



UNIVERSITEIT VAN AMSTERDAM

**CULTURE AND ETHICAL DECISION MAKING:
AN APPLICATION OF THE SELF CONSTRUAL THEORY.**

Master Thesis

Supervisor: Drs. Karianne Kalshoven

Second Supervisor: Dr. Stefan Mol

Student: Violeta Petrachi

5766680

Submission Date: 25th of August, 2008

AMSTERDAM, 2008

Abstract

This study investigates the relationship between moral awareness and ethical decision making by using a survey based on scenarios. It also investigates if this relationship is moderated by culture seen from an individual level. The results, based on a survey of students of Business and Economics, revealed that moral aware students are not necessarily taking ethical decisions, as those morally unaware will not take only unethical decisions. The survey's results also indicate that individualistic and collectivistic people do not differ in the way they take ethical decisions.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to many people for help, both direct and indirect, for conducting this study. It would never have become reality without the knowledge, advice, feedback and constant support of my supervisor, Drs. Karianne Kalshoven. Therefore, my biggest thanks go to her, whose help I have appreciated very much. Also, I want to express my gratitude to my friends, who helped me collecting the data, and also to the fellow students who responded to the questionnaires. Least, but not last, I want to thank my parents for their constant mental and financial support, without which I would not have got till here.

Thank you all!

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
INTRODUCTION	5
THEORETICAL INSIGHTS	7
1. THEORIES REFLECTING MORAL AWARENESS AND ETHICAL DECISION MAKING	7
2. RELATING MORAL AWARENESS AND ETHICAL DECISION MAKING	10
3. CULTURE	12
<i>Culture: individualistic vs. collectivistic</i>	13
RESEARCH METHODS	15
SAMPLE AND PROCEDURE	15
MEASURES.....	15
1. <i>Culture</i>	15
2. <i>Moral awareness and Ethical decision making</i>	16
RESULTS	18
1. PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS FOR THE FOREMAN SCENARIO	18
2. PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS FOR THE ROGER SCENARIO	19
3. COMPARISON BETWEEN THE FOREMAN SCENARIO AND THE ROGER SCENARIO	19
4. THE REGRESSION ANALYSIS	21
5. THE TWO-WAY ANOVA ANALYSIS	22
CONCLUDING REMARKS	24
1. DISCUSSION	24
2. LIMITATIONS AND STRENGTHS	27
3. CONCLUSION	28
REFERENCE LIST	29
APPENDIX	32

Introduction

Over the past few years concern for ethics in organizations has been growing as more and more unethical practices were reported. As a result, considerable attention has been given to the process of ethical decision making in organizations and what determines individuals to adopt an ethical behaviour. Researchers as Dubinsky and Loken (1989), Ferrel and Gresham (1985), Hunt and Vitell (1986), Jones (1991), Rest (1986) and Treviño (1986), have developed a plethora of models in order to better understand the process of ethical decision making of individuals. Despite the number of theories focused on this subject, there is still little empirical research testing these theories. Moreover, the topic gets even more complex when the organizations are activating in international settings, and subsequently, the knowledge and understanding of how other cultures view ethical decisions will be much valued by these multinational entities.

The purpose of this paper is to first analyze the relationship between moral awareness and ethical decision making. Previous literature (Rest, 1986; Treviño, 1986; Jones, 1991) has shown a strong relationship between these two concepts; nonetheless, this study investigates if moral aware individuals are going to take ethical decisions, if individuals who are not aware of moral issues could take ethical decisions and, finally, if individuals who are not moral aware take only unethical decisions. According to Velasquez and Rostankowsky (1985), a *moral issue* is present when the actions performed freely by a person will cause harm or bring benefits to others. Therefore, the action or decision must be made willingly and must have, at least to some extent, consequences on others. The person performing the action or taking the moral decision is called *moral agent*, even if he or she is not aware of the moral issues in cause. Further, an *ethical decision* is defined as the decision which is legally and morally accepted by the most of the community.

Moreover, this paper tests if culture can provide an explanation for the individuals' different approaches on ethical decision making. More to the point, it tests if there is a difference in this respect between individualistic and collectivistic people. A difference regarding ethical decision making between these two typologies is expected because, as research showed (e.g., Triandis & Gelfand, 1998; Kanagawa & Markus, 2001; Fritzsche & Oz, 2007), individualistic people are more self-oriented therefore less willing to take into consideration other people when taking a decision.

As it can be seen, research in the field of ethics and ethical decision making has been given considerable attention; nonetheless, understanding ethical decision making in business

context is only at the beginning. More than that, research investigating the effects of culture on ethical decision making is rather scarce and little empirical testing has been done to date. Additionally, most of the research concerning this relationship has considered culture from a national level, using Hofstede's theory (1984). However, in the model suggested here, the influences of culture are tested from an individual perspective. Specifically, the paper avoids making generalizations based on the countries of origin of the respondents, but verifies if their personal characteristics (individualistic or collectivistic typologies) affect this relationship. Therefore, this paper also contributes in filling a gap in the area of ethical decision making by empirically researching it.

Knowing if moral aware individuals are also going to take ethical decisions, or if there is a difference between individualistic and collectivistic people when taking ethical decisions, would provide organizations with a better understanding of what kind of employees would be more appropriate for their ethically-driven work. Thus, the findings of this paper can be used especially by companies which place great importance on having employees who show an ethical disposition (e.g., healthcare industry, accountancy and auditing, automotive industry).

To sum up, this research aims to answer the following question: *Does culture, from an individual level, have an effect on the ethical decision making process?* For this purpose, the paper will start with a review of the body of knowledge acquired in this field, at the same time presenting the expectations regarding the model proposed; subsequently, the methodology used to test the hypotheses will be presented and afterwards shown its results. In the end an overall conclusion of the findings will be made and directions for future research will be suggested.

Theoretical Insights

Through the research done to date, moral aware individuals have been shown to more likely engage in ethical behaviours than individuals who are not aware of the moral issues involved in a specific situation. For example, theories such as those of Rest (1986) and Jones (1991) argue that being moral aware is the first step of the process of ethical decision making. Moreover, Kohlberg's theory (1981, 1984) adds that the level of cognitive moral development is equally important for taking ethical decisions. Nonetheless, Jones (1991) stresses that however moral aware an individual may be and whichever is his/her level of cognitive moral development, still, if s/he does not perceive as important the moral aspects, then s/he will not engage in an ethical behaviour. Also, other researchers (e.g. Brady & Wheeler, 1996) have argued that the process of ethical decision making may also be influenced by the ethical predisposition the individual has; that is, which aspects are perceived as having a moral connotation. Therefore, in the following part these theories will be introduced and also their connection with this paper will be shown.

1. Theories reflecting Moral Awareness and Ethical Decision Making

In literature, various models are discussed to provide frameworks understanding the relation between moral awareness and ethical decision making. For example, the **theory of Rest** (1986) states that moral awareness is the first of four steps contributing to an ethical decision or action and consists in recognizