

Spheres of Influence on Students' Ethical Decision Making

Nancy J. Niles
Karie A. Barbour

Abstract

Our study contributes to the literature that explores whether age, gender, and various spheres of influence (religious principles, family values, educational training, workplace environment and peer interactions) affect perceptions of individual ethical behavior. We administered a business ethics survey to undergraduate students at a public undergraduate university in West Virginia. All respondents were asked to agree or disagree with twenty business ethics behavioral vignettes using a 4-point Likert type scale. In addition to these responses, we collected demographic information including gender, age, marital status, and academic major. Respondents were also asked to rank their personal spheres of influence: family, friends, religion, education and work environment. They were also required to categorize themselves as "religious" or "not religious". The results of multivariate ordered probit models indicated that spheres of influence do have statistically significant marginal impacts on ethical decision making and that females, religious students and older students are more likely to engage in ethical behavior.

Keywords: spheres of influence, business ethics, religion, gender, age

Introduction

There have been multiple decades of academic research attempting to determine why or why not unethical decision making occurs in the business environment. Business ethics courses have been integrated into both undergraduate and graduate business education curricula, and codes of ethics and ethics training have been implemented in organizations, and yet huge business scandals continue to occur. These continued business scandals have lead researchers to investigate what demographic factors such as age, gender or spheres of influence such as religion, workplace environment, peers, legal system family and community impact individual ethical decision.

The literature review indicates that several studies have previously investigated the impact of age and gender on individual ethical decision making (Kohut and Corriher, 1994; Borkowski and Urgas, 1998; McDevitt and Hise, 2002; Conroy and Emerson, 2004; O'Fallon and Butterfield, 2005; Spake, Megehee and Franke, 2007; Eweje and Brunton, 2009; Gill, 2009; Sharma, 2009; and Bampton and Maclagan, 2009). Several studies also investigated the spheres of influence that had an impact on ethical decision making (Sheidahl 1986; Donaldson and Preston, 1995; Bommer, Gratto, Gravander and Tuttle, 1987; Rawwas and Isakson, 2000; Andolson, 1997; Weaver and Agle, 2002; Parboteeah, Hoegl and Cullen, 2007; Lowery and Beadles, 2009; Kum-Lung and Teck-Chai, 2010). The following section discusses the current literature in those two areas of research.

Discussion of Current Literature

McDevitt and Hise (2002) survey research recognizes several spheres of influence on ethical decision making, indicating that 80 percent of the respondents were impacted by workplace policy, 75 percent were impacted by family influences, while only 60 percent were impacted by religion and community. Sharma (2009) survey results indicate that as age increases, workers become more ethical. Eweje and Burton (2010) further evaluated the impact of age on ethical deci-

sion making. Based on the results of their survey, the older students appeared to be more ethically aware than students in the 16-20 and 21-25 ranges. Their results also indicated that in some instances, age did not have a positive impact on ethical behavior but increased work experience did.

In terms of gender, Conroy and Emerson's (2004) survey research finds that male respondents were more accepting of unethical decision making and that females were, in general, more ethical than males. O'Fallon and Butterfield (2005) and Bampton and Maclagan (2009) research supports the idea that women may be more ethical in certain situations. Gill (2009) performed a student survey in India, the results of which show that females scored higher on ethical issues such as employees' rights and justice. These results support Gilligan's (2009) research which indicates that females are more focused on the relationship impact of ethical situations. Kum-Lung and Teck-Chai (2010) survey indicated, however, that there was no significant difference between male and female attitudes towards business ethics.

Andolson (1997) indicated that religion has a positive influence on ethical decision making. Conroy and Emerson (2004) support that religion positively impacts individual ethical attitudes; however, they also find that taking a religion course does not affect ethical perceptions. Parboteeah, Hoegl, and Cullen (2007) indicated there was a positive relationship between religion and ethical decision making. Lowery and Beadles (2009) indicated that those survey respondents who considered themselves religious would typically have a strong reaction to unethical behavior inside and outside of the work environment. Kum-Lung and Teck-Chai (2010) also discussed the influence of self-identification of religiosity with ethical behavior. Those who self-identified as religious had a positive attitude towards business ethics. There were few studies that focused on family influence on ethical behavior. Rawwas and Isakson (2000) developed a behavior model of spheres of influence which indicate that small family size has a positive impact on ethical decision making be-

cause parents have more time to teach values to their children.

Based on the literature review, we explored whether age, gender, religion, and family influences have a positive or negative impact on an individual's perception of what qualifies as unethical behavior. We developed three research questions to assess these influences on student behavior: Are students who self-identify as religious more likely to make ethical decisions than students who are not religious? Which sphere of influence has the most impact on ethical decisions: religion, family, education, work, or friends? Do these results differ across gender?

Survey Implementation

A business ethics survey (Appendix) was administered to undergraduate business students at a public undergraduate university in West Virginia. The responses were voluntary and anonymous. All respondents were asked to respond to 20 business ethics vignettes using a 4-point Likert-type scale of "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," or "strongly disagree." Demographic information was requested of each respondent which included age, marital status, academic major, number of children, country of citizenship, and if they considered themselves religious. The respondents were also asked to rank their personal spheres of influence: family, friends, religion, education and work environment as "1" for most influential to "5" for the least influential on their ethical behavior.

Summary Statistics

The average response and standard deviation for each of the twenty vignettes are presented in Table I. Recall that the survey responses to each ethics vignette are measured on a 4-point Likert-type scale with the following numerical assignments: Strongly Agree = 1, Agree = 2, Disagree = 3 and Strongly Disagree = 4. Therefore each vignette would have a mean of 2.5 if responses are uniformly distributed. The larger the mean response, the less ethical the scenario is deemed to be by survey participants.

Only two vignettes, 13 (pretending to be sick) and 17 (violating privacy rules), have mean responses that are not statistically significantly different from 2.5 at the 5 percent significance level. Students were evenly torn between being loyal to a family member and following company policy in vignette 17, suggesting perhaps that the ethical decision in this scenario would depend on an individual's perspective. Vignette 13 presents a very familiar situation to students who have ever pretended to be sick to skip school, so it is not surprising that fewer students consider this to be unethical behavior.

Vignette 2 (finding \$1 and keeping it) has a mean of 2.37 which is statistically significantly lower than the uniform mean of 2.5 at the 5 percent level. Again, students may have been in a familiar situation in this scenario. Who hasn't found a dollar and kept it? All other vignettes have mean responses that are statistically significantly higher than 2.5 at the 5 percent level, indicating that on average survey respondents considered the actions described in these scenarios to be unethical to some degree. Vignettes 4 (borrowing from the cash register) and 10 (unannounced business closings) have the largest means, 3.65 and 3.69 respectively.

Table II (p. 12) presents the descriptive statistics of the 222 students who participated in the survey. Participants were fairly evenly split among genders (females – 48.9 percent, males - 51.1 percent). The average participant was 24.2 years of age, religious (75.7 percent), single (86.1 percent), and a business major

(91.4 percent). Despite the fact that a large majority of students indicated a religious status, family was most often identified as the number one sphere of influence on ethical behavior with 65.2 percent of students in this category. Religion was a distant second with 23.7 percent of students in this category. Education, friends, and work all had fewer than 5 percent of students identifying them as their most important source of ethical behavior respectively, representing the remaining 11 percent of survey participants. As a result, students who selected these last three spheres as their number one influence are lumped together in the sphere of influence labeled "other" in the analysis that follows. In total, 22 students selected these options as their number one sphere of influence. The individual sample sizes of 8, 8, and 6 respectively were too small to obtain statistically reliable results.

Table I Summary statistics for responses to vignette

Vignette	Mean	SD	N
1 Oversees unfair labor practices	3.23	0.77	220
2 Finding \$1	2.37	0.88	219
3 Finding \$100	3.03	0.85	219
4 Borrowing from cash register	3.65	0.66	220
5 Bookstores resells free books	2.97	0.85	220
6 Accepting money from clients	2.82	0.80	209
7 Claiming credit for an idea	3.51	0.57	219
8 Gender wage discrimination	3.52	0.60	217
9 CEO bonuses	3.55	0.59	217
10 Unannounced business closing	3.69	0.51	217
11 Unauthorized computer use	2.74	0.69	216
12 Padding travel expenses	3.22	0.66	215
13 Pretending to be sick	2.60	0.77	217
14 Stealing office supplies	3.02	0.66	217
15 Software piracy	3.02	0.73	217
16 Failing to report coworker	3.45	0.62	216
17 Violating privacy rules	2.50	0.92	216
18 Consuming alcohol at lunch	3.09	0.82	218
19 Padding overtime hours	3.21	0.68	218
20 Failing to report sexual harassment	3.40	0.65	217

The final columns of table II show that there are significant differences in the characteristics of survey participants across genders. Most notably, females were more likely to identify themselves as religious and to select religion as the number one sphere of influence for beliefs on ethics. Over 82 percent of females identified themselves as religious compared to only 69 percent of males. While family was the most popular sphere of influence for both genders, only 58 percent of females selected it as number one compared to 72 percent of males. Conversely, 33 percent of females selected religion as their number one sphere compared to only 13.8 percent of males. Females were also more likely to be married than males and were slightly less likely to be business majors.

Additional summary statistics presented in Tables III and IV (p. 13) attempt to isolate the effects of religion and the spheres of influence from the effects of gender on perspectives of ethics. The results in Table III summarize the responses of only the female survey participants across the three spheres of influence categories. The last two columns of the table provide the results of separate chi-square statistical tests for independence and the corresponding Cramer's V statistic to adjust for the influence of different sample sizes across the selected spheres. Cramer's V

Table II: Descriptive statistics of survey participants

n= 222	Overall (%)	Female (%)	Male (%)
Gender			
Female	48.9		
Male	51.1		
Religious			
Yes	75.7	82.3	69.4
No	24.3	17.7	30.6
#1 Sphere of Influence			
Education	4.0	3.9	4.3
Family	65.2	58.3	72.3
Friends	3.0	1.9	4.3
Religion	23.7	33.0	13.8
Work	4.0	2.9	5.3
Academic Major			
Business	91.4	89.4	93.5
Non-business	8.6	10.6	6.5
Marital status			
Married	13.9	18.0	9.6
Single	86.1	82.0	90.4
Age			
Mean	24.2	24.8	23.5
Std.dev.	7.47	8.28	6.51

measures the degree of association between the two categorical variables, and ranges from 0 to 1. Larger values indicate a stronger relationship. A value of 0.1 typically provides a good minimum threshold for suggesting there is a substantive relationship. Table III reports only the vignettes in which statistically significant results were found. Here the chi-squared test identifies the results for two vignettes as statistically significant at the 10 percent level (2 and 14) and two other vignettes (11 and 15) have statistically significant results at the 5 percent level. Females who rank religion as their number one sphere were less likely to approve of keeping a dollar found on the floor. This is not surprising because 'thou shalt not steal' is common in religious beliefs. However, in the other three significant scenarios, females who ranked education, friends, or work (Other) as their number one sphere were more likely to consider the behaviors described in the vignettes as unethical. Interestingly, when we conducted a similar set of test for males, none of the vignettes show statistically significant results across spheres of influence and are therefore not included in this table. This supports the research indicating females' recognition of the importance of ethical behavior.

When we examine the average responses and chi-square test results across religious identities in Table IV, we see that three scenarios turned out to be statistically significant for females. Females who consider themselves to be religious are more likely to find the behavior unethical in vignette 7 (taking credit for a colleague's idea) and 18 (drinking during lunch against company policy). However, females who are not religious are more likely to find the behavior described in vignette 1 (unfair labor practices) as unethical. This seems to support the findings in previous literature that females consider discrimination or social injustices as unethical regardless of whether they are religious or not.

