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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.
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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 Corriner, 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 Bamton 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, Gravender and Turtle, 1987; Rawwas and Isaakson, 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 decision 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 Bamton 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 did 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 Isaakson (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.
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 tests 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 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 Zavoina (1975). The ORM assumes that a latent continuous variable $y^*$, 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 $y$ are: 1 = Strongly agree (SA), 2 = Agree (A), 3 = Disagree (D), and 4 = Strongly disagree (SD). The underlying structural model is:

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

where $y_i^*$ is the latent variable of ethics, $\beta$ is a set of coefficient estimates that correspond to the set of independent variables $\mathbf{x}_i$, and $\epsilon_i$ 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Vignette</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2 Finding $1</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Unauthorized computer use</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Stealing office supplies</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Software piracy</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Vignette</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Not Religious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1 Oversees unfair labor practices</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Claiming credit for an idea</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Consuming alcohol at lunch</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1 Oversees unfair labor practices</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Claiming credit for an idea</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Violating privacy rules</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion #1</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.122*</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.170**</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other #1</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.155*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.156**</td>
<td>-0.083***</td>
<td>-0.143**</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>-0.095**</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-0.454***</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.268**</td>
<td>0.130*</td>
<td>-0.181*</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.284***</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.014*</td>
<td>0.010***</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.085**</td>
<td>-0.150*</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business students</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-185.77</td>
<td>-219.58</td>
<td>-213.63</td>
<td>-135.31</td>
<td>-221.6</td>
<td>-211.91</td>
<td>-149.88</td>
<td>-125.87</td>
<td>-155.79</td>
<td>-129.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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.
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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 a 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

PLEASE RANK YOUR 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/________________

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.