

# Impressions of Questionable Marketing Practices in Indonesia: The Influence of Gender and Social Desirability Response Bias

Richard A. Bernardi  
Keri L. LeComte

## Abstract

Our research examines the ethical sensitivity of 90 Indonesian business students (61 male and 29 female) toward questionable marketing practices using self-reported data; however, unlike most ethics research, we control for social desirability responsibility bias. In our research, we found that, when social desirability response bias was not considered, there was a significant gender difference. However, we also found that female students scored significantly higher on our measure of social desirability response bias than did their male counterparts. When we considered both gender and social desirability response bias in our models, the differences in ethical sensitivity between genders were mitigated. Consequently, it is our belief that social desirability response bias contaminates much of the self-reported data that is used in academic ethics research.

## Keywords

Marketing Ethical Dilemmas, Social Desirability Response Bias

## Introduction

Gatewood et al., (1993) suggest that impressions about a potential employer's environment and reputation of are frequently based on publicly-available information. Bernardi et al. (2002a) found that the proportion of female directors on several companies' boards of directors has increased over the years. The authors suggest that companies are advertising the diversification of their boards in order to appear more credible to their stakeholders and comply with the requirements of the Sarbanes Oxley Act (2002). For instance, one CEO justifies recruiting minorities (Goodpaster, 1991, p. 65) because:

[T]he obvious answer that it is in our best interest to seek out and employ good people in all sectors of our society. And there is the answer that enlightened self-interest tells us that more and more of the younger people, whom we must attract as future employees, choose companies by their social records as much as by their business prospects.

This research is an extension of Bernardi et al.'s (2002b) research that examined the association between a gender and students beliefs about potentially questionable marketing practices. We define questionable marketing practices as those designed to mislead their target market or that advertise adult products when children are the primary audience. Of the six scenarios used by Bernardi et al., five deal with advertising campaigns and/or their timing and suggest questionable marketing practices, which were adapted from Wall Street Journal stories.

Most ethics research employs samples from the United States and indicates the problem of generalizability of the research's findings; consequently, Indonesia provides two interesting contrasts to the United States. While the uncertainty avoidance construct (Hofstede, 1980) for Indonesia (48) is similar to that of the United States (46), Indonesia provides a useful contrast to Bernardi et al.'s sample because of difference in the individualism construct (14 for Indonesia and 91

for the US). Transparency International's (2006) Corruption Index provides another potential contrast between the United States (2.7) and Indonesia (7.3). Transparency International defines its corruption perceptions index as 10 (1) being the least (most) corrupt countries; however, it is not an intuitive measure to have the highest value represent the least corrupt country. Consequently, some research transposes these values (i.e., subtracted Transparency International's values from 10), which results in the highest (lowest) values representing the most (least) corrupt countries. We follow this convention in our research.

Our sample includes 90 Indonesian college students who are all business majors; we believe that this is a relevant sample because college students' attitudes are similar to those of newly-hired college graduates. College students' ethical sensitivity to questionable marketing practices is important as cheating in college associates (i.e., is carried forward) with unethical behavior in the workplace (Sims, 1993). However, unlike most ethics research, we control for social desirability responsibility bias (Paulhus, 1986).

## Literature Review

### Questionable Marketing Practices

The explosion in computer and video technologies has dramatically increased the exposure rate to forms of corporate advertising. For example, Dalmeny (2003) examined several ways that advertisers use to reach children. One of the most prominent techniques is the use of cartoon and other well-known TV characters; additionally, companies can also use e-mails, online websites plastered with brand names, and computer games. Dalmeny notes that over three fourths of the products marketed toward children contained did not meet government nutrition guidelines and that the amount of food advertising during children's programming was between two and three times higher than that of adult programming. While these media are ideal forums for advertising, they also provide hereto-

fore unthought-of opportunities for dishonesty in advertising. For example, the online availability of college papers and the growing concern of click fraud in online advertising (Grow and Elgin, 2006), which involves false visits to corporations' website advertising.

However, attitudes about how ethical an advertisement campaign is perceived may depend on the target audience. For example, Spain et al. (2002) studied undergraduate attitudes about the placement of smoking advertisements at a time when there were no bans on this form of advertisement. The schools used in the sample were located in states based on smoking rates: Kentucky - highest at 31 percent, Virginia - mid range at 26 percent, and Utah - lowest at 14 percent. Of the students surveyed, 86 percent said they would not place an advertisement in a high school newspaper; however, the same percent said they would place the advertising in a college newspaper. As for advertising smoking in movies, 89 percent indicated they would not place the advertisement in a "G" rated movie; however, 93 percent thought that smoking had a place in "R" rated movies.

Many believe that individuals' ethical behavior "reflect the values and beliefs of their culture" (Buller et al., 1991, p. 768); so that, culture (Hofstede, 1980) can effect one's perceptions of similar events. Prior research found associations between ethics and the cultural dimension of individualism. Hofstede (1984, 83-84) describes the cultural construct of individualism as:

[A] preference for a loosely knit social framework in society. The fundamental issue addressed by this dimension is the degree of interdependence a society maintains among individuals.

Hofstede's (1980) cultural construct of individualism has been found to be negatively associated with Transparency International's (2006) corruption index (Husted, 1999) and managerial concerns about making hard decisions that could result in the loss of a client (Arnold et al., 1999). The level of corporate disclosures increased as the level of individualism for a country increased (Wingate, 1997).

### Ethical Sensitivity

Sensitivity to ethical dilemmas and/or cues may be a factor of moral development (Rest, 1979b); Rest explains ethical decision-making using a four-component model: (1) recognizing an ethical dilemma; (2) evaluating the alternatives; (3) making a decision; and making a decision; and (4) acting on the decision (Rest, 1986). For example, Bernardi et al. (2004) proposed three of regression models that follow Rest's four-component model using the DIT and a subject-matter specific version of the DIT dealing with student cheating. These authors found that the models dealing with recognizing an ethical dilemma, making a decision and acting on the decision, which we use in this research, accurately predicted the cheating behavior of students who had cheated in both high school and college. It appears that students have become desensitized to the moral implications of cheating (Baack et al., 2000) and believe that cheating is acceptable when used to compete with their peers (Lane and Schaupp, 1989). Lawson (2004), Sims (1993) and Whitley (1998) indicate that college cheating associates with unethical behavior in the workplace.

Rest's (1979a) Defining Issues Test (DIT) has also been used to measure individuals' sensitivity to the ethical components of scenarios. For example, Bernardi (1994) found that audit managers who scored higher on Rest's DIT detected fraud at a higher rate when provided client integrity data than the managers who scored lower on Rest's measure (i.e., 75 versus 47 percent detection rates). However, Bernardi also found that audit managers who scored high on the DIT but did not receive informa-

tion about client integrity detected fraud at about the same rate as audit managers who scored lower on the DIT (i.e., 54 versus 56 percent detection rates). Additionally, Bernardi and Arnold (1994) found that managers used more conservative estimate of materiality as their scores on the DIT increased. Ponemon and Gabhart (1993) studied the associations between audit partners and managers' level of ethical sensitivity measured on the DIT and their judgments concerning the integrity of a client's management and assessments of audit risk. Ponemon and Gabhart (p. 102) suggest that because of their cognitive skills (wording in brackets added by the authors):

[C]ertain auditors [individuals] may be unable to frame reliable judgments regarding the ethical characteristics of client management [an advertising campaign]. Hence, inability rather than gullibility may explain why certain auditors [individuals] fail to detect obvious warning signs. (underlining in original text)

### Gender Differences

Even though many studies report that women are more sensitive to ethical dilemmas, there are those who believe that Rest's model of moral development favors a man's decision making process (Gilligan, 1982). Jaffee and Hyde (2000) examine Gilligan's assertion that there are two moral voices used in ethical dilemmas and that gender plays a role in determining which voice is used. The first voice is a care voice which is "characterized by the desire to maintain relationships and to respond to others' needs" (p. 703). The second voice is a justice voice that is "characterized by considerations of fairness and equity" (p. 703). Gilligan believed that females tended to use the care voice and males the justice voice. Using 180 studies in a mega analysis, Jaffee and Hyde's data indicate that there is no statistical support for the claim that the care and justice orientations are strongly related to gender. In addition, 72 percent of the justice orientation measuring studies and 73 percent of the care-orientation measuring studies showed no statistical significance differences between the genders in moral orientation.

Bernardi et al. (2002) found a significant difference between the genders. Five of their scenarios provided evidence that females reported higher ethical sensitivity. Franke et al. (1997) conducted a meta-analysis of 66 studies and found evidence to support that females do report higher ethical standards. They found that this reporting is even greater when evaluating a non-monetary scenario. Franke et al. (1997) used 66 studies in a mega analysis to evaluate the role gender plays in ethical decision making. They report that women "report higher ethical standards than men in evaluating business practices" (p. 925). While Beltramini et al. (1984) and Peterson et al. (1991) report that female students were consistently more concerned about ethical issues – especially if the issues included a social aspect (Smith and Oakley, 1997). McCabe et al. (2006) found that women tend to be more ethically sensitive about bribery and/or gift giving when it involves receiving something in return than men. Franke et al. data indicate that there were larger gender differences in non-monetary cases. Their study also showed that, while gender differences were relatively small in the areas of collusion and conflicts of interest, women perceived rule breaking and the misuse of insider information as being significantly more unethical than their male counterparts. Female students were more ethically sensitive towards marketing dilemmas than male students (Malinowski and Berger, 1996). Given the results of the cited research, we propose the following hypothesis:

H1: Female participants will perceive the scenarios as being less ethical than male participants.

### Social Desirability Response Bias and Culture

Honest responding to survey questions is an essential assumption for all empirical ethics research; however, Randall and Gibson (1990) found that only about one percent of the ethics studies using self-reported data considered social desirability response bias. King and Bruner (1999) also note that social desirability bias has not been employed in the majority of marketing articles over the past 20 years. Social desirability response bias occurs when individuals under-report (over-report) activities that are deemed to be socially undesirable (desirable) (Zerbe and Paulhus, 1987). Nyaw and Ng (1994) suggest that, as individuals tend to respond in a socially desirable manner, the validity of survey-based ethics studies that do not control for social desirability response bias could be brought into question.

Bernardi (2006) found a significant difference between responses for the United States and Australia, Canada, China, Columbia, Ecuador, Hong Kong, Ireland, Japan, Nepal, and South Africa. He also found a significant overall difference between genders and significant correlations between SDRB and uncertainty avoidance, and individualism (Hofstede, 1980). Bernardi et al. (2003) found that as the scores on the IMS desirability response survey increased, so did the tendency to rate scenarios as less acceptable, thus more socially desirable.

Bernardi and Adamaitis look at the effect of social desirability response bias on self reported data on cheating. They provide statistical support that social desirability response bias does contaminate both dependent and independent variables. This means that "socially desirable responding results in lower levels of self-reported cheating" (p. 29). The authors found that those respondents who had a higher intent to cheat in the future also reported a higher rate of cheating. However, for all five countries surveyed, the group of respondents who had the lowest amount of SDRB reported higher cheating behavior than that of the group with the highest SDRB.

H2: Female participants' average score for social desirability response bias will be higher than for male participants.

However, Bernardi (2006) found that male students tended to respond in a less socially desirable manner (i.e., scored lower on a measure of social desirability response bias) than female students. He believes that this finding calls for further research on the notion that females are more ethically sensitive than

males, which may result solely because of the female tendency to report in a more socially desirable manner. Additionally, Rest (1982) indicates that the difference between male and female students' scores on the Defining Issues Test (i.e., a measure of ethical sensitivity) was not significant. These results lead to our final research hypothesis:

H3: Social desirability response bias will mitigate the effect of gender as it relates to ethical sensitivity to the research scenarios.

### Subjects and Measures

Questionnaires including the six scenarios were sent to the parents of an international student at our university who knew business professors at two universities in Indonesia. The parents asked these instructors to administer the questionnaire to their classes. Table 1 shows the composition and demographic data for our sample of 90 business students. The Table 1 data indicate that, except for the mean scores on Paulhus' measure of social desirability response bias, there was little variance between males and females students for the demographic data.

Our research uses the same six scenarios that were developed by Bernardi et al. (2002); this research extends this work to an Indonesian sample. Of the six scenarios, five deal with advertising campaigns and/or their timing and suggest questionable marketing practices, which were adapted from actual articles that Bernardi et al. (2002) found in Wall Street Journal.

The final scenario is a management scenario that was included as a control to determine whether a different context would elicit different responses. In this research, our questions examine the students' responses to steps one and three of Rest's (1979b) four-component model. We asked participants to rate their feelings to two questions following each dilemma using a seven-point Likert scale. The scale coded "One" ("Seven") for the most unethical (ethical) response:

1. Do you consider this to be an ethical practice?
2. Do you agree with their strategy?

#### Social Desirability Response Bias

The Impression Management Subscale of Paulhus' (1986) Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (see Appendix C) was used to measure the participants' tendency to respond in a

**Table 1. Sample demographics**

|   | Males         | Females       | Total         |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Sample Composition  | 61            | 29            | 90            |
| Age   | 20.6<br>(1.0) | 20.8<br>(1.3) | 20.7<br>(1.1) |
| College level   | 2.9<br>(1.1)  | 3.0<br>(1.3)  | 2.9<br>(1.1)  |
| Undergraduate GPA   | 3.3<br>(1.0)  | 3.3<br>(1.1)  | 3.3<br>(1.0)  |
| GPA in Major  | 3.4<br>(0.8)  | 3.4<br>(1.0)  | 3.4<br>(0.8)  |
| SDRB  | 5.4<br>(3.1)  | 7.8<br>(3.9)  | 6.1<br>(3.5)  |
| Coding: X.X Mean<br>(Y.Y) Standard Deviation<br>College level Freshman (1), Sophomore (2) etc.<br>SDRB Average Social Desirability Response Bias Score. |               |               |               |

socially desirable manner. The impression management portion of the BIDR is a 20-item subscale that had the overall highest correlation with seven other social desirability measures reported by Randall and Fernandes (1991). Paulhus' Impression Management Subscale (IMS) is a 20-item subscale that asks participants to respond to 20 statements on a seven-point Likert scale that uses one as 'strongly disagree' and seven as 'strongly agree'. The IMS reverse codes every other response; for example, the first two questions on the IMS are:

