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ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Repeating Unethical Workplace Behavior Through Ethical Fading: Justification from Perspective-taking Supervisors

By BULIN ZHANG

Due to the high costs associated with unethical workplace behaviors, preventing their reoccurrence is critically important for organizations. However, not so much has been known about the process whereby some individuals repeat unethical workplace behaviors and conditions that enable it. To help organizations understand such behavioral contingencies and inform organizational prevention strategies, through integrating insights from ethical fading theory and attribution of responsibility (Heider, 2013; Kelley, 1967; Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004), I proposed an alternative mechanism of ethical responsibility that explains when and how some individuals repeatedly engage in unethical workplace behaviors through ethical fading, and identified the justification role of the perspective-taking supervisor in this process. I tested the hypotheses by a sample of employees in a real estate company in China. And the results supported that, by providing individuals who have engaged in unethical workplace behaviors with justification for their biased attribution, perspective-taking supervisors promote ethical fading that is manifested through faded ethical responsibility. With faded ethical responsibility, individuals are more likely to engage in unethical workplace behaviors again.
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INTRODUCTION

Organizations generally establish norms and regulations that govern individuals’ behaviors to support business operations and facilitate the accomplishment of organizational goals. However, wherever there are rules, there are rule breakers, and behaviors that violate organizational standards and rules of conduct threatens stakeholder values and normally is considered unacceptable (Kaptein, 2008; Kidwell & Martin, 2005; Treviño & Brown, 2005). Researchers propose that these behaviors may have ethical concerns, and argue that the nature of it is subject to the moral norms generally accepted by the larger community (Jones, 1991; Treviño, Weaver & Reynolds, 2006; e.g. Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Gino, Schweitzer, Mead & Ariely, 2011; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). For example, Kidwell & Martin (2005: 7) argued that deviant activities at work are unethical because “individuals who engage in these activities clearly lack moral strength and violate ethical standards”. Drawing inferences from previous definition, unethical workplace behavior is defined here as behaviors that violate moral norms of working that are typically endorsed by the larger community. For example, taking excessive breaks, losing important work documents and acting rudely towards others that generally hamper work quality, quantity and property across organizations are all considered as instances of unethical workplace behaviors (e.g. Kish-Gephart, Harrison & Treviño, 2010).

Unethical workplace behavior is a widespread phenomenon (e.g. Gino, 2015; Kaptein, 2011) and has incurred significant organizational costs (Den Nieuwenboer, 2008; Harris & Ogbonna, 2002; Scakett, 2002). In response, both organizations and researchers have extensively investigated unethical workplace behaviors (e.g. Jones, 1991; Treviño, 1986), which they have attributed primarily to character flaws (e.g.,
Machiavellianism) or unhealthy organizational climates (e.g., Detert, Treviño & Sweitzer, 2008; Kish-Gephart et al., 2010). However, Bersoff (1999), Martin, Kish-Gephart and Detert (2014) and Umphress and Bingham (2011) proposed and found that even ethical people and infrastructures can paradoxically promote unethical decisions by reducing rationalization or increasing intentions to create unethically pro-organizational benefits. Their findings indicate that unethical workplace behavior is pervasive and cannot be completely avoided by addressing only problematic individuals or organizational climates.

As the potential for unethical workplace behaviors always exists, established patterns of unethical behavior are particularly problematic and costly for organizations. Thus, preventing unethical behaviors from reoccurring is a high organizational priority. However, before effective interventions can be developed, from a behavioral modification perspective (e.g., Stajkovic & Luthans, 1997), its behavioral contingencies must be first understood.

Previously, researchers have attempted to investigate what underlies the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behavior, focusing on an individual’s motivation to avoid self-censure after engaging in such behavior. They proposed that cognitive disengagement mechanisms disable the link between immoral behavior and self-sanctioning (Bandura, 1991, 1999; Moore, Detert, Treviño, Baker & Mayer, 2012), and thus trigger the reoccurrence of workplace unethical behaviors. For example, Welsh, Ordóñez, Snyder and Christian (2014) indicated that incremental changes in individuals’ unethical workplace behaviors would facilitate moral disengagement, leading to progressively worse behaviors. Similarly, Shu, Gino and Bazerman (2011) proposed that
after cheating, individuals are more likely to deactivate their self-regulatory function to avoid self-censure.

Even though previous research has revealed one explanation for the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behaviors, some variance in unethical decisions remains unexplained, indicating the existence of other processes that could serve as triggers. Specifically, Tenbrunsel and Messick (2004) proposed that faded ethical concerns associated with one’s decision could trigger unethical workplace behaviors, suggesting that individuals may re-engage in unethical workplace behavior without even realizing the ethical concerns associated with this decision (e.g. Wedell-Wedellsborg, 2019).

Unfortunately, few researchers have focused on how and when ethical fading could lead to the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behaviors. As individuals generally exhibit strong self-bias and consider themselves to be more ethical than others (Tenbrusel, 1995; Tyson, 1992), it’s possible that they would respond to their engagement in unethical behaviors with biased attribution of responsibility, which allows the ethical responsibility associated with their decisions to fade, making it important to investigate such condition.

Thus, to help organizations understand the contingencies of reoccurring unethical workplace behavior and develop effective prevention strategies, I investigate “when” and “how” some individuals repeat unethical workplace behavior. Drawing upon the literature on ethical fading theory and attribution of responsibilities (Heider, 2013; Kelley, 1967; Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004), I explain the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behavior through an ethical fading mechanism, and identify the justification role of the perspective-taking supervisors. Building on ethical fading theory (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004), I suggest that self-bias to maintain positive image motivates individuals to deny
responsibility for undesirable behaviors (Zuckerman, 1979), and enables ethical fading after engagement in unethical workplace behaviors (e.g., Zuber, 2015). When individuals obscure the causes of unethical workplace behavior (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004), their sense of ethical responsibility (i.e., internalized ethical concern or obligation) fades (e.g., Fuller, Marier & Hester, 2006), making them less motivated to modify and more likely to repeat those behaviors (Jones & Ryan, 1998).

More importantly, I propose that supervisors who adopt employees’ perspectives promote ethical fading. According to social information processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), supervisors are an important source of information individuals use to construct their beliefs and attitudes. Thus, I propose that, after unethical workplace behaviors, if supervisors endorse individuals’ perspective (e.g. Fiori, Krings, Kleinlogel & Reich, 2016), individuals would be more likely to treat their attribution bias as permissible. This in turn makes them more likely to ignore responsibilities related to their previous unethical workplace behavior through ethical fading, which leads to repeated unethical workplace behaviors.

By incorporating ethical fading into the explanation for reoccurring unethical workplace behavior, I make three contributions. First, in previous research, scholars have generally incorporated ethical fading theory into their theoretical arguments (e.g., Ruedy & Schweitzer, 2010) or manipulated related phenomena in laboratory settings (e.g., Welsh et al., 2014). However, they did not discuss the mechanism whereby ethical fading affects individuals’ decisions to re-engage in unethical workplace behavior, thereby making it impossible to identify the role of ethical fading in such behavioral decision-making process. I address this issue and extend ethical fading theory by proposing that
faded ethical responsibility explains how ethical fading affects the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behaviors. Drawing upon ethical fading theory (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004), I suggest that biased attribution of responsibility could easily be triggered after engagement in unethical workplace behavior to protect positive image. Such erroneous perceptions about why things occur allows individuals to distance and relieve themselves from ethical responsibility at hand (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004; Heider, 2013), manifesting ethical fading process in the form of faded ethical responsibility.

Secondly, by adopting ethical fading theory (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004), I provide an alternative lens by which to examine factors that lead to repeated unethical workplace behavior. By proposing that faded ethical responsibility explains how ethical fading affects the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behaviors, I provide one of the first tests to show the effects of ethical fading on the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behavior. I believe that proposing the alternative mechanism leads to additional insights as to the possible behavioral contingencies (when and how) for reoccurred unethical workplace behavior.

Thirdly, by proposing the contributory role of perspective-taking supervisors, I extend the literature by identifying the conditions under which ethical fading could be triggered. Previously, researchers focused on the role of unethical leaders such as abusive supervisors (e.g., Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007) in promoting unethical workplace behaviors, arguing that mistreatment by unethical supervisors lead employees to retaliate and engage in unethical behaviors. From a social information theory perspective, I argue that supervisors could also promote unethical workplace behaviors by confirming
individuals’ biased perceptions that obscure the ethical responsibilities of their decisions. Thus, even though perspective-taking is associated with positive organizational outcomes such as creativity and contextual performance (Grant & Berry, 2011; Parker & Axtell, 2001), I propose that this behavior promotes ethical fading by confirming individuals’ biased attribution of responsibility.

Overall, this study’s findings may help organizations understand when and how some individuals repeat unethical workplace behaviors. Specifically, I demonstrate that by endorsing subordinates’ bias in attribution of responsibility, perspective-taking supervisors promote their ethical fading, which is manifested through faded ethical responsibility that leads to the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behavior.
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

Ethical Fading Theory

Organizational researchers have proposed that past behavior is more likely to be repeated in the future if it is accepted, supported and practiced (Aarts, Verplanken & Van Knippenberg, 1998; Ouellette & Wood, 1998). Thus, if unethical workplace behavior is accepted rather than corrected, individuals would be more likely to display similar behaviors in the future.

In this study, I propose that ethical fading theory (Tenbrunsel and Messick, 2004) provides one of the insights to understand when and how some individuals repeat rather than correct unethical workplace behavior. Specifically, ethical fading theory emphasizes the innate psychological tendency for individuals to fade the “ethics” associated with their decision (Tenbrunsel and Messick, 2004). Tenbrunsel and Messick (2004) propose that individuals engage in unethical workplace behaviors because false beliefs about oneself create errors in ethical judgment, which make the ethical concerns associated with one’s decisions to fade into the background and enable individuals to behave incongruently without realizing it (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004), suggesting that individuals may re-engage in unethical workplace behavior without even realizing the ethical concerns associated with this decision (e.g. Wedell-Wedellsborg, 2019).

Tenbrunsel and Messick (2004) propose that there are four enablers of ethical fading: euphemistic language, the “slippery slope” of decision making, biased perceptual causation and constrained self-representation. According to ethical fading theory, euphemistic language revises and distorts a decision such that it is devoid of its ethical concerns. A “slippery slope” is created through repeated exposure and routinization,
which leads to ethical numbing, rendering individuals insensitive to the ethical concerns of their decisions. Biased perceptual causation creates distance between oneself and ethical issues through self-interested attributions as to why things occur, whereas constrained representation enables ethical fading through the human inability to have a truly objective perception of the truth (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004).

Because individuals generally exhibit strong self-bias, which has the adaptive function of enhancing self-esteem (Blackwood, Bentall, ffytche, Simmons, Murray & Howard, 2003; Tenbrusel, 1995; Tyson, 1992), it’s possible that they would respond to their engagement in unethical behaviors with biased attribution of responsibility to protect esteem, which enables ethical fading that allows ethical concerns associated with their decisions to fade. However, few researchers have focused on the role of ethical fading in the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behaviors. To help organizations understand such behavioral contingencies and develop effective prevention strategies, I incorporate ethical fading into the explanation for reoccurring unethical workplace behavior and suggest that ethical fading explains its effects on repeated unethical workplace behaviors in the form of faded ethical responsibility.

**Unethical Workplace Behavior and Ethical Responsibility**

Before I discuss how unethical workplace behavior affects ethical responsibility through ethical fading, ethical responsibility must be defined. Specifically, an employee’s responsibility refers to an individual’s concern and sense of obligations regarding the consequences of the actions or events in which he or she participates (e.g. Hackman & Oldham, 1976). In previous studies, researchers reported that an employee’s felt
responsibility is positively associated with intrinsic work motivations, attention to work outcomes, extra-role behavior, and a high level of job performance (Fuller et al., 2006; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Pearce & Gregersen, 1991). Because individuals could similarly care about ethical consequences of their conduct on organizations and attach high obligation and valence to engagement in ethical behavior, I propose that perceived ethical responsibility has important implications for unethical workplace behaviors. Drawing inferences from previous work on felt responsibility (e.g., Fuller et al., 2006), I define ethical responsibility as the perceived obligation to conduct oneself in accordance with ethical norms and standards, and propose that individuals with high levels of ethical responsibility are concerned about the ethical consequences associated with their own behaviors, and attach negative valence to engagement in unethical behaviors.

Because ethical responsibility reflects an individual’s ethical concerns about his or her own conduct, based on previous discussion of ethical fading theory, when ethical fading is triggered that allows ethical concerns associated with one’s decision to fade into the background (Tenbrunsel and Messick, 2004), I suggest that ethical responsibility likely is affected.

But how does unethical workplace behavior affect ethical responsibility through ethical fading? According to attribution of responsibility theory (Heider, 2013; Kelley, 1967), individuals generally make casual explanations to understand forces underlying one’s own or other’s unethical workplace behaviors (Blackwood et al., 2003; Kelley & Michela, 1980). The degree to which individuals assign responsibility of why an unethical workplace behavior occurred depends on the perceived relative contribution of
personal and external factors to the outcome (Gailey & Lee, 2005). However, because maintaining positive self-worth has been identified as an important human goal (Hales, 1985), researchers propose that attribution of responsibility between personal and external factors is not always rational, but affected by self-serving bias, which has the adaptive function of enhancing self-esteem (Blackwood et al., 2003; Burger, 1981; Zuckerman, 1979). Specifically, they found that self-serving bias leads individuals to take personal responsibility for desirable outcomes but make external attributions for undesirable ones (Kelley, 1967; Hastorf, Schneider & Polefka, 1970; Shepperd, Malone and Sweeny, 2008; Zuckerman, 1979; e.g. Tenbrusel, 1995; Zuber, 2015). For example, Arkin, Appelman and Burger (1980) found that individuals portrayed themselves as more personal responsible for success than for failure, supporting the existence of self-serving bias in attribution of responsibility.

Researchers propose that engagement in unethical workplace behaviors hamper self-esteem because it deviates from moral standards (e.g. Bersoff, 1999). Because bias and illusion are common in human thoughts (Taylor, 1989; Tenbrusel, 1995), unethical workplace behavior would likely trigger self-serving bias in attribution of responsibility to help preserve positive self-esteem. According to Tenbrusel & Messick (2004), errors in perceptual causation is one of the enablers of ethical fading. Thus, when individuals engage in biased attribution of responsibility after unethical workplace behavior, ethical fading is activated through the process in which individuals adopt false beliefs about why things occur and generate erroneous ethical judgement of their unethical workplace behavior through externalizing responsibility (Heider, 2013; Kelley, 1967). For example, Chugh, Bazerman and Banaji (2005) propose that a biased self-view of oneself as a moral
and competent person prevents the recognition of ethical implications when making unethical decisions.

Furthermore, Heider (2013)’s model of responsibility proposes that the degree to which individuals assign responsibility of why an unethical workplace behavior occurred depends on the perceived relative contribution of personal and external factors: The greater the perceived external influence on the outcome, the less the person is held responsible (Gailey & Lee, 2005). Thus, after engagement in unethical workplace behavior, through transferring ethical responsibility to external factors rather than to themselves via biased attribution of responsibility, an individual’s own concerns about or sense of obligation for the ethical consequences of unethical workplace behavior (ethical responsibility) likely become less salient or faded, thereby manifesting ethical fading in the form of faded ethical responsibility. This is also supported by Jones and Ryan’s (1998) model of moral approbation, which indicates that when the degree of complicity is diminished, perceived ethical responsibility is negatively affected.

Thus, as we can see, as a result of engaging unethical workplace behavior, individuals are primed to justify their actions to protect self-esteem by fading their ethical responsibility (Bersoff, 1999). This occurs through an ethical fading process in which false beliefs of attribution allow individuals to externalize responsibility. As a result, based on attribution theory and ethical fading theory, I expect that, through ethical fading, one’s initial engagement in unethical behavior (at Time 1) is negatively associated with their ethical responsibility.

**Hypothesis 1**: There is a negative relationship between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and ethical responsibility.
The Moderating Role of Perspective-taking Supervisor

According to ethical fading theory (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004), individuals likely respond to their unethical workplace behavior with greater reductions in ethical responsibility when environmental cues permit such behaviors. Because individuals generally look to their supervisors for ethical guidance (Treviño & Brown, 2005), supervisors likely play an important role in promoting ethical fading after they engage in unethical workplace behaviors. Previously, researchers examined how various negative leadership practices such as abusive behavior, toxic leadership and the undermining of authority (Brown & Mitchell, 2010; Duffy, Ganster & Pagon, 2002; Frost, 2004; Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007) affect the ethical decision-making process, arguing that mistreatment by leaders negatively affects employees’ attitudes and triggers retaliation through unethical decisions (e.g., Thau, Bennett, Mitchell & Marrs, 2009). However, unethical workplace behavior may also be promoted when individuals engage in biased attribution of responsibility, which enables ethical fading and relieves one’s ethical responsibility to correct previously unethical behaviors (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004). Therefore, supervisors who justify errors in perceptual causation could also promote unethical workplace behavior through ethical fading.

Thus, by drawing inferences from social information processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), which emphasizes the role of social information in constructing individual’s beliefs and attitudes, I propose that perspective-taking supervisors, as an important source of social information, paradoxically promote faded ethical responsibility by confirming individuals’ biased views and justifying ethical fading. Specifically, perspective-taking refers to a cognitive process for individuals to produce experience of
empathy through taking others’ perspective and increasing self-other awareness (Davis, 1983, 2018; Decety & Jackson, 2004). Researchers proposed that perspective-taking, as to internalize others’ experience, is based on attribution theory, which explains the human tendency to apply different standards when evaluating behaviors (Kelley, 1967). As discussed previously, unlike individuals who adopt biased attribution to assign ethical responsibility of their own unethical workplace behaviors to external factors but others’ to internal causes (e.g. Fiori et al., 2016), researchers argue that perspective-takers are able to align their views with others’ thinking and put themselves in others’ places, thereby narrowing the gap between their own views and others’ view (e.g. Lester, Turnley, Bloodgood & Bolino, 2002; Parker & Axtell, 2001).

Previously, researchers proposed that perspective-taking is associated with positive organizational outcomes. For example, Galinsky and Moskowitz (2000) found that perspective taking would reduce stereotypes and in-group bias. Similarly, Galinsky, Ku and Wang (2005) proposed that perspective-taking that leads to a self-other overlap in cognitive representation would facilitate interpersonal cooperation. However, even though perspective taking has an advantage through reducing the gap between one’s own view and others’ perspective, it would also paradoxically make it easier for perspective takers to accept others’ self-serving bias in attribution of responsibility, and thus facilitates their ethical fading.

Specifically, because perspective-taking supervisors adopt subordinates’ views as their own, they are more likely to internalize subordinates’ bias in attribution of responsibility and to accept their excuses for unethical workplace behaviors. For example, Fiori et al. (2016) argued that taking others’ perspectives to understand the
reasons behind unethical behaviors may make individuals to blame external conditions rather than the people involved, and Park and Axtell (2001) proposed that perspective-taking makes one’s attribution about targets’ behaviors to be more like the attributions others made about their own behaviors. Similarly, Park and Raile (2010) and Sessa (1996) proposed that perspective-taking enables individuals to value, understand and comprehend information provided by others, and Oswald (1996) suggested that entertaining other perspectives motivates individuals to pay attention to others’ thoughts, concerns and feelings.

However, by accepting others’ thoughts, perspective-taking supervisors unexpectedly justified individuals’ biases and false beliefs in perceptual causation, which in turn facilitates ethical fading in the form of faded ethical responsibility. According to social information processing theory, supervisors act as important sources of social information that individuals use to construct attitudes and behaviors (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). For example, Boekhorst (2015) suggested that authentic leaders transmit social cues in the workplace, thereby affecting individuals’ perceptions of an inclusive climate. Similarly, Ng and Feldman (2013) argued that perceptions of supervisor embeddedness function as important social cues that help individuals develop their own job attitudes and behaviors. Thus, according to social information processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), as supervisors act as important source of information for individuals to construct beliefs and attitudes, individuals with perspective-taking supervisors who confirm their biased attributions of responsibility are more likely to rationalize their false beliefs, providing them with cognitive flexibility to engage in ethical fading and to transfer ethical responsibility to external factors. Therefore, I expect that when individuals’ self-
serving bias is justified through supervisor’s perspective-taking, ethical fading becomes more likely, whereby ethical responsibility become less salient.

In sum, because perspective-taking supervisors are able to adopt individuals’ views, comprehend the information they provide and pay attention to their thoughts, self-biased attributions of unethical workplace behaviors are more likely to be accepted. This in turn provides individuals with the cognitive flexibility to rationalize biased attribution of previous unethical workplace behaviors, which enables ethical fading in the form of faded ethical responsibility. As a result, individuals with perspective-taking supervisors may be more likely to engage in ethical fading to decrease ethical responsibility. Thus, a perspective-taking supervisor likely moderates the negative relationship between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and ethical responsibility through facilitating ethical fading.

**Hypothesis 2:** Perspective-taking supervisor moderates the negative relationship between subordinate unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and subordinate ethical responsibility. Specifically, the negative relationship between subordinate unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and subordinate ethical responsibility is stronger when supervisor perspective-taking is high.

**Ethical Responsibility and Reoccurrence of Unethical Workplace Behavior**

Researchers have suggested that faded ethical responsibility leads to subsequent unethical workplace behavior, which, in other words, means that ethical responsibility has a negative effect on subsequent unethical workplace behavior. Specifically, Hall, Frink and Buckley (2017)’s review of accountability propose that, when individuals felt
accountable, they perceive expectation that their behavior will be evaluated by others and are concerned about seeking approval by them. Because responsibility is generally considered as a subcomponent of accountability (Schlenker, Weigold & Doherty, 1991), Hall et al. (2017)’s review suggest that perceived ethical responsibility reflects one’s expectation to seek approval from external audience for ethical behaviors, and to been seen in a way that is consistent with the ethical image that they wish to display. Because ethical responsibility creates a behavioral boundary that directs resources towards achieving the expected ethical behaviors (Wallance, Johnson, Mathe & Paul, 2011), with ethical responsibility, individuals are expected to be less likely to engage in subsequent unethical workplace behavior.

Other researchers have also suggested the negative relationship between ethical responsibility and unethical workplace behavior. For example, researchers, such as Goodstein and Butterfield (2010) and Ren and Gray (2009), indicated that perception of responsibility reflects the state of having duty for one’s wrongdoings, and represents one’s cognitive willingness to make amendments. They propose that, when individuals accept responsibility, they are generally more likely to engage in behavioral change and make amendment of wrongdoing (Goodstein & Butterfield, 2010; Ren & Gray, 2009). In addition, Jones and Ryan (1998) proposed that individuals with moral responsibility constantly compare their planned behavior with moral approbation, and when they perceive a gap, are compelled to modify their behaviors to ensure compliance.

These discussions indicate that, with ethical responsibility, individuals are motivated to channel resources towards the goal of achieving ethical outcomes, either by making ethical decisions or modifying previous unethical workplace behaviors. In other
words, however, when individuals lack such ethical responsibility, they are not motivated to modify previous unethical workplace behaviors. As a result, they do not perceive the need to engage in self-regulation (Bandura, 1989), making them more likely to repeat such behaviors. Thus, I expect that one’s ethical responsibility is negatively associated with his or her subsequent engagement in unethical behavior (Time 2).

**Hypothesis 3:** There is a negative relationship between ethical responsibility and unethical workplace behavior at Time 2.

If unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 leads to faded ethical responsibility through ethical fading (or in other works, a negative relationship between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and ethical responsibility), and if faded ethical responsibility leads to unethical workplace behavior at Time 2 (or in other words, a negative relationship between ethical responsibility and unethical workplace behavior at Time 2), ethical responsibility likely mediates the positive relationship between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and Time 2, indicating that the effect of ethical fading on reoccurrence unethical workplace behavior is manifested through faded ethical responsibility.

More importantly, if a perspective-taking supervisor moderates the negative relationship between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and ethical responsibility, a perspective-taking supervisor likely moderates the positive indirect relationship between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and Time 2 through ethical responsibility. Thus, I expect that:

**Hypothesis 4:** Perspective-taking supervisor moderates the positive indirect
relationship between subordinate unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and unethical workplace behavior at Time 2 via ethical responsibility.

-------------------------

Insert Figure 1 about here

-------------------------
METHODS

Sample and Procedure

To test the hypotheses, I employed data collected from a real estate company in China, in which employees work at various locations led by local managers. Supervisors and employees responded to internet-based questionnaires in December 2014. With organizational support, 836 employees and 168 managers provided responses. In addition to survey data, I obtained objective data of recorded unethical workplace behaviors from the company.

Using employee ID numbers, I merged employees’ survey data with objective information about their unethical workplace behaviors, which ended up with 357 employees. Using ID numbers for employees’ identified supervisors, I further merged employees’ survey data with supervisors’ survey data, leaving a final sample of 313 employees matched with 119 supervisors, and there are around 3 employees per supervisor.

Among the 313 employees, 47.28% had a bachelor’s degree, 51.76% had an associate’s degree, and 0.96% had other degrees. Their average age was 24.17 (SD = 1.68) and average tenure was 12.64 months (SD = 7.98). Further analysis revealed significant differences in age (t = -4.09, p < .05) and tenure (t = -12.49, p < .05) between cases retained in this study and cases that had been excluded, indicating that employees in retained cases were older and remained with the organization longer than employees in excluded cases. Thus, I controlled for age and tenure in subsequent analyses.

Measures
Unethical workplace behavior (Time 1 and Time 2). I obtained data on unethical workplace behavior from organizational records which documented violations of organizational rules and regulations. Specifically, unethical workplace behaviors include failure to follow work instructions, loss of important work documents, customer complaints, rude behavior, etc. I coded the absence of behavioral violations as 0.

My primary aim was to investigate the effects of unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 on ethical responsibility, which in turn affects unethical workplace behavior at Time 2. To identify unethical workplace behavior at Time 1, I averaged each employee’s documented unethical workplace behaviors for the 4-month period immediately preceding survey data collection. Similarly, I averaged each employee’s documented unethical workplace behaviors for the 4-month period immediately following survey data collection to represent their unethical workplace behavior at Time 2. I chose a 4-month period because it provided a sufficient time frame to observe employees’ unethical workplace behaviors, and best enabled the use of objective data of unethical workplace behaviors obtained from this organization.

Ethical responsibility. I measured ethical responsibility using three items adapted from Zhao (2011: 44). Sample items were “I was concerned about the negative consequences of misconduct on my task performance;” “I was careful not to engage in misconduct because I knew every violation could influence my performance evaluation negatively;” and “I did not feel comfortable engaging in misconduct because I know that misconduct is not acceptable in this company.” Employees responded to items using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Cronbach’s alpha for this scale is 0.76.
**Supervisor perspective-taking.** I used supervisors’ survey data to measure whether or not they engaged in perspective-taking. Supervisors responded to seven items developed by Davis (1980: 11) using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Sample items were “Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I was in her place;” and “When I’m upset at someone, I usually try to put myself in his shoes for a while”). Two reverse-coded items did not load significantly on the construct of perspective-taking supervisor, and thus were deleted (e.g. Jozsa & Morgan, 2017). After deleting these two items, the reliability of this scale improved from .62 to .85.

**Control variables.** I controlled for the effect of age, tenure, and job satisfaction in the analysis. I controlled for age and tenure because I found that cases retained in this study was biased towards those employees who were older and had longer tenure. Last, I controlled for job satisfaction because previous research, such as Liu, Lin and Hu (2013), and a meta-analysis conducted by Kish-Gephart et al. (2010) found that job satisfaction is negatively related to unethical behaviors. Equity theory explains that job satisfaction has a negative effect on unethical behavior because dissatisfied employees, who perceived imbalance between one’s input/output ratio, choose to restore balance through engaging in unethical behavior (Adams, 1965; Kish-Gephart et al., 2010). Furthermore, job satisfaction has found to be associated with felt responsibility (e.g. Breaux, Perrewé, Hall, Frink & Hochwarter, 2008). Given these relationships, it’s possible that unethical workplace behavior relates to ethical responsibility not because the process of ethical fading as I suggest, but rather because of job satisfaction. To rule out such an alternative explanation, I controlled for job satisfaction (Bernerth & Aguinis, 2016). Specifically, I
measured job satisfaction with one item: “Overall, to which extent are you satisfied with your job?”.

**Analytical Strategy**

I followed procedures for the moderated mediation to test the proposed hypotheses using path analysis in Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, 2019). Because individuals are nested within supervisors, their unethical workplace behavior and ethical responsibility are similar for groups of individuals under the same supervisor, which have violated the assumptions of independence for OLS regression. As a result, I adjusted for the clustered standard errors before the analysis.

Specifically, I analyzed Hypotheses 1 and 3 at the employee level with adjustment for the clustered standard errors. In addition, because Hypothesis 2 propose the moderating effect of a perspective-taking supervisor, I thus created and included a mean-centered interaction item between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and a perspective-taking supervisor in the analysis. As for Hypothesis 4, which proposes the moderating effect of perspective-taking supervisor on the indirect relationship between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and Time 2 via ethical responsibility, I used bootstrapping method with 5,000 replications to compute the 95% bias-corrected confidence interval for this moderated indirect effect (Preacher & Hayes, 2004).
RESULTS

I present means, standard deviations and correlations of key variables in Table 1. A significant correlation exists between ethical responsibility and unethical workplace behavior at Time 2, providing some initial support for Hypothesis 3. However, because age and tenure are unrelated to all variables of interest in this study and did not change the study results when included and exclude. To maximize statistical power, I then report the results without controlling for age and tenure.

Hypothesis 1 predicts a negative relationship between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and ethical responsibility. As shown in Table 2, after controlling for job satisfaction, the relationship between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and ethical responsibility is negative but not significant (β = -.14, p = .11), indicating that unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 may not lead individuals to fade their ethical responsibility. Thus, Hypothesis 1 is not supported.

Hypothesis 2 proposes that perspective-taking supervisor moderates the negative relationship between subordinate unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and ethical responsibility. As shown in Table 4, the interaction between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and a perspective-taking supervisor is negative and significant (β = -.28, p
< .05), indicating that a perspective-taking supervisor moderates the relationship between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and ethical responsibility. A simple slope analysis of the significant interaction term further reveals that the relationship between unethical workplace behavior and ethical responsibility is significant and negative ($\beta = -1.18, p < .05$) at a low value of supervisor perspective taking (one standard deviation below the mean), while this negative relationship is significant and becomes much stronger ($\beta = -1.49, p < .05$) when at a high value of supervisor perspective-taking (one standard deviation above the mean). Thus, the results suggest that perspective-taking supervisors would promote individual’s ethical fading to obscure ethical responsibility after they engage in unethical workplace behavior. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 is supported.

Hypothesis 3 proposes that ethical responsibility is negatively related to unethical workplace behaviors at Time 2. As shown in Table 2, a negative and significant relationship exists between ethical responsibility and unethical workplace behaviors at Time 2 ($\beta = -.19, p < .05$) at the employee level, indicating that individuals with high levels of ethical responsibility are less likely to display unethical workplace behavior again. Thus, Hypothesis 3 is supported.

Hypothesis 4 predicts that a perspective-taking supervisor moderates the indirect relationship between unethical workplace behaviors at Time 1 and Time 2 via ethical responsibility. Results in Table 4 provide some initial support for Hypothesis 4: both the interaction between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and perspective-taking supervisor on ethical responsibility ($\beta = -.28, p < .05$), and the relationship between ethical responsibility and unethical workplace behavior at Time 2 ($\beta = -.19, p < .05$) are negative and significant. Estimates of the indirect effect using bootstrapping methods
with 5,000 replications reveal that, when the degree of perspective-taking is one standard deviation above the mean, there is a positive indirect relationship between unethical workplace behaviors at Time 1 and Time 2 via ethical responsibility and this indirect effect is significant (indirect effect = .25, CI = .01, .78). Whereas when the degree of perspective-taking is one standard deviation below the mean, the positive indirect relationship between unethical workplace behaviors at Time 1 and Time 2 via ethical responsibility is still significant but becomes much weaker (indirect effect = .20, CI = .01, .62). These results provide support for the hypothesis that a perspective-taking supervisor moderates the positive indirect relationship between unethical workplace behaviors at Time 1 and Time 2 via ethical responsibility. Specifically, perspective-taking supervisors promote ethical fading, motivating individuals to decrease ethical responsibility, which in turn leads to subsequent unethical workplace behaviors. As a result, Hypothesis 4 is supported.

--------------------------------------------------------
Insert Table 3 and Figure 2 about here
--------------------------------------------------------
DISCUSSION

Due to the high costs associated with unethical workplace behaviors, preventing their reoccurrence is critically important for organizations. However, not so much has been known about the process whereby some individuals repeat unethical workplace behaviors and conditions that enable it. To help organizations understand such behavioral contingencies and inform organizational prevention strategies, I explored ethical fading as a mechanism that affects the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behaviors.

Building on ethical fading theory and attribution of responsibility theory (Heider, 2013; Kelley, 1967; Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004), I proposed that individuals’ self-serving bias in attribution of responsibility (i.e., false beliefs about why things occur), which motivates them to externalize responsibilities for undesirable behaviors, enables ethical fading after engagement in unethical workplace behaviors (e.g., Zuber, 2015). Obscuring the causation of their unethical workplace behaviors (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004) allows individuals’ ethical responsibility to fade, making them less motivated to modify such behaviors and more likely to repeat them (Jones & Ryan, 1998). More importantly, I proposed that perspective-taking supervisors would promote ethical fading in subordinates. By accepting individuals’ attribution bias (e.g., Batson, Early & Salvarani, 1997; Fiori et al., 2016), perspective-taking supervisors likely facilitates the cognitive flexibility necessary to engage in ethical fading, making individuals more likely to repeat unethical workplace behaviors.

Using data from a real estate company in China, I find support for the negative relationship between ethical responsibility and unethical behavior at Time 2, suggesting that individuals, who have high levels of ethical responsibility, are less likely to display
unethical workplace behavior again. Even though I failed to find support for the negative relationship between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and ethical responsibility, I find support for the moderating effect of perspective-taking supervisor. Furthermore, I demonstrated the mediating role of ethical responsibility and found that the positive indirect relationship between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and Time 2 becomes stronger when a supervisor’s degree of perspective-taking is high rather than low. This finding confirms that individuals generally look to their supervisors for ethical guidance (Treviño & Brown, 2005); perspective-taking supervisors, who are more likely to value individuals’ thoughts and accept their biased attributions of unethical workplace behaviors, prompt ethical fading among individuals who engage in unethical workplace behaviors. The findings thus reveal a negative side effect of perspective-taking supervisors, and show how ethical fading promoted by them could be another mechanism that explains when and how individuals repeat unethical workplace behavior.

**Theoretical and Practical Implication**

By identifying how perspective-taking supervisors may prompt unethical workplace behaviors, I contribute to discussions about reoccurring unethical workplace behavior and the important role of supervisors in individuals’ ethical decisions. First, I have identified an alternative explanation for the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behaviors. Specifically, individuals not only feel motivated to avoid self-sanctioning (Bandura, 1991, 1999), but also experience ethical fading when their supervisors justify their self-serving bias in attribution of responsibility (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004). The findings show ethical fading to be an alternative mechanism that explains how unethical
workplace behavior reoccurs, and reveal the conditions under which ethical fading is triggered after individuals initially engage in unethical workplace behaviors.

Second, I contribute to literature on ethical fading by identifying the mechanism through which ethical fading facilitates the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behaviors. Specifically, I found that when individuals obscure the causation of their unethical workplace behaviors to protect self-esteem, and those biased attributions are accepted by perspective-taking supervisors (Tenbrunsel and Messick, 2004), individuals become more likely to disregard the ethical implications of their behaviors, and less concerned about the ethical consequences of their conduct, resulting in faded ethical responsibility. More importantly, I found that there is an indirect relationship between unethical workplace behaviors at Time 1 and Time 2 via ethical responsibility when individuals have perspective-taking supervisors. Thus, ethical responsibility explains how ethical fading triggered by perspective-taking supervisors affects the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behaviors. In the future, researchers and organizations could assess ethical responsibility to identify whether or not individuals have experienced ethical fading. Moreover, because ethical responsibility explains the ethical fading process, organizations could provide ethical training and guidance to enhance individuals’ acceptance of ethical responsibility to reduce the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behaviors.

Third, I contribute to discussions about the important role of supervisors in individuals’ ethical decisions. Unlike previous research, in which scholars argued that negative leadership practices (e.g., abusive behavior) enhance unethical workplace behaviors by triggering retaliation (e.g. Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007), I proposed that
supervisors who engage in perspective-taking (which is commonly viewed as a positive leadership practice) promote unethical workplace behaviors by confirming individuals’ biased perceptions. The findings demonstrate that perspective-taking supervisors paradoxically facilitate ethical fading among subordinates, resulting in repeated unethical workplace behaviors. Thus, to prevent the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behavior, organizations should pay more attention to biased perceptions and the side effects of perspective-taking supervisors. Specifically, organizations should train perspective-taking supervisors to identify individuals’ attribution bias and take actions to correct these false beliefs.

Limitations and Future Research

Although I addressed common method variance and potential issues of reverse causality by obtaining data related to the variables of interest from different sources at different time intervals, this study is not without limitations. First, I proposed ethical fading as an alternative mechanism that explains the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behaviors. However, because I did not measure moral disengagement, I was not able to compare the effects of moral disengagement and ethical fading, or explore whether these two mechanisms function as complements or substitutes. In the future, researchers should extend this discussion and explore the relationship between these two mechanisms in explaining unethical workplace behaviors, thereby providing a more comprehensive understanding of when and how individuals repeat them.

Second, I only focused on the mechanism of ethical fading. However, scholars have highlighted other mechanisms that may explain the reoccurrence of unethical
workplace behaviors. For example, researchers have argued that individuals tend to misremember their previous behaviors, which enables them to believe that their conduct is consistent with moral standards (Feldman, 2014; Shu et al., 2011). Researchers have also highlighted moral forgetting as another potential mechanism that explains the reoccurrence of unethical workplace behaviors. In the future, researchers could explore moral forgetting and other mechanisms that may be at play.

Third, due to data limitations, I was not able to control for individual differences in personality, such as conscientiousness and emotional stability, which are associated with unethical workplace behaviors (e.g., Egan et al., 2015; Giluk & Postlethwaite, 2015). However, because I focused on the process whereby individuals repeat unethical workplace behaviors rather than antecedents of such behaviors, I posit that when ethical fading is triggered, individuals likely form false beliefs and obscure their ethical responsibilities, regardless of their propensity to engage in unethical workplace behaviors in the first place. Moreover, because there was an insignificant relationship between unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 and ethical responsibility, it relieved the concern that individual differences, such as character flaws, may cause a spurious relationship between unethical workplace behavior and ethical responsibility. Although personality was not a big concern in this study, researchers should take individual personality differences into consideration to rule out alternative explanations for when and how individuals repeat unethical workplace behaviors.

Fourth, I did not explore how the severity of unethical workplace behaviors affects individuals’ subsequent ethical decisions. Researchers have argued that severity affects how people view unethical behaviors (e.g., Umphress & Bingham, 2011); thus
severity likely influences the process whereby individuals choose to repeat their unethical workplace behaviors. For example, unethical behaviors such as sexual harassment are more likely to be identified and punished, providing little opportunity for individuals to obscure causation of their behaviors and engage in ethical fading. Thus, in future research, scholars should consider the severity of unethical workplace behaviors and explore how severity affects their reoccurrence.
CONCLUSION

Integrating insights from ethical fading theory and attribution theory (Kelley, 1967; Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004), I proposed an alternative mechanism that explains when and how individuals repeatedly engage in unethical workplace behaviors. Specifically, I found that by providing individuals who have engaged in unethical workplace behaviors with the cognitive flexibility for biased attribution, perspective-taking supervisors promote ethical fading, which decreases individuals’ ethical responsibility to modify their behaviors, leading to their reoccurrence. Overall, I have contributed to the discussion about repeated unethical workplace behavior and the important role played by supervisors in individuals’ ethical decisions, suggesting that organizations should pay attention to the side effects of perspective-taking supervisors and take actions to enhance individuals’ ethical responsibility to prevent unethical workplace behavior from reoccurring.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Age</td>
<td>24.17</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Tenure</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unethical workplace behavior at Time 1</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ethical responsibility</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unethical workplace behavior at Time 2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>-0.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perspective-taking supervisor</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: **p< .001; *p< .05; †p< .1; N = 313;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Mediator = Ethical responsibility</th>
<th>DV = Unethical workplace behavior at Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.07 (0.30)**</td>
<td>1.17 (0.34)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction (control)</td>
<td>0.20 (0.08)*</td>
<td>0.02 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical workplace behavior at Time 1</td>
<td>-0.14 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.23 (0.09)†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical responsibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.19 (0.07)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: **p<.001; *p<.05; †p<.1; N = 313.
### TABLE 3 Regression Results for the Moderating Role of Perspective-taking Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Ethical responsibility</th>
<th>Unethical behavior at Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.10 (0.25)**</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction (control)</td>
<td>0.14 (0.07)*</td>
<td>0.08 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical workplace behavior at Time 1</td>
<td>-0.16 (0.09)*</td>
<td>0.24 (0.13)†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical responsibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.17 (0.07)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective-taking supervisor</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.09)</td>
<td>-0.05 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical behavior at Time 1 x perspective-taking supervisor</td>
<td>-0.28 (0.12)*</td>
<td>0.14 (0.23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conditional indirect effect of unethical behavior at Time 1 on Time 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>95% LL, UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Perspective-taking supervisor (- 1 SD)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Perspective-taking supervisor (+ 1 SD)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: **p< .001; *p< .05; †p<.1; The 95% confidence intervals for the indirect effects were calculated using bootstrapping method with 5,000 replications.
FIGURE 1 Hypothesized Model

Perspective-taking supervisor

Between-person

Within-person

Unethical workplace behavior at Time 1 → Ethical responsibility → Unethical workplace behavior at Time 2
FIGURE 2 Effects of Interaction Between Unethical Workplace Behavior at Time 1 and Perspective-taking Supervisor on Ethical Responsibility

Unethical workplace behavior x Perspective-taking supervisor on ethical responsibility

- Low workplace unethical behavior at Time 1
- High workplace unethical behavior at Time 1

- High perspective-taking supervisor
- Low perspective-taking supervisor
## APPENDIX

### TABLE 4 ICCs for Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unethical workplace behavior at Time 1</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical workplace behavior at Time 2</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical responsibility</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mplus Code for Table 2

TITLE: Regression for unethical workplace behavior at Time 1, Time 2 and ethical responsibility

DATA: FILE IS ms.csv;

VARIABLE:

   NAMES ARE EEID UB1 UB2 JS EI MRID PERS;
   USEVARIABLES ARE UB1 UB2 JS EI;
   MISSING ARE ALL (999);
   CLUSTER IS MRID;

ANALYSIS:

   TYPE IS COMPLEX;

MODEL:

   EI ON UB1 JS;
   UB2 ON UB1 EI JS;
Mplus Code for Table 3

TITLE: Regression for the Moderating Role of Perspective-taking Supervisor

DATA: FILE IS ms.csv;

VARIABLE:
    NAMES ARE EEID UB1 UB2 JS EI MRID PERS;
    USEVARIABLES ARE UB1 UB2 JS EI PERS Int;
    MISSING ARE ALL (999);
    CLUSTER IS MRID;

DEFINE: CENTER PERS UB1(GRANDMEAN);
    Int = PERS*UB1;

ANALYSIS:
    TYPE IS COMPLEX;

MODEL:
    EI ON UB1(a1);
    EI ON PERS JS;
    EI ON Int (a2);
    UB2 ON EI (b);
    UB2 ON UB1 PERS Int JS;

MODEL CONSTRAINT:
NEW(ind1 ind2);

ind1 = (a1 + a2 * 4.75) * b;

ind2 = (a1 + a2 * 3.62) * b;