

# Adaptation of the Ethical Sales Behavior Scale for Mozambique

Adelino Bernardo Barros José

*PhD Candidate - [adelinojose39@gmail.com](mailto:adelinojose39@gmail.com) –University of Brasilia, Brazil*

Jeanine Ângela Vieira Zagheto

*PhD Candidate - [jeanineangela@gmail.com](mailto:jeanineangela@gmail.com) - University of Brasilia, Brazil*

Juliana Barreiros Porto

*Associate Professor - [jbporto@unb.br](mailto:jbporto@unb.br) –University of Brasilia, Brazil*

## Abstract

**Purpose:** Salespeople are on the front line of organizations and are often the only point of contact between the consumer and the organization. They need, therefore, to behave ethically to build lasting customer-organization relationships. This article aimed to translate, adapt and collect validity evidence for the Ethical Sales Behavior Scale in Mozambique.

**Design/methodology/approach:** Two studies were conducted. The first one focused on exploratory factor analysis using a sample of 198 Mozambican consumers. In the second study, confirmatory factor analysis was performed with a sample of 549 consumers.

**Findings:** Our results indicated good validity evidence for a single-factor structure scale in both samples. The confirmatory factor analysis indicates a CFI = .99; TLI = .98; RMSEA = .06 with adequate reliability indices ( $\alpha = .85$ ,  $\omega = .94$ ). The final scale contains behaviors specific to the Mozambique context, besides those used internationally.

**Research implications:** The scale can be used for the development of research on ethical sales behavior and as a diagnostic tool for organizations in Mozambique as well as in other Portuguese-speaking countries with similar contexts.

**Originality/value:** An original contribution of the study is the development of a scale to measure ethical behavior in the African context, which has been little explored in research in the area. And this instrument is a helpful tool for promoting ethical behavior among sales personnel.

**Keywords:** Ethical sales behavior, Ethics, Factor analysis, Test validity, Mozambique

## Introduction

Sales transactions and actions, which are the closest relational events occurring between a consumer and an organization, have been changing significantly over time due to the increasing demands of consumers and society. Consumer demand for ethical behavior from salespeople is increasing, but salespeople's behavior does not always live up to consumer expectations. There is a mismatch between sales practices and consumer demand, and unethical sales behavior has a negative impact on customers and sales organizations (Madhani, 2014).

A study focused on workplace ethics showed 41% of workers reporting to have witnessed some unethical or illegal behavior at work (Russell et al., 2017). Despite the presence of codes of conduct and employee monitoring systems, ethical failures still emerge (De Cremer & Moore, 2020). Large companies have been affected by this problem. Sears was accused of fraud and had its reputation irreparably damaged, facing a total cost of about \$60 million to settle lawsuits because of unethical behavior by its salespeople. Its automotive service advisers were selling

customers unnecessary service repairs and were accused of overcharging customers. This behavior was shown to be linked to the company's compensation system policy (Madhani, 2014).

On the bright side, business ethics are a part of the ESG (environmental, social, and governance) indicators, and it has been demonstrated that it enhances stakeholders' perceptions and confidence, leading to higher firm values (Mohamad et al., 2020). Also, humane governance (leadership, integrity, religiosity, spirituality, culture, training & development, recruitment & selection, and internal control system) has been linked to the understanding of rules, regulations, and policies of corruption and identification of weaknesses within a system which may contribute opportunities for corruption (Abdullah et al., 2020). A literature review on sales ethical behavior indicates that ethical behavior is positively related to perceived trust, satisfaction, and commitment of customers (Ameer & Halinen, 2019).

Given the relevance of the topic, studies have been dedicated to identifying, mainly, ways that organizations can manage and control the unethical behavior of salespeople (Ameer & Halinen, 2019). Most studies are conducted in the United States (Ameer & Halinen, 2019), especially in Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic countries (Henrich et al., 2010). Few studies are conducted in African countries, where social norms defining what is considered appropriate behavior may differ. In order to expand study and research on consumption and consumer-organization relationships, there is a need for developing research instruments suited to the reality and cultural context in which the research is conducted. One of the first steps toward producing knowledge in the area, therefore, is the development of validated and reliable instruments. The application of scales and questionnaires in a country other than that in which they were developed requires a process of translation, validation, and cross-cultural adaptation to ensure items attain semantic equivalence (Beaton et al., 2000) and psychometric value (Borsa et al., 2012) in the culture where they will be used. Therefore, the study presented in this article aims to adapt to Mozambican Portuguese and to obtain validity evidence for a scale measuring ethical sales behavior based on the work of Román (2003).

Mozambique is a young country that won its independence from Portuguese colonialism 47 years ago, on June 25, 1975. It has an estimated population of about 28 million people, according to the National Institute of Statistics' 2017 census figures. Located in the eastern part of southern Africa, it has Portuguese as its official language. The country has a large cultural diversity, however, and some native languages are more widely spoken as a first language by Mozambicans than the official Portuguese language (Dias, 2010), although Portuguese is understood by all.

Commerce in the country is also diversified due to the mix of Mozambicans and resident foreigners that participated in it. In order to survey and measure sales behavior, we need a psychometric instrument suited to the reality of the people and, consequently, of salespeople in the African context. An adapted instrument will help to conduct robust cross-cultural studies, assess differences between different contexts, and produce a deeper and more meaningful body of knowledge (Lino et al., 2018).

Adapting and validating the ethical sales behavior scale will be useful because it will allow researchers to survey salespeople's behavior and study its antecedents and consequences. Moreover, this may help organization leaders understand the relationship between their sales teams and consumers and thus adopt models that favor the latter.

To that end, the phenomenon will first be defined and then the measure of ethical sales behavior presented. Next, two studies will be discussed. The first describes the adaptation of the Ethical Sales Behavior Scale for Mozambique and provides validity evidence using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). The second provides validity evidence using Confirmatory Factor Analysis

(CFA) with a second sample of participants. After describing the results, this article concludes with a discussion of the study findings, limitations, and overall contributions.

### **(Un)ethical sales behavior**

Ethical behavior in the workplace has been defined as behaviors or decisions consistent with societal norms (and not necessarily with organizational norms) about how to act right at work (Kaptein, 2008; Treviño et al., 2014). Ethical behavior studies rest on the assumption that unethical behavior should be avoided, and ethical behavior encouraged (Treviño et al., 2014). Unethical behaviors are defined as actions and behaviors that employees engage in that deceive or exploit other persons or provide oneself, one's organization, or one's associates with an unfair advantage in the service of some other end (Wiernik & Ones, 2018). Wiernik & Ones suggest that unethical behavior is a component of the set of counterproductive behaviors and that future research should adopt clearer definitions of ethical behavior as well as appropriate measures to assess these definitions. In addition to integrating the concept into work performance models.

Russell et al. (2017) performed a qualitative analysis of literature, codes of ethics and critical incidents to propose 10 behavioral dimensions of ethical performance at work: truthfulness (does not knowingly provide wrong or inaccurate information), conflict of interest (avoids or overtly acknowledges potential conflicts of interest), intellectual property (does not violate the intellectual property rights of others), confidentiality (maintains appropriate confidentiality), unfair treatment (does not provide an unfair advantage to self or others via), defamation of others (does not maliciously harm the reputation, work, or performance of others), workplace bullying (does not subject others to physical or psychological harassment), whistleblowing (reports maliciousness, harmful, or unlawful behavior to the appropriate authority), abuse of power (uses own position power to coerce others) and respect for rules (does not violate laws or agreements). They define ethical behavior as those that violate prescribed norms based on the code of ethical work conduct and that cause harm to any of the organization's stakeholders. Furthermore, the authors propose that the ethical dimension be added to Campbell's (2012) work performance model. Therefore, ethical behaviors are an integral part of work performance and should be considered in any performance assessment.

Ethical sales behavior toward customers (ESB) can be defined as fair and honest actions that enable the salesperson to foster long-term relationships with customers based on customer satisfaction, trust, and loyalty (Madhani, 2014). It refers to salespeople who gain sales orders by following the social norms of fair play, honesty, and full disclosure (Wu, 2017). By contrast, unethical sales behavior is defined as a short-run salesperson's conduct that enables them to gain at the expense of the customer (Román & Ruiz, 2005), which is thus in agreement with the broad definition of unethical behavior in the workplace. Some examples of ethical sales behavior are the following: selling products that meet customer needs; giving truthful information about the product (for example, in comparison with competitors' products, or in terms of product benefits or availability); and using low-pressure selling techniques (Chonko & Burnett, 1983; Lagace et al., 1991; Reidenbach et al., 1991; Singhapakdi et al., 1999; Tansey et al., 1994; Verbeke et al., 1996). The most common unethical behavior identified in the literature are offering bribes and gifts and exaggerating or overpromising are widely identified as unethical activities (Ameer & Halinen, 2019).

When the consumer perceives a salesperson's behavior as ethical, this perception is generalized to the entire organization (Lin, 2011). Moreover, a salesperson's ethical behavior can establish a successful relationship with the customer, thus attaining customer satisfaction and trust (Alrubaie, 2012; Legace et al., 1999; Román & Ruiz, 2005; Vesel & Zabkar, 2009). Customers tend to identify with the organization and maintain their relationship when the organization is

perceived as ethical (Ahearne et al., 2005). The greater the customers' perception of the salesperson's ESB, the greater the customer's satisfaction, trust, and loyalty to the organization (Mansouri et al., 2022; Román, 2003).

Studies indicate that promoting ethical behavior in organizations depends on both individual and organizational characteristics (De Cremer & Moore, 2020; Treviño et al., 2014). In the case of ESB, the compensation and control systems have a significant impact. Compensation systems with a higher percentage of fixed salary versus sales commissions promote ethical behaviors, as well as behavior-based control systems in which managers look at how goals are reached (Román & Munuera, 2005). Also, middle managers can create routines to induce their frontline subordinates to engage in unethical behavior (den Nieuwenboer et al., 2017).

ESB relationships with other variables are fundamental for improving the business environment, for both organizations and consumers. This understanding has underlain ESB studies. And it is the development of measures of ESB that enables the research upon which salespeople's practices rest.

### **Measures of ESB**

Research in ESB mainly uses the scale developed by Román (2003). To develop the scale, the author conducted a literature review and in-depth interviews with 10 financial services consumers in Spain. The first version was tested on a sample of 249 consumers, with results used to improve the scale. The final scale was then applied to 630 consumers. The ESB scale was composed of 5 items assessed by 10-point multiple-item questions, which ranged from "1=never" to "10=always." The scale was evaluated through a confirmatory factor analysis that indicated that the ethical sales behavior factor had a coefficient alpha for reliability of .88. Results for the scale constructs were acceptable, with ESB positively correlated with consumer satisfaction, trust, and loyalty to the organization (Román, 2003). The factor loadings reported in a later study ranged from .72 to .82 and the composite reliability showed a value of .67 (Román & Ruiz, 2005).

The original or adapted versions of the scale were used in later studies, showing acceptable levels for psychometric properties and confirming the single-factor structure (Alrubaiee, 2012; Chen & Mau, 2009; Hansen & Riggle, 2009; Ou et al., 2015; Pezhman et al., 2013; Román & Ruiz, 2005; Wu, 2017). Because it is the most widely used scale to assess ESB and has shown positive validity evidence, this instrument was selected.

### **Study 1: Adaptation of the scale and collection of validity evidence**

The study aims to adapt the Ethical Sales Behavior Scale - ESBS (Román & Ruiz 2005) to the Portuguese spoken in Mozambique, as well as to collect initial validity evidence through exploratory factor analysis.

### **Method**

#### **Instrument**

The first step was to translate the ESBS into the Portuguese spoken in Mozambique. To that end, the methodology proposed by Borsa et al. (2012) was used and a back-translation was carried out, in which the scale's translated version was sent to two native specialists who performed the back-translation into English. The versions were compared by the authors of this study and no significant differences were identified between them.

To assess whether the scale is suited to the Mozambican context, 31 interviews were conducted with Mozambican salespersons and consumers. One of the interview questions asked interviewees to give examples of unethical sales behavior. Analysis of these examples indicated the suitability of the original scale items. All behaviors included in the scale were also presented

in the interviews, demonstrating a good understanding of the scale items in this context. In addition to the original scale items, another 6 items representing unethical sales behaviors that might occur in Mozambique were created. Next, these items were submitted to semantic analysis and evaluation by judges (Pasquali, 1999). The new items created were the following: *This salesperson tries to convince the customer to buy a low-priced product outside the establishment; This salesperson refuses to replace a defective product even though I have shown the purchase receipt and it is still within the warranty period; This salesperson allows his/her acquaintances or those he/she considers most important to skip the checkout line; This salesperson makes you pay an additional fee to the product price for you to pay with a debit card.* Two expert judges participated in this evaluation, with each one evaluating the 6 proposed items, of which 2 were excluded and 4 approved. A final 9-item list was obtained, with each item measured by a 5-point multiple-item scale, ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” It should be noted that the scale assesses negative behaviors, that is, unethical behaviors. Therefore, the greater the score, the greater the customers’ perception of the salesperson’s unethical behavior.

### **Sample**

The study sample consisted of 198 participants who indicated having purchased in the last six months, most were male (72.2%), single (57.1%), with some higher education (32.8%), and with an average age of 34.1 years ( $SD = 10.0$ ). Regarding the participants’ country of origin, 98.5% were Mozambicans. Other nationalities mentioned were: Angolan, Congolese, and Somali.

### **Data collection and analysis**

Data were collected from January to May 2022 with Mozambican participants who signed an Informed Consent Form. The questionnaire was applied using Google Forms and the link to the electronic form was disseminated through email lists and social networks, using the snowball technique. Regarding inclusion criteria, the study sample included only individuals who had purchased tangible goods 6 months before the date of the questionnaire application. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used in the descriptive analysis and to test the analysis assumptions. An Exploratory Factor Analysis was performed using the Factor software. The analysis was performed using a polychoric correlation matrix and the Robust Diagonally Weighted Least Squares (RDWLS) extraction method. A Parallel Analysis approach with a random permutation of the observed data was used to identify the number of factors to be retained (Timmerman & Lorenzo-Seva, 2011), and Promin was used for the rotation of retained factors (Lorenzo-Seva, 1999). All items should have factor loadings above .39 to remain in the analysis (Hair et al., 2009).

Model adequacy checking was performed using the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) and the Root Mean Square of Residuals (RMSR). Fit indices should present values below .05 for RMSR and above .90 for GFI (Brown, 2015). In addition, the adequacy or non-adequacy of a single-factor model was verified using Unidimensional Congruence (UniCo), Explained Common Variance (ECV), and Mean of Item Residual Absolute Loadings (MIREAL). The model is considered adequate for a single-factor structure if UniCo > .95, ECV > .85, and MIREAL < .30 (Ferrando & Lorenzo-Seva, 2018). The internal consistency of the factors was assessed using Cronbach’s Alpha and McDonald’s Omega coefficients.

### **Results**

Item normality was assessed using descriptive analysis and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests. Results indicated a non-normal distribution of the items. Bootstrapping

showed that average responses for the items are within the 95% confidence interval, thus indicating a normal distribution.

Mahalanobis Distance was used to assess the multivariate outliers (26.125, df 8,  $p < .001$ ). Only 1 case was found above the cutoff set by the chi-square critical values table, thus it was decided not to exclude the cases from the sample. No multicollinearities were found between the items, with correlations ranging from .28 to .52. No missing values were found.

Bartlett's (976.1, df = 36,  $p < 0.001$ ) and KMO (0.88) tests of sphericity suggested the interpretability of the items' correlation matrix. Parallel analysis suggested a single-factor structure as the best fit for the data. The instrument's fit indices were adequate (RMSR = 0.06; GFI = 1.00). The single-factor structure was confirmed (UniCo = 0.98; ECV = 0.88; MIREAL = 0.23). The final structure has 9 items with an explained variance percentage of 64.6%. Table 1 shows the factor loadings of the items and the internal consistency coefficients.

Results indicated good psychometric indicators for the scale, which was used in Study 2 without changes.

Table 1: ESBS Exploratory Factor Analysis Results

Item	Factor Loading
1. This salesperson lies about the availability of products in order to make a sale.	0.65
2. This salesperson lies about the competition in order to make the sale.	0.76
3. This salesperson gives answers when he/she doesn't really know the answers.	0.74
4. This salesperson applies sales pressure on the consumer to sell a product even though he/she knows it is not right for me.	0.70
5. This salesperson paints rosy pictures of the products to make them sound as good as possible.	0.82
6. This salesperson tries to convince the customer to buy a low-priced product outside the establishment.	0.62
7. This salesperson refuses to replace a defective product even though I have shown the purchase receipt and it is still within the warranty period.	0.76
8. This salesperson allows his/her acquaintances or those he/she considers most important to skip the checkout line.	0.72
9. This salesperson makes you pay an additional fee for the product if you pay with a debit card.	0.77
<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	0.90
<i>Omega</i>	0.90

### Study 2: Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Ethical Sales Behavior Scale

Study 2 aimed to replicate the findings of Study 1 in a new sample with different data collection techniques and collect validity and reliability evidence for the scale using confirmatory factor analysis.

#### Method

##### Sample

The study sample consisted of 549 consumers present at a point of sale. Of the participants, 56.6% were male, 68.8% were single, 27% were married and 4.2% were separated, with an

average age of 28.5 years ( $SD = 9.8$ ). Regarding education, 67.7% reported having higher education, 29.7% secondary education, and 2.6% a master's or a doctoral degree. With respect to country of origin, 98.2% were Mozambican and the other 1.8% were Nigerian or Russian.

### Instrument

In addition to the adapted Ethical Sales Behavior Scale (ESBS) described in Study 1, demographic data were collected to characterize the sample.

### Data collection and analysis

Data was collected by approaching consumers who had finalized a purchase at a point of sale of home appliances. The study's main researcher approached and invited consumers to participate in the study. The research objective was then explained, namely, to evaluate consumer experience just after a purchase has been finalized. Consumers who agreed to participate in the study answered the questionnaire anonymously. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to conduct descriptive analysis and test its assumptions. A Confirmatory Factor Analysis was performed using the JAPS software to assess the plausibility of a single-factor structure for the Ethical Sales Behavior Scale and the Robust Diagonally Weighted Least Squares (RDWLS) estimation method, suitable for categorical data (DiStefano & Morgan, 2014; Li, 2016). Items should present factor loadings above .39 to be included in the analysis (Hair et al., 2009).

Model adequacy was assessed using the fit indices:  $\chi^2$ ;  $\chi^2/df$ ; Comparative Fit Index (CFI); and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI). Values for  $\chi^2$  should not be significant; the  $\chi^2/df$  ratio should be less than 5 or, preferably, below 3. CFI and TLI values should be greater than .95. Residuals were analyzed using the Standardized Root Mean Residual (SRMR) and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) fit indices. SRMS values should be less than .05 and RMSEA values below .08 or, preferably, below .06, with a confidence interval (upper limit) below .10 (Brown, 2015). Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha and McDonald's Omega coefficients.

### Results

The database was examined to verify whether all analysis assumptions were met. Initially, descriptive and exploratory statistical analyses were conducted to assess the accuracy of data entry and distribution, as well as missing and extreme cases. Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were performed to assess item normality. Results pointed to a non-normal distribution of items. Bootstrapping showed that average responses for the items are within the 95% confidence interval, thus indicating a normal distribution.

Assessment of the single-factor structure showed satisfactory results, as shown in Table 2. The chi-square value was significant, but the chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio showed a value within the acceptable range indicated by the literature. CFI, TLI, SRMR, and RMSEA indices supported the model. The proposed single-factor structure with 9 items fitted the data well, with an explained variance of 46.3% and a value of .85 for Cronbach's Alpha and .94 for the Omega coefficient. Values for factor loadings ranged from .53 to .80, as shown in Table 3.

Table 2: Fit indices for the ESBS single-factor model

$\chi^2$ (df)	$\chi^2/df$	CFI	TLI	SRMR	RMSEA (90% CI)
85.81 (27)**	3.17	0.99	0.98	0.05	0.06 (0.04 – 0.07)

$\chi^2$  = chi-square;  $df$  = degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CI = confidence interval; \*\*  $p < 0.001$ .

Table 3:ESBS structure and loadings with confidence intervals for confirmatory factor analysis

Item	Factor Loading	CI 95%	
		(LL)	(UL)
1. This salesperson lies about the availability of products in order to make a sale.	0.53	0.46	0.60
2. This salesperson lies about the competition in order to make the sale.	0.61	0.55	0.68
3. This salesperson gives answers when he/she doesn't really know the answers.	0.66	0.60	0.72
4. This salesperson applies sales pressure on the consumer to sell a product even though he/she knows it is not right for me.	0.74	0.69	0.79
5. This salesperson paints rosy pictures of the products to make them sound as good as possible.	0.75	0.70	0.80
6. This salesperson tries to convince the customer to buy a low-priced product outside the establishment.	0.66	0.60	0.72
7. This salesperson refuses to replace a defective product even though I have shown the purchase receipt and it is still within the warranty period.	0.78	0.73	0.83
8. This salesperson allows his/her acquaintances or those he/she considers most important to skip the checkout line.	0.80	0.76	0.85
9. This salesperson makes you pay an additional fee for the product if you pay with a debit card.	0.70	0.64	0.75

CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.

### Discussion

Studies 1 and 2 examined validity evidence for the ESBS for a sample from Mozambique. Assessment of single-factor structure showed satisfactory results for both studies. Model testing in Study 2 showed a significant chi-square value, but the chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio showed a value within the acceptable range indicated by the literature (Brown, 2015). CFI, TLI, SRMR, and RMSEA indices supported the model. Reliability indices were also adequate, with all scale items retained in the final model.

The scale includes unethical behaviors that are in line with the definition presented by Wu (2017) and Román and Ruiz (2005), who define unethical sales behavior as a short-run salesperson's conduct that enables them to gain at the expense of the customer. This kind of behavior allows salespeople to obtain unfair advantages for themselves or their organization to the detriment of consumer well-being. Our results show evidence of item adequacy in terms of representing the concept of unethical sales behavior in research and diagnostic instruments. Moreover, our results support the use of the ESBS developed by Román (2003) in different research contexts.

Considering the dimensions of ethical performance at work (Russell et al., 2017), the revised scale includes behaviors that reflect truthfulness, unfair treatment, and rule-abiding. But other dimensions that could be applied to this profession were not included as conflict of interest, and confidentiality. Future research could expand the behaviors assessed to include these dimensions.



### **Limitations and Further Research**

One of the major challenges regarding measures of ethical behavior refers to the effect of social desirability (Randall & Fernandes, 1991). After detecting the effect of desirability in ethical behavior research, Randall and Fernandes suggest alternatives to reduce this effect: the use of randomized response methods, forced-choice items, proxy subjects (another person or group of people), or computer administration. When these alternatives are not viable, they suggest controlling or partializing out the effects of social desirability. Thus, it is important to control the effect of social desirability when using this scale. On the other hand, the ESBS uses hetero evaluation (consumers evaluate salespeople's behavior), which can reduce this effect. However, it would be important to examine in future studies whether this problem is also present in the hetero evaluation of salespeople.

Another limitation refers to the adequacy of the behaviors to represent the concept of ethical sales behavior. To develop this scale, we adopted previous scales that were developed in the literature and interviews with customers and sales personnel, but other behaviors could have been included as mentioned above. And other techniques could permit a more in-depth comprehension of the phenomena. Finally, this scale can only be used by educated people who can understand the instructions and items.

Although the use of the scale has shown very promising results, it is worth highlighting the need to constantly improve the scale's psychometric indicators. Further research focusing on predictive and concurrent validity evidence is desirable. As the literature states and other studies tested (Alrubaie, 2012; Legace et al., 1999; Román & Ruiz, 2005; Vesel & Zabkar, 2009), it would be of great interest to investigate whether the scale predicts consumer satisfaction and loyalty.

### **Conclusion**

This study aimed to adapt to Mozambican Portuguese and collect validity evidence for an ethical sales behavior scale (Román, 2003). Analysis results for two different samples, using different forms of data collection (online and face-to-face), indicated the suitability of the single-factor model and of the items developed to assess ethical sales behavior. Our results also show that the scale, initially developed to evaluate financial products in Spain, is adequate to evaluate tangible products in the Mozambican context and represents salespeople's common behaviors, allowing its application to different sales contexts.

In conclusion, our results support the use of the scale for applied and research purposes in the Mozambican context, thus enabling knowledge production and the enhancement of ethical behavior in organizations, benefiting consumers and society at large. Additionally, improving ethical behavior in society is a goal of the UN 2030 agenda. The possibility of assessing ESB allows managers and professionals to develop mechanisms for monitoring and training salespeople with a focus on organizational ethics. An original contribution of the study is the development of a scale for the African context, which has been little explored in research in the area. It can also be applied to other Portuguese-speaking settings.

### **Acknowledgements**

Authors acknowledge the financial support through CNPq (Grant Number: 306853/2021-3) and CAPES.

**References**

- Abdullah, W. M. T. W., Daud, S., & Hanapiyah, Z. M. (2020). Human governance and corruption risk in Malaysia public sector. *Global Business and Management Research. An International Journal*, 12(4), 721–731.
- Ahearne, M., Mathieu, J., & Rapp, A. (2005). To Empower or Not to Empower Your Sales Force? An Empirical Examination of the Influence of Leadership Empowerment Behavior on Customer Satisfaction and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 945–955. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.945>
- Alrubaiee, L. (2012). Exploring the relationship between ethical sales behavior, relationship quality, and customer loyalty. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 4 (1), 7-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v4n1p7>
- Ameer, I., & Halinen, A. (2019). Moving beyond ethical decision-making: a practice-based view to study unethical sales behavior. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 39(2), 103–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2018.1544077>
- Borsa, J. C., Damásio, B. F., & Bandeira, D. R. (2012). Adaptação e validação de instrumentos psicológicos entre culturas: algumas considerações. *Paidéia (Ribeirão Preto)*, 22 (53), 423-432. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-863X2012000300014>
- Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine*, 25(24), 3186-3191. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014>
- Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Applied Research* (2nd Ed). Guilford Press.
- Chen, Mei-Fang & Mau, Liang-Hung (2009). The impacts of ethical sales behaviour on customer loyalty in the life insurance industry. *The Service Industries Journal*, 29 (1), 59–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642060802116339>
- Chonko, L. B., & Burnett, J. J. (1983). Measuring the importance of ethical situations as a source of role conflict: A survey of salespeople, sales managers, and sales support personnel. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 3(1), 41-47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.1983.10754347>
- De Cremer, D., & Moore, C. (2020). Toward a better understanding of behavioral ethics in the workplace. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 7(1), 369–393. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015151>
- den Nieuwenboer, N. A., Cunha, J. V. da, & Treviño, L. K. (2017). Middle Managers and Corruptive Routine Translation: The Social Production of Deceptive Performance. *Organization Science*, 28(5), 781–803. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2017.1153>
- Dias, H. N. (2010). Diversidade cultural e educação em Moçambique. *V!RUS (São Carlos)*, 4, 1-15.
- DiStefano, C., Morgan, G. B. (2014). A Comparison of Diagonal Weighted Least Squares Robust Estimation Techniques for Ordinal Data. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 21(3), 425-438. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2014.915373>
- Ferrando, P. J., & Lorenzo-Seva U. (2018). Assessing the quality and appropriateness of factor solutions and factor score estimates in exploratory item factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 78 (5), 762-780. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164417719308>
- Hair, J. F. J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2009). *Análise multivariada de dados*. Bookman.
- Hansen, John D., & Riggle, Robert J. (2009). Ethical salesperson behaviour in sales relationships. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 29 (1), 151–166. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02642060802116339>

- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral & Brain Sciences*, 33(2-3), 61–83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Kaptein, M. (2008). Developing a measure of unethical behavior in the workplace: A stakeholder perspective. *Journal of Management*, 34 (5), 978–1008. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308318614>
- Lagace, R. R. (1991). An Exploratory Study of Reciprocal Trust between Sales Managers and Salespersons. *The Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 11(2), 49–58. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40472020>
- Li, C. H. (2016). Confirmatory factor analysis with ordinal data: Comparing robust maximum likelihood and diagonally weighted least squares. *Behavioral Research Methods*, 48(3), 936–49. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0619-7>
- Lin, J. Y. (2011). New structural economics: A framework for rethinking development. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 26(2), 193–221. <https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkr007>
- Lino, C. R. D. M., Brüggemann, O. M., Souza, M. D. L. D., Barbosa, S. D. F. F., & Santos, E. K. A. D. (2018). Adaptação transcultural de instrumentos de pesquisa conduzida pela enfermagem do Brasil: uma revisão integrativa. *Texto & Contexto-Enfermagem*, 26(4), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0104-07072017001730017>
- Lorenzo-Seva, U. (1999). Promin: a method for oblique factor rotation. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 34(3), 347–356. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3403\\_3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3403_3)
- Mansouri, H., Boroujerdi, S. S., & Husin, M. M. (2022). The influence of sellers' ethical behaviour on customer's loyalty, satisfaction and trust. *Spanish Journal of Marketing-ESIC*, (ahead-of-print).
- Madhani, P. M. (2014). Compensation, ethical sales behavior and customer lifetime value. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 46(4), 204–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886368714560286>
- Mohamad, N. E. A. B. (2020). Do Environmental , Social , and Governance Practices ( ESG ) Signify Firm Value ? Evidence from FTSE4Good Bursa Malaysia ( F4GBM ). *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*, 12(4), 365–376.
- Ou, W. M., Shih, C. M., & Chen, C. Y. (2015). Effects of ethical sales behaviour on satisfaction, trust, commitment, retention and words-of-mouth. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 25(4), 673–686. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCoMA-04-2013-0040>
- Pasquali, L. (1999). *Instrumentos psicológicos: Manual prático de elaboração*. Brasília: LabPAM & IBAPP.
- Pezhman, R., Javadi, M. H. M., & Shahin, A. (2013). Analyzing the influence of ethical sales behavior on customers loyalty through customer satisfaction and trust in insurance company. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(9), 754–763. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v3-i9/266>
- Randall, D. M., & Fernandes, M. F. (1991). The social desirability response bias in ethics research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10, 805–817. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00383696>
- Reidenbach, R. E., and Robin, D. P. (1991), A conceptual model of corporate moral development. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10, 273–284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00382966>
- Román, S. (2003). The Impact of Ethical Sales Behaviour on Customer Satisfaction, Trust and Loyalty to the Company: An Empirical Study in the Financial Services Industry. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 19(9-10), 915–939. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0267257x.2003.9728245>

- Román, S., & Munuera, J. L. (2005). Determinants and consequences of ethical behaviour: an empirical study of salespeople. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39 (5/6), 473-495. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03090560510590674>
- Román, S., & Ruiz, S. (2005). Relationship outcomes of perceived ethical sales behavior: the customer's perspective. *Journal of business research*, 58(4), 439-445. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2003.07.002>
- Russell, T. L., Sparks, T. E., Campbell, J. P., Handy, K., Ramsberger, P., & Grand, J. A. (2017). Situating ethical behavior in the nomological network of job performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32(3), 253–271. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-016-9454-9>
- Singhapakdi, A., Vitell, S. J., & Franke, G. R. (1999). Antecedents, consequences, and mediating effects of perceived moral intensity and personal moral philosophies. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 27(1), 19-36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070399271002>
- Tansey, R., Brown, G., Hyman, M. R., & Dawson, L. E. (1994). Personal Moral Philosophies and the Moral Judgments of Salespeople. *The Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 14(1), 59–75. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40471518>
- Timmerman, M. E., & Lorenzo-Seva, U. (2011). Dimensionality assessment of ordered polytomous items with parallel analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 16(2), 209-220. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023353>
- Treviño, L. K., den Nieuwenboer, N., & Kish-Gephart, J. J. (2014). (Un)ethical behavior in organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 635–60. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143745>
- Verbeke, W., Ouwerkerk, C., & Peelen, E. (1996). Exploring the contextual and individual factors on ethical decision making of salespeople. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(11), 1175-1187. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00412816>
- Vesel, P., & Zabkar, V. (2009). Managing customer loyalty through the mediating role of satisfaction in the DIY retail loyalty program. *Journal of Retailing and consumer Services*, 16(5), 396-406. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2009.05.002>
- Wiernik, B. M., & Ones, D. S. (2018). Ethical employee behaviors in the consensus taxonomy of counterproductive work behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 26(1), 36–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12199>
- Wu, Y. C. (2017). Mechanisms Linking Ethical Leadership to Ethical Sales Behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 120(3), 537–560. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294117693594>