When we examine the results for males in Table IV, we see that again three scenarios turn out to be statistically significant; however, only vignette 1 overlaps with the female results. Males who consider themselves to be religious are more likely to find the behavior in vignettes 1 and 17 (working for a company with unfair labor practices, and violating company policy to tell a relative about a company issue). However, males who are not religious are more likely to find the behavior described in vi-

gnette 7 (taking credit for a colleague's idea at work) as unethical. It is interesting to note the conflicting results for religious males and females in vignette 1. From the male perspective, our culture has developed the male role as protective of women and children. This result may support that fact. From a female perspective, this type of vignette is a violation of social justice, which has been discussed in the literature as a foundation of women's perceptions of unethical behavior. Of course, in order to further isolate the effect of religion and the spheres of influence from the gender effects, a multivariate analysis is required.

Empirical Model

Our survey elicits ordered responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree for each of the twenty vignettes. Therefore the appropriate multivariate regression technique is the ordered regression model (ORM) first introduced by McKelvey and Zovoina (1975). The ORM assumes that a latent continuous variable y_i^* , sense of ethics, is mapped to an observed variable y_i , individual response to a vignette. The continuous latent variable can be thought of as the propensity to disagree that the activity described in each vignette is ethical, and thus represents a measurement of ethics. The observed response categories for y_i are: 1 = Strongly agree (SA), 2 = Agree (A), 3 = Disagree (D), and 4 = Strongly disagree (SD). The underlying structural model is:

$$y_i^* = \mathbf{x}_i \boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i$$

where y_i^* is the latent variable of ethics, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a set of coefficient estimates that correspond to the set of independent variables \mathbf{x}_i , and ε_i is a random error following Long (1997, p. 117).

We use the ordered probit model to produce consistent and efficient estimates of the relationship between the vignette responses and the individual characteristics of the survey respondents. The independent variables include the following: dummy variables for being "male," "single," and a "business student," and continuous variables for age and number of children. To account for spheres of influence, we include the following set of dummy variables: "Religion #1" to indicate the respondent chose religion as the primary influence on his ethics and "Other #1" to indicate the respondent chose education, friends, or work as the primary influence on his ethics. Thus, we use the family sphere of influence as the reference category to avoid concerns of collinearity. In a separate set of regressions, we substitute a dummy variable indicating that the respondent is "religious" for the sphere of influence variables.

Multivariate Results

Our first set of estimation results are presented in Table V (p. 13). The reported estimates represent the marginal effects on the probability of strongly disagreeing that the activity described in each vignette is ethical. The sphere of influence variables are statistically significant at the 10 percent level or better in 7 out of 20 vignettes. Religion as the number one sphere of influence is statistically significant in four vignettes (4, 8, 11, and 15). Religion has its largest absolute impact in vignette 8. Here we can conclude that holding all else constant, the probability of strongly disagreeing that wage discrimination is unethical is decreased by 0.17 for an individual who selected religion as his number one sphere of influence relative to individuals who selected another sphere. However, this is the only case where religion has a statistically significant negative impact, the impact

Table III: Summary Statistics by Sphere of Influence and Gender

Gender	Vignette	Family		Religion		Other		V	P
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
	2 Finding \$1	2.35	0.78	2.88	0.82	2.56	1.01	0.233	0.087
	11 Unauthorized computer use	2.75	0.58	2.97	0.67	3.33	0.71	0.229	0.030
Female	Stealing office supplies	3.00	0.62	3.26	0.67	3.33	0.87	0.208	0.066
	Software piracy	2.98	0.66	3.26	0.67	3.67	0.50	0.227	0.033

Table IV: Summary statistics by Sphere of Influence and Religious Status

Gender	Vignette	Religious		Not Religious		V	P
		M	SD	M	SD		
Female	1 Oversees unfair labor practices	3.38	0.64	3.89	0.85	0.297	0.020
	7 Claiming credit for an idea	3.57	0.56	3.16	0.69	0.266	0.020
	18 Consuming alcohol at lunch	3.42	0.60	3.05	0.62	0.226	0.060
Male	1 Oversees unfair labor practices	3.16	0.66	2.91	1.13	0.357	0.003
	7 Claiming credit for an idea	3.45	0.55	3.73	0.45	0.234	0.043
	17 Violating privacy rules	2.58	0.90	2.15	0.94	0.273	0.051

Table V: Marginal Effects on the Probability of Strongly Disagreeing for the Ordered Probit Model with Spheres of Influence

Independent variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Religion #1	-0.076	0.074	0.106	0.122*	-0.051	-0.002	0.030	-0.170**	-0.041	-0.027
Other #1	-0.010	0.056	-0.007	0.049	-0.048	0.033	0.039	0.093	0.112	0.155*
Male	-0.156**	-0.083***	-0.143**	-0.003	-0.069	-0.095**	0.013	-0.454***	-0.033	0.020
Single	-0.029	0.007	-0.268**	0.130*	-0.181*	-0.042	-0.056	-0.284***	0.005	-0.112
Age	0.014*	0.010***	0.008	0.009	0.004	0.007	0.008	-0.008	0.001	-0.005
Number of children	-0.044	-0.085**	-0.150*	-0.024	-0.031	0.024	0.020	0.064	0.056	0.049
Business students	-0.000	0.048	0.096	-0.073	0.017	0.043	-0.097	-0.114	0.101	-0.047
Log likelihood	-185.77	-219.58	-213.63	-135.31	-221.6	-211.91	-149.88	-125.87	-155.79	-129.35
N	191	190	190	190	191	190	190	189	189	189
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Religion #1	0.091*	0.073	0.005	0.110	0.133*	-0.001	0.049	0.089	0.097	0.041
Other #1	0.139	0.0129	0.175**	0.101	0.295**	0.036	0.087	0.169	0.226*	-0.011
Male	-0.056	-0.138**	0.005	-0.073	-0.102**	-0.025	-0.022	-0.277***	-0.081	-0.129*
Single	-0.018	-0.112	0.041	-0.146	-0.124	-0.140	0.020	-0.108	-0.183	-0.085
Age	0.005*	0.016***	0.004	0.006	0.005	0.006	0.003	-0.000	0.000	0.008
Number of children	-0.020	-0.047	0.003	-0.020	-0.013	-0.154	0.022	-0.021	0.004	-0.163**
Business student	-0.018	0.209***	-0.018	0.128**	-0.041	0.084	0.052	0.121	0.080	0.149
Log likelihood	-183.06	-171.77	-214.47	-179.9	-196.37	-165.2	-241.11	-201.27	-181.69	-174.36
N	188	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	189

of religion is positive in the other three vignettes, and the marginal effects range from 0.09 to 0.13. The 'Other' number one sphere of influence is also statistically significant in four vignettes (10, 13, 15, and 19), and the marginal effects range from 0.16 to 0.30. Vignette 15 is the only one in which both sphere variables are statistically significant. Identifying education, friends, or work as the number one sphere of influence increases the probability of strongly disagreeing that software piracy is ethical by 0.30, whereas, identifying religion as the number one sphere of influence only increases this probability by 0.13. In fact, the magnitudes of the estimates for the "other" number one sphere are all larger than those for the religion sphere.

Table VI (p. 14) reports estimation results for models in which the religious status dummy variable is used instead of the sphere of influence variables. The marginal effect of being religious is statistically significant in three vignettes: 15, 17 and 18. Students who consider themselves to be religious are more likely to consider drinking alcohol at lunch, pirating software, and violating company policies to be unethical. Individuals who self-identify as religious may adhere to strict religious beliefs such as no alcoholic beverages, and thou shalt not steal (software). They also may not want to become involved in an adulterous situation, which is why they feel that violating the company policy to help a relative is unethical.

Table VI: Marginal Effects on the Probability of Strongly Disagreeing for the Ordered Probit Model with Religious Status

Independent variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Religious	0.0634	0.028	0.038	-0.042	-0.012	0.03	-0.029	0.115	-0.117	-0.096
Male	-0.150**	-0.102***	-0.142***	-0.003	-0.107**	-0.086**	0.040	-0.407***	-0.043	0.035
Single	-0.024	-0.024	-0.309***	-0.080	-0.133	-0.024	-0.106	-0.220**	0.040	-0.107
Age	0.015**	0.009***	0.005	0.009	0.003	0.007	0.005	-0.008	0.001	-0.003
Number of children	-0.099	-0.069*	-0.122*	-0.005	-0.077	0.032	0.053	0.019	0.044	0.041
Business students	0.035	0.035	0.062	-0.081	0.058	0.046	-0.102	-0.090	0.126	-0.062
Log likelihood	-214.34	-248.19	-240.04	-154.90	-253.19	-241.71	-165.76	-144.91	-171.47	-142.84
N	212	211	211	212	213	211	211	210	210	210
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Religious	0.040	-0.040	0.012	0.077	0.098*	-0.024	0.067**	0.173***	0.022	0.061
	-0.067**	-0.118*	-0.005	-0.071	-0.098**	-0.012	-0.024	-0.243***	-0.036	-0.124
Single	-0.009	-0.137	0.035	-0.138	-0.095	-0.110	0.037	-0.117	-0.184	-0.100
Age	0.007**	0.013**	0.003	0.008*	0.006	0.005	0.005*	0.004	-0.000	0.008
Number of children	-0.031	0.015	0.010	-0.027	-0.028	-0.127	0.003	-0.025	0.049	-0.156**
Business student	-0.014	0.201**	-0.016	0.0124	0.006	0.046	0.074*	0.090	0.064	0.123
Log likelihood	-209.06	-189.08	-241.59	-202.38	-222.92	-183.00	-268.09	-227.20	-205.67	-189.85
N	209	209	210	210	210	209	209	210	210	209

Our findings on gender controls are consistent with the literature. Males are consistently less likely to consider the activities described in each vignette as unethical. The gender marginal effect is negative and statistically significant in 50 percent of the vignettes in model one and 55 percent of the vignettes in model two, thus making gender the most significant predictor of ethical perceptions. The average marginal effect for gender is -0.156. Interestingly, the probability that men indicate that they strongly disagree with wage discrimination is approximately 45 percentage points below the probability for women, holding all other variables constant. This result is consistent with the literature that indicates females support social justice and consider discrimination an unethical issue. This also supports data that women consistently receive less pay than men, despite federal regulations supporting equal pay, and have experienced wage discrimination more than males have and therefore are more likely to consider it unethical.

Age also has a significant effect on ethical perceptions in approximately 22 percent of the models. In each and every case the impact of age is positive, indicating that older survey respondents were more likely to strongly disagree with the activities described in the vignettes. The marginal effects of age are considerably smaller than those for other significant variables. They range from only 0.005 to 0.016. The effects of marital status, business major and having children are less apparent in our results. These variables are statistically significant in three or fewer vignettes in either model. These results are consistent with the literature which indicates that the older the respondent,

the more unethical they considered these vignettes.

Conclusion and Directions for Future Research

Ethical decision making is impacted by the individual's personal and professional environment. A limitation of an undergraduate student survey is their lack of work experience. McDevitt and Hise (2002) research indicated that 80 percent of their respondents were impacted by workplace policy regarding their workplace behavior. Eweje and Brunton (2010) indicate that ethical awareness increases with work experience. However, the results of this survey research support the majority of the current literature in that religion has a positive impact on ethical decision making, that females tend to be more ethical than males, and that the older the respondent, the more unethical they considered these vignettes. More data needs to be collected to assess the impact of other spheres of influence such as the work environment, peers, education, and family. It would also be interesting to assess if specific religions have different impacts on ethical decision making. The next step in the authors' research is to compare the difference between the respondents' perceptions of the 20 business vignettes and how they answered the second component of the question as to whether they would actually perform the action themselves. It would also be interesting to give this survey to graduate students, who are typically older and have more work experience, to identify any difference in the results.

