchical difference between superiors and subordinates are reasonable. Therefore, they are more inclined to obey orders from superiors. This leads them to be more likely to initiate moral disengagement in face of authoritarian leadership. They then defend their unethical pro-organizational behaviors and be "perfectly justifiable" to implement unethical pro-organizational behavior. Thus, it can be seen that the power distance orientation as a cultural characteristic variable has certain significance to the study of the causes of unethical pro-organizational behavior.

### 5.3 Practical implications

There are three implications for managerial practice. First, authoritarian leadership can improve employees' productivity. However, sometimes it can backfire. Excessive performance pressure can lead employees to take risks and sacrifice the interests of the outside group for the benefit of the organization. Finally, it will have a negative impact on the long-term development of the enterprise. Thus, authoritarian leaders should pay attention to giving orders and motivating subordinates in an appropriate way. What's more, superior leaders should give some performance indicators appropriately and guide employees to achieve the performance legally.

Second, as a situational variable, moral disengagement is very easy to be induced. In this way, enterprises should pay attention to the cultivation of employees' moral codes, preventing them from being opportunistic. When employees raise their moral standards, the moral disengagement is not easy to be activated. In addition, enterprise managers should also guide employees to establish the concept of long-term interests.

Third, employees are different in power distance orientation, and their attitudes and behaviors vary widely. Therefore, enterprise managers should differentiate the employees who have different cultural traits. For employees with high power distance orientation, leaders should counsel them so as to avoid unethical behavior due to excessive loyalty when they use employees' loyalty and sense of responsibility. For employees with low power distance orientation, leaders need to strengthen communication with them and improve their loyalty.

### 5.4 Limitations and future research

The shortcomings of this paper mainly include following points. Above all, although the data were collected over time, common method biases are hard to avoid. Next, this study controls social desirability, but it is still difficult to eliminate the existence of social desirability completely by self-assessment method. The future research can be measured by deep interview method and experiment method. In addition, this study only considers one style of the paternalistic leadership. Future research can explore the influence of the interaction of authoritarian leadership and other two leadership styles on unethical pro-organizational behavior. This study only discusses the moderating effect of power distance orientation, and future research can study other cultural variables.

### References

- Bandura, A. (1991), "Social cognitive theory of self-regulation", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 248-287.
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G.V. and Pastorelli, C. (1996), "Mechanisms of moral disengagement in exercise of moral agency", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 364-374.
- Baron, R.M. and Kenny D.A. (1986), "The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Brislin, R.W.(1970), "back-translation for cross-cultural research", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1, 185-216.
- Cheng, B.S., Chou, L.F. and Farh, J.L. (2000), "A triad model of paternalistic leadership: constructs and measurement", *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 14, 3-64.
- Cheng, B.S., Huang, M.P., Chou, L.F., Farh, J.L. and Peng, S.Q. (2003), "A triad model of paternalistic leadership: evidence from business organizations in mainland China", *Local Psychological Research*, 20, 209-252.
- Clugston, M., Howell, J.P. and Dorfman, P.W. (2000), "Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment", *Journal of Management*, 26, 5-30.
- Dorfman, P.W. and Howell, J.P. (1988), "Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns: Hofstede Revisited", *Advances in International Comparative Management*, 3, 127-150.
- Duffy, M.K., Scott, K.L., Shaw, J.D., Tepper, B.J. and Aquino, K.A. (2012), "Social context model of envy and social undermining", *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 643-666.
- Effelsberg, D., Solga, M. and Gurt, J. (2014), "Transformational leadership and follower's unethical behavior for the benefit of the company: A two-study investigation", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120, 81-93.
- Farh, J.L. and Cheng, B.S. (2000), "A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations", *Management and Organizations in the Chinese Context*, 84-127.
- Farh, J.L., Hackett, R.D. and Liang, J. (2007), "Individual-level cultural values as moderators of perceived organizational support-employee outcome relationships in China: comparing the effects of power distance and traditionality", *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 715-729.
- Hofstede, G. (1980), *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*, Sage, Beverly Hills, Cal., and London.
- Joel, B., Grant, A., Jerald, G., Michele J.G., Anne M.F., Chen, Z.X., Kwok, L., Gunter, B., Carolina, G., Bradley L.K. and Debra, S. (2001), "Culture and procedural justice: the influence of power distance on reactions to

- voice”, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 300-315.
- Kay, E. and Meyer, H.H. (1965), “Effects of threat in a performance appraisal interview”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49, 311-317.
- Kirkman, B.L. and Shapiro, D.L. (2001), “The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams: the mediating role of employee resistance”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 557-569.
- Kirkman, B.L., Chen, G., Farh, J.L., Chen, Z.X. and Lowe, K.B. (2009), “Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: a cross-level, cross-cultural examination”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 744-764.
- Kish-Gephart, J.J., Detert, J.R., Baker, V.L. and Martin, S. (2014), “Situational moral disengagement: Can the effects of self-interest be mitigated”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 125, 267-285.
- Locke, E.A. and Latham, G.P. (2006), “New directions in goal-setting theory”, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15, 265-268.
- Martin, S.R., Kish-Gephart, J.J. and Detert, J.R. (2014), “Blind forces: Ethical infrastructures and moral disengagement in organizations”, *Organizational Psychology Review*, 4, 295-325.
- Matherne, C.F. and Litchfield, S.R. (2012), “Investigating the relationship between affective commitment and unethical pro-organizational behaviors: the role of moral identity”, *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 9, 35-47.
- May, D.R., Chang, Y.K. and Shao, R. (2015), “Does ethical membership matter? Moral identification and its organizational implications”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 681-94.
- Miao, Q., Newman, A., Yu, J. and Xu L. (2013), “The relationship between ethical leadership and unethical pro-organizational behavior: linear or curvilinear effects”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116, 641-653.
- Redding, S.G. (1990), *The spirit of Chinese capitalism*, Walter de Gruyter, New York, NY.
- Silin, R.H. (1976), *Leadership and values: The organization of large-scale Taiwanese enterprise*, Harvard University Asia Center, London.
- Tsui, A.S. (2004), “Contributing to global management knowledge: A case for high quality indigenous research”, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 21, 491-513.
- Umphress, E.E., Bingham, J.B. and Mitchell, M.S. (2010), “Unethical behavior in the name of the company: the moderating effect of organizational identification and positive reciprocity beliefs on unethical pro-organizational behavior”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 769-80.
- Umphress, E.E. and Bingham, J.B. (2011), “When employees do bad things for good reasons: examining unethical pro-organizational behavior”, *Organization Science*, 22, 621-640.