1. Sometimes I tell lies if I have to.
2. I never cover up my mistakes.

If a participant were to respond to the first statement in a socially desirable manner, they would respond on the strongly disagree side of the Likert scale as telling a lie is not a socially desirable behavior. Similarly, if a participant were to respond to the second statement in a socially desirable manner, they would respond on the strongly agree side of the Likert scale as covering up one's mistakes is not a socially desirable behavior.

## Data Analysis

### Overview

It is important to remember that lower (higher) average rankings are indicative of students having a heightened level ethical sensitivity (not being sensitive) to that marketing scenario. Overall, students viewed the practices in scenarios one and two as the least ethical and the practice of advertising a new major well ahead of the construction date of the required facilities to support the major as the least offensive (Table 2). Students had

only slightly lower views of the "Made in America" and "Way to an A" campaigns. Surprisingly, marketing adult products during times when children were the primary viewers was not perceived as being unethical.

### Gender and Perceptions (H1)

For our first survey question in each scenario "Do you consider this to be an ethical practice?", male students rated four of the six scenarios as being more ethical than female students. Male students thought that the 'Made In' and 'TV Ads' were less ethical than female students impressions. However, the only significant difference between male and female opinions was for the 'Tuition' scenario ( $p = 0.07$ ) if one does not consider social desirability response bias (SDRB) in the model. When SDRB is also considered as a covariate, gender is no longer significant ( $p = 0.71$ ). For the 'Kooky Kola' scenario, considering SDRB in the model actually resulted in gender being significant ( $p = 0.07$ ).

### Social Desirability Response Bias (H2)

Paulhus' Impression Management Subscale (IMS) is scored first done for the odd numbered questions and then for the even numbered questions. Paulhus indicates that participants who respond with either a one or two (six or seven) on odd (even) numbered questions are responding in a socially desirable manner. Responses from three through five are not considered socially desirable on either set of questions. A participant's score on Paulhus' IMS is the sum of the socially desirable responses for the two sets of questions. The data support hypothesis one; female participants' average score of 7.8 (Table 1) was signifi-

**Table 2. Differences in scenario responses by gender and SDRB**

| Question 1: Do you consider this to be an ethical practice?                          |             |             |         |              |             |             |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
|  | Tuition     | Air & Space | Made in | Easy A       | TV ads      | Kooky Kola  |
| Means:   |             |             |         |              |             |             |
| Male   | 3.21        | 4.25        | 4.54    | 4.15         | 4.37        | 3.75        |
| Female   | 2.45        | 3.79        | 4.97    | 3.93         | 4.66        | 3.07        |
| Difference   | 0.76        | 0.46        | -0.43   | 0.22         | -0.29       | 0.68        |
| Regression-1   |             |             |         |              |             |             |
| Only Gender  | <b>0.07</b> | 0.26        | -0.31   | 0.59         | -0.53       | 0.16        |
| Regression-2   |             |             |         |              |             |             |
| SDRB   | -0.71       | <b>0.10</b> | -0.24   | 0.97         | -0.20       | <b>0.07</b> |
| Gender   | <b>0.11</b> | <b>0.11</b> | -0.18   | 0.60         | -0.31       | <b>0.05</b> |
| Question 2: Would you agree with their strategy?                                     |             |             |         |              |             |             |
|  | Tuition     | Air & Space | Made in | Easy A       | TV ads      | Kooky Kola  |
| Means:   |             |             |         |              |             |             |
| Male   | 2.34        | 3.67        | 4.92    | 3.39         | 2.65        | 2.43        |
| Female   | 1.66        | 3.76        | 4.79    | 2.62         | 2.00        | 1.48        |
| Difference   | 0.68        | -0.09       | 0.13    | 0.77         | 0.65        | 0.95        |
| Regression-1   |             |             |         |              |             |             |
| Only Gender  | 0.02        | 0.84        | 0.77    | <b>0.04</b>  | <b>0.06</b> | 0.00        |
| Regression-2   |             |             |         |              |             |             |
| SDRB   | -0.68       | -0.04       | -0.02   | 0.14         | <b>0.07</b> | 0.47        |
| Gender   | 0.03        | -0.64       | -0.62   | <b>-0.11</b> | <b>0.87</b> | 0.00        |
| Highlighted Areas: Gender changed its significance when SDRB was added to the model. |             |             |         |              |             |             |

cantly higher ( $p = 0.00$ ) than the average score of 5.4 for male participants.

### SDRB, Gender and Perceptions (H3)

For our second survey question in each scenario "Do you agree with their strategy?", male students indicated they agreed with the strategy in five of the six scenarios at a higher level than female students. While male students disagreed with the 'Air and Space' advertising more than female students, the difference was not significant. The difference between male and female students was significant for four of the five scenarios: Tuition ( $p = 0.02$ ), Easy A ( $p = 0.04$ ), TV Ads ( $p = 0.06$ ) and Kooky Kola ( $p = 0.00$ ). When SDRB is also considered as a covariate, gender was no longer significant in the Easy A ( $p = 0.11$ ) and TV Ads ( $p = 0.87$ ) scenarios.

## Conclusions

Our research provided evidence that gender differences found in the United States regarding sensitivity toward ethical dilemmas translates over to Indonesia. The main conclusion of our research is that the effect of gender is mitigated when social desirability response bias is controlled for in ethics research. Prior to controlling for social desirability response bias, our findings support the conception that gender plays a role in sensitivity toward ethical dilemmas where females report more sensitivity than do males. Our data indicate that females only thought that the 'TV Ads' and 'Made in' practices were more ethical than males and only agreed with the "Air & Space" strategy more than males; however, none of these were statistically significant. An important finding is that we also found that females do report higher social desirability response bias than do males. There was one dilemma ('Tuition') where gender was significant under our first research question. However, once social desirability response bias was taken into consideration, gender was no longer significant. Under our second research question, four of the six scenarios showed significance in regards to gender. Once social desirability was added to the equation for these, gender remained significant for only two of these questions.

Our research provides evidence of social desirability response bias contamination in studies that could potentially be used by students and professionals. Thus, our results support the need for social desirability response bias testing in scholarly research (Bernardi, 2006; King and Bruner, 1999; and Randall and Gibson, 1990) in order to ensure the accuracy of information being provided to the academic and professional world. We also found that Indonesian women had a higher score on Paulhus' measure of social desirable response bias. Even though research from the United States or Indonesia finds evidence that women respond in a more socially desirable manner, one could attribute this evidence to a localized affect in one or two societies. However, our finding along with Bernardi's (2006) data provide evidence that this phenomenon occurs consistently across 12 countries whose cultures and geographic locations vary considerably.

Our research indicates that controlling for gender without controlling for social desirable responding does not present a complete analysis; we believe that ethics research should either

control for both gender and social desirability response bias or stop reporting gender differences. Consequently, our research provides an opportunity for future research into the reasons and/or causes of why women respond in a more socially desirable manner. Our research also suggests that past research indicating a significant gender difference should be replicated to determine whether an actual gender effect is present when one controls for social desirability response bias.

Alarming, the literature (Lawson, 2004; Sims, 1993) indicates that cheating in college, which associates with dishonesty in the workplace, has increased to pandemic levels. Lysonski and Gaidis (1991, p. 148) believe that "schools may be inadvertently overemphasizing technical training and ignoring ethical considerations". The Ethics Task Force for the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (2004, p. 14) encourages schools to demonstrate both a currency in and a commitment to ethics "throughout their academic programs." This suggests that the across the curriculum approach towards ethics coverage, which most business schools use, provides an excellent venue for addressing the importance of the ethical issues studied in research. Specifically, the core marketing course should address questionable marketing practices such as the ones studied in this research. However, for the across the curriculum approach to be effective, all business disciplines must commit to emphasizing ethics in their business core courses otherwise the synergy of this approach is lost. An across the curriculum approach to covering ethics essentially means that each of the ten core business courses should incorporate approximately four hours of ethics coverage to achieve the same coverage as a separate business ethics course.

There are at least two limitations to our research. Our first limitation is that the differences we found could be the result of the scenarios we used. Students from Indonesia may not be exposed to the same level of TV advertisements and/or online term papers as students in Bernardi et al.'s (2002) study. Future research should examine what marketing practices might be defined as questionable in other societies in addition to testing the current scenarios to determine whether or not our findings can be generalized to other populations. Second, while the sample was taken from two Indonesian universities, the students at these universities come from several provinces throughout Indonesia. Consequently, we believe that these students are representative of the Indonesian students and entry-level business professionals; however, our results may not be generalizable to other cultures.

While Indonesia provided a useful contrast to Bernardi et al.'s sample because of difference in the individualism construct, these studies used samples at the extremes of the individualism spectrum (See Figure 1). Future research should examine the marketing practices in other countries such as Denmark, Ireland, Japan, the Philippines and Venezuela, which provide good distributions for both individualism and uncertainty avoidance and nearly a dichotomous distribution for corruption. The addition of these five countries would contribute to the breadth of coverage for Hofstede's constructs of individualism and uncertainty avoidance, which are frequently noted in ethics research.

**Figure 1. Hofstede's cultural constructs and Transparency International's corruption index**

| Individualism (1980, 222)   |                |                 |           |                |               |           |                 |           |                |
|---|----------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|
|   | VN (12)        |                 |           |                |               |           |                 |           |                |
|   | <b>IN (14)</b> |                 | PH (32)   | JA (46)        |               | IR (70)   | DN (74)         |           | <b>US (91)</b> |
| 01 – 10   | 11 - 20        | 21 - 30         | 31 – 40   | 41 - 50        | 51 - 60       | 61 – 70   | 71 - 80         | 81 - 90   | 91 - 100       |
| Uncertainty Avoidance (1980, 165)   |                |                 |           |                |               |           |                 |           |                |
|   |                |                 |           | PH (44)        |               |           |                 |           |                |
|   |                |                 |           | <b>US (46)</b> |               |           |                 |           |                |
|   |                | DN (23)         | IR (35)   | <b>IN (48)</b> |               |           | VN (76)         |           | JA (92)        |
| 01 – 10   | 11 – 20        | 21 – 30         | 31 – 40   | 41 - 50        | 51 - 60       | 61 – 70   | 71 - 80         | 81 - 90   | 91 - 100       |
| Corruption Index (2006)   |                |                 |           |                |               |           |                 |           |                |
|   |                | JA (2.4)        |           |                |               |           | PH (7.5)        |           |                |
|   |                | IR (2.6)        |           |                |               |           | <b>IN (7.6)</b> |           |                |
| DN (0.5)  |                | <b>US (2.7)</b> |           |                |               |           | VN (7.7)        |           |                |
| 0.1 – 1.0   | 1.1 – 2.0      | 2.1 – 3.0       | 3.1 – 4.0 | 4.1 – 5.0      | 5.1 – 6.0     | 6.1 – 7.0 | 7.1 – 8.0       | 8.1 – 9.0 | 9.1 – 10.0     |
| Values in parentheses are the constructs for individualism and uncertainty avoidance or the country's corruption index. |                |                 |           |                |               |           |                 |           |                |
| Highlighting indicates countries used in this study and Bernardi et al. (2002b).  |                |                 |           |                |               |           |                 |           |                |
| DN  | Denmark        |                 |           | JA             | Japan         |           | VE              | Venezuela |                |
| IN  | Indonesia      |                 |           | PH             | Philippines   |           |                 |           |                |
| IR  | Ireland        |                 |           | US             | United States |           |                 |           |                |

## References

- AACSB. 2004. Ethics Education in Business Schools, AACSB International: St. Louis
- Arnold, D. F., Bernardi, R. A., and Neidermeyer, P. (1999). The effect of independence on decisions concerning additional audit work: A European perspective, *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 18 (2), 45-67.
- Baack, D., Fogliasso, C., and Harris, J. (2000). The personal impact of ethical decisions: A social penetration theory, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 24 (1), 39-49.
- Beltramini, R. F., Peterson, R. A., and Kozmetsky, G. (1984). Concerns of College Students Regarding Business Ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 195-200.
- Bernardi, R. A. (2006). Associations between Hofstede's Cultural Constructs and Social Desirability Response Bias, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 65 No. 1, pp. 46-56.
- Bernardi, Richard A. (1994). Fraud Detection: The Effect of Client Integrity and Competence and Auditor Cognitive Style. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 13 (Supplement), 68-84.
- Bernardi, R. A. and Adamaitis, K. L. (2006). Data Contamination by Social Desirability Response Bias: An International Study of Students' Cheating Behavior, *Research on Professional Responsibility and Ethics in Accounting*, Vol. 11, pp. 157-184.
- Bernardi, R. A., Metzger, R. L., Scofield-Bruno, R. G. Wade-Hoogkamp, M. A., Reyes, L. A., and Barnaby, G. H. (2004). Examining the Decision Process of Students' Cheating Behavior: An Empirical Study, *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 50 No. 4, pp. 397-414.
- Bernardi, R. A., Delorey, E. L., LaCross, C. C. and Waite, R. A. (2003). Evidence of Social Desirability Response Bias in Ethics Research: An International Study, *Journal of Applied Business Research*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 41-51.
- Bernardi, R. A., Bean, D. F., and Weippert, K. M. (2002a). Signaling Gender Diversity through Annual Report Pictures: A Research Note on Image Management, Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 609-616.
- Bernardi, R. A., Shepherd, C. R., and Woodworth, J. L. (2002b). Gender Differences in Students' Ethical Impressions of Questionable Marketing Practices, *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, Vol. 1 No. 9, pp. 25-34.
- Buller, F. P., Kohis, J. J. and Anderson, K. S. (1991). The Challenge of Global Ethics, *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 10 No. 10, pp. 767-775.
- Dalmeny, K. (2003). Food marketing: The role of advertising in child health. *Consumer Policy Review*, Vol. 13 No. 1, 2-7.
- Franke, G. R., Crown, D. F. and Spake, D. F. (1997). Gender Differences in Ethical Perceptions of Business Practices: A Social Role Theory Perspective, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 82 No. 6, pp. 920-934.
- Gatewood, R. D., Gowan, M. A., and Lautenshlager, G. J. (1993). Corporate Image Recruitment Image, and Initial Job Choice Decisions, *Academy of Management Journal* Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 414-427.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goodpaster, K. E. (1991). Business Ethics and stakeholder Analysis, *Business Ethics Quarterly* Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 53-73.
- Grow, B. and Elgin, B. (2006). Click fraud: The dark side of online advertising, *Business Week*, October 2: 46-56.
- Hofstede, G. 1984. Culture Dimensions in management and Planning. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, January: 81-99.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences*, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Husted, B. W. (1999). Wealth, Culture, and Corruption, *Journal of*

- International Business Studies, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 339-360.
- Jaffee, S. and Shibley Hyde, J. (2000). Gender Differences in Moral Orientation: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 126 No. 5, pp. 703-726.
- King, M. F. and Bruner, G. C. (1999). Social desirability bias: A neglected aspect of validity testing. *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 79-103.
- Lane, M. S. and Schaupp, D. (1989). Ethics in Education: A Comparative Study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 8 No., 943-949.
- Lawson, R. A. (2004). Is classroom cheating related to business students' propensity to cheat in the 'real world'? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 49 (2), 189-199.
- Lysonski, S. and W. Gaidis. 1991. A Cross-Cultural Comparison of the Ethics of Business Students. *Journal of Business Ethics* 10 (2): 141-150.
- Malinowski, C., and Berger, K. A. (1996). Undergraduate Student Attitudes About Hypothetical Marketing Dilemmas. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15 No. 5, pp. 525-535.
- McCabe, C. A., Ingram, R. and Dato-on, M. C. (2006). The Business of Ethics and Gender. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 64 No. 2, pp. 101-116.
- Nyaw, M. and Ng, I. (1994). A Comparative Analysis of Ethical Beliefs: A Four Country Study. *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 13 No. 7, pp. 543-555.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1986). Self-Deception and Impression Management in Test Responses' in A. Angleiter and J. S. Wiggins (Eds.), *Personality Assessment via Questionnaire: Current Issues in Theory and Measurement*, pp. 17-41, Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Peterson, R. A., Beltramini, R. F., and Kozmetsky, G. (1991). Concerns of College Students Regarding Business Ethics: A Replication. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 10 No. 10, pp. 733-738.
- Ponemon, L. A. and Gabhart, D. R. L. (1993). *Ethical Reasoning in Accounting and Auditing*. Research Monograph Number 21, CGA-Canada Research Foundation: Vancouver, BC.
- Randall, D. M. and Fernandes, M. F. (1991). The Social Desirability Response Bias in Ethics Research. *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 10 11, pp. 805-817.
- Randall, D. M. and Gibson, A. M. (1990). Methodology in Business Ethics Research: A Review and Critical Assessment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 9 No. 6, pp. 457-472.
- Rest, J. R. (1986). *Moral Development: Advances in Research and Theory*, New York, Praeger.
- Rest, J. R. (1979). *Development in Judging Moral Issues*. Center for the Study of Ethical Development, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sims, R. L. (1993). The Relationship Between Academic Dishonesty and Unethical Business Practices. *Journal of Education for Business*, Vol. 69 No. 4, 207-211.
- Smith, P. L., and Oakley, E. F., III, (1997) Gender-Related Differences in Ethical and Social Values of Business Students: Implications for Management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 37-45.
- Spain, J. W., Brewer, P., Brewer, V., and Garner, S. J. (2002). Ethics and Geography – Impact of Geographical Cultural Differences on Students' Ethical Decisions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 41 No. 1 and 2, pp. 187-194.
- Transparency International, (2002). *Corruption Perceptions Index: An Index of Perceptions of Business People of Corruption around the World*, [http://www.transparency.org/policy\\_research/surveys\\_indices/cpi/2006](http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2006).
- Whitley, B. E. Jr. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students: A review. *Research in Higher Education*, 39 (3), 235-274.
- Wingate, M. L., (1997). An Examination of Cultural Influence on Audit Environment. *Research in Accounting Regulation*, 11: Supplement, 115-127.
- Zerbe, W. J., and D. L. Paulhus: (1987). Socially Desirable Responding in Organizational Behavior: A Reconception. *Academy of Management Journal* Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 250-264.

## Appendix A

### Background questionnaire

|                                  |                                |                         |                         |                         |                        |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| My current level is (Circle one) | Freshman                       | Sophomore               | Junior                  | Senior                  | Other: _____           |
| Gender (Circle one)              | Male                           | Female                  |                         |                         |                        |
| Age: _____                       |                                |                         |                         |                         |                        |
| My current overall GPA is:       | Less than 2.0<br>Less than 'C' | 2.0-2.49<br>About a 'C' | 2.5-2.99<br>'C+' to 'B' | 3.0-3.49<br>About a 'B' | 3.5-4.0<br>'B+' to 'A' |
| My current GPA in major is:      | Less than 2.0<br>Less than 'C' | 2.0-2.49<br>About a 'C' | 2.5-2.99<br>'C+' to 'B' | 3.0-3.49<br>About a 'B' | 3.5-4.0<br>'B+' to 'A' |

## Appendix B

### Survey questionnaire

#### Scenario 1 (Tuition)

After some extensive a greater amount of prestige. The university is making this raise in tuition without making any other advancements or changes to the current facility or curriculum. The University is not planning on changing their tuition policy and will continue to make students pay more for the same education they would have got at the old price.

1. Do you consider this to be an ethical practice?

|                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|

2. Do you agree with their strategy?

|                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|

#### Scenario 2 (Air & Space)

A university located in northern Indonesia has just received a large contribution from one of its richest Alumni. The university plans to build a state-of-the-art facility for its new Air and Space major. Construction on the new facility has already begun but the facility will be completed for another two years. Admissions of new students. Admissions have begun advertising in every video, handbook and pamphlet for the new program saying, "Construction has already begun, and it will be completed soon so reach for the stars at our university."

#### Scenario 3 (Made in)

John is the advertising manager for a clothing company that advertises their clothing as "Made in Indonesia" to appeal to a target market that objects to using foreign production. However, the company only assembles the clothing in Indonesia most of the materials that go into the construction are made in foreign countries. Regardless of the origin of the materials, the company will continue advertising its clothing as "Made in Indonesia".

#### Scenario 4 (Easy A)

M.J. is the marketing VP for Term Papers Etc., a new web-based company that offers complete papers of all topics available for a nominal fee. This company advertises to the college market by calling themselves the "Way to the Easy A" The company uses a disclaimer stating that the papers are to be used for research purposes only and is not to be used to replace actually doing the work. This disclaimer, however, is in very small print in a remote section of the web site. The company continues to advertise in this manner to boost profits and college student popularity.

#### Scenario 5 (TV ads)

Daytime television programming in the afternoon is usually geared towards younger children and adolescents who have just come home from school. During these youth-oriented programs, advertising that clearly appeals to an adult audience is aired. As a result, children are exposed to the products and become familiar with catchy slogans and/or jingles, further promoting the adult products. This television station has no intentions of changing the time slots of their current advertising and the schedule will go on uninterrupted.

#### Scenario 6 (Kooky Kola)

Kooky Kola Company produces millions of cans of cola each day. It was recently discovered that there have been traces of a toxic chemical in the machinery used in the production of the cola. This chemical has been found to be fatal in humans if it is digested in large enough doses but the chance of anyone being severely harmed by the cola is only 2%. The cost of new machinery is too much for the company right now and since it is believed that it would be very unlikely if anyone were to be harmed by the levels of the chemical found so far the company will go on with production and distribution as usual.



## Appendix C

### Paulhus' Impression Management Subscale

| 1        | 2 | 3 | 4             | 5 | 6 | 7         |
|----------|---|---|---------------|---|---|-----------|
| Not True |   |   | Somewhat true |   |   | Very true |

1. Sometimes I tell lies if I have to.
2. I never cover up my mistakes.
3. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
4. I never swear.
5. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
6. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
7. I have said something bad about a friend behind his/her back.
8. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
9. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.
10. I always declare everything at customs.
11. When I was young, I sometimes stole things.
12. I have never dropped litter on the street.
13. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.
14. I never read sexy books or magazines.
15. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.
16. I never take things that don't belong to me.
17. I have taken sick leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.
18. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
19. I have some pretty awful habits.
20. I don't gossip about other people's business.

---

## Authors

**Bernardi, Richard A.** Professor of Accounting at Roger Williams University, is a retired Air Force lieutenant colonel who flew B-52s and FB-111s. Dr. Bernardi received a PhD in Accounting from Union College in 1992. He has published over 80 articles as well as receiving Teaching Excellence Awards from Roger Williams University and the State University of New York.

**LeComte, Keri L.** A graduate of Roger Williams University's Honors Program; at graduation, she was one of the first twelve recipients of the President's Core Value Medal. This research is an outgrowth of her honors thesis. She is currently working in Student Programs and Leadership Office at Roger Williams University.