References

- Andolsen, B. (1997) "Roman Catholic tradition and ritual and business ethics: a feminist perspective, *Business Ethics Quarterly*, March, pp.71-82.
- Bampton, R. & Maclagan, P. (2009) "Does a care orientation explain

gender differences in ethical decision making? A critical analysis and fresh findings", *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Vol.18 No.2, pp.179-191.

- Bommer, M., Gratta, J. & Tuttle, M. (1987) "A behavioral model of

- ethical and unethical decision making", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 7 No.3, pp. 265-280.
- Borkoswki, S. & Ugras, Y. (1998) "Business students and ethics: A meta-analysis", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 17, pp. 1117-1127.
- Conroy, S. & Emerson, T. (2004) "Business ethics and religion: Religiosity as a predictor of ethical awareness among students", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 50, pp. 383-396.
- Donaldson, T. & Preston, L. (1995) "The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence and Implications", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, pp. 65-91.
- Eweje, G. & Brunton, M. (2010) "Ethical perceptions of business students in a New Zealand university: Do gender, age and work experience matter?" *Business Ethics, A European Review*, Vo.19 No.1, pp.95-111.
- Gill, S. (2010) "Is gender inclusivity an answer to ethical issues in business? An Indian stance", *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vo. 25 No.1, pp. 37-63.
- Kum-Lung, C. & Teck-Chai, L. (2010) "Attitude toward business ethics: Examining the influence of Religiosity, gender and education levels", *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, Vo. 2 No.1, pp. 225-232.
- Long, J. (1997) "Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables", London, UK. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lowery, C. & Beadles, N. (2009) "Differences between work-related ethics and non-work ethics, and the effects of religiosity", *Journal of Management Issues*, Vol. XXI, No. 3, pp. 421-435.
- Mcdevitt, R. & Hise, J. (2002) "Influences in ethical dilemmas of increasing intensity", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 261-274.
- McKelvey, R. & Zavoina, W. (1975) "A statistical model for the analysis of ordinal level dependent Variables", *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, Vol. 4, pp. 103-120.
- O'Fallon, M. & Butterfield, K. (2005) "A review of the empirical ethical decision-making literature: 1996-2003", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 59, No.4, pp. 375-413.
- Parboteeah, K., Hoegl, M., & Cullen, J. (2008). "Ethics and religion: An empirical test of a multidimensional model", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol, 80, No.2, pp. 387-398.
- Rawwas, M. & Isakson, H. (2000) "Ethics of tomorrow's business manager: The influence of personal beliefs and values, individual characteristics, and situational factors", *Journal of Education for Business*, July/August 2000, pp. 321-330.
- Sharma, S. (2009). "Role of age and work experience in ethical behavior", *The Icfai University Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. VII, No.2, pp. 35-41.
- Sheidahl, T. (1986) "Ethical dilemmas in managerial accounting", *Management Accounting*, Vol. 64, pp. 34-41.
- Smith, P & Oakley, E. (1997) "Gender-related differences in ethics and social values of business students: Implications for management", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 16, pp. 37-45.
- Spake, D., Megehee, D. & Franke, G. (2007) "Students' views of ethical behavior and the impact of Association", *Marketing Education Review*, Vol. 17, No.3, pp. 33-47.
- Tilley, E. (2010) "Ethics and gender at the point of decision making: An exploration of intervention and Kinship", *Prism*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 1-19.
- Weaver, G. & Agle, B. (2002) "Religiosity and ethical behavior in organizations: A symbolic Interactionist perspective", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp.77-97.

Authors

Nancy J. Niles, PhD, is an associate professor in the AACSB accredited School of Management at Lander University. Her primary teaching responsibilities include undergraduate courses in business and health care management. Her research interests include business ethics, human resource management, health policy and business strategy. She received a PhD in Health Policy from the University of Illinois, a Master of Public Health at Tulane, a Master of Business Administration and Master of Science from the University of Maryland's University College. Her recent publications include two textbooks and four peer reviewed journal articles in her research interests.

E-mail: nniles@lander.edu

Karie A. Barbour, PhD, is an assistant professor in the Department of Economics and Business Administration at Bridgewater College. Her research interests include the behavioral effects of taxation, non-market valuation, students' perception of business ethics, and Appalachian issues. Prior to arriving at Bridgewater College, Karie Barbour's graduate work includes an M.A. in economics in 2003, and a Ph. D. in economics in 2004 from the University of Tennessee. She has also taught at Lander University in Greenwood, S.C. and Illinois State University in Normal I.L. Her recent publications include four peer reviewed journal articles in her research interests.

E-mail: kbarbour@bridgewater.edu

APPENDIX

Business Student Ethics Survey

The purpose of this survey is to assess if the Business Ethics course has had an impact on students' ethical judgments. This survey is being completed by students who are enrolled in the Business Ethics course. There is no right or wrong answer. This survey is anonymous. The survey will be distributed and picked up by a designated student and returned in a sealed envelope to the instructor. THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

A) Please read the following statements and indicate whether you agree/disagree that these statements are ETHICAL. (Strongly agree=Ethical)

B) Please indicate with a Y/N how you would act if placed in the same situation.

1) To reduce costs and increase profits, the company you work for decided to import products from a company overseas that unfairly paid women and children in their labor factories.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you look for another job with a different company? Y N

2) Finding a dollar on the floor at work and keeping it.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you keep the dollar? Y N

3) Finding \$100 on the floor at work and keeping it.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you keep the \$100? Y N

4) Borrowing 100 dollars from the cash register at work and returning it later when you get paid.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you borrow the \$100? Y N

5) Your bookstore manager decides to sell books to customers that were free copies given to them by textbook publishers.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you continue to work for this bookstore? Y N

6) Although it is against company policy, a grateful client offered you a monetary reward for helping him which you took because your daughter needed braces.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you accept the money? Y N

7) Taking credit for an idea of a colleague at work to impress your boss.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you take the credit? Y N

8) Companies that support unequal pay between women and men who have the same exact job

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you work for this company? Y N

9) The CEO of a company receives a huge bonus even though the company's profits are down and the employees have not received a raise in two years.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you work for this company? Y N

10) Owners have closed their bankrupt business without notifying their employees ahead of time.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

If you were the owner, would you do this? Y N

11) Using the company's computer for personal use during your lunch hour even though it is against company policy.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you use the company's computer? Y N

12) Padding personal expenses for a trip so your company will reimburse you more.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you pad your personal expenses? Y N

13) Calling in sick to work even if you are not because you need a day off.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you call in sick? Y N

14) Taking home office supplies for personal use.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you take home office supplies? Y N

15) Copying the company's software which is licensed to the company and putting it on your computer at home.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you copy company software? Y N

16) You see coworker steal money and decide not to report it.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you report the coworker stealing money? Y N

17) You work at a flower shop and find out your sister's boyfriend is sending flowers to three other women. Against company policy, you use the company information to tell your sister about her boyfriend.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you use the company information? Y N

18) Although it is against company policy to drink alcohol during the lunch hour, because your supervisor decided to have a beer, you decided to have a beer also.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you have alcohol at lunch? Y N

19) You have medical bills that you can't afford to pay so you pad your overtime pay since your company doesn't pay you very well anyway.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you pad your overtime pay? Y N

20) Your supervisor is sexually harassing one of your colleagues. You ignore the situation because you are worried about your promotion to the next level.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Would you ignore the situation? Y N

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS

1) Age _____ 2) Sex _____ 3) Marital Status _____ 4) Children _____ 5) US Citizen Y N 6) If Yes, State of Birth _____ 7) If No, Country of Birth _____ 8) Do you consider yourself religious? Y N

9) Rank in order of influence, where you learned about ethical behavior: _____ Family _____ Friends _____ Religion _____ Education _____ Work environment (Rank 1-5, 1=most influential, 5=least influential)

Ethics Education

1) Are you a business student? Y N If yes, indicate major/s _____

2) Have you taken the Business Ethics course at this institution? Y N

3) Have you taken an ethics course at another educational institution? Y N

4) Is business ethics discussed in-depth in other business courses you have taken at your institution? Y N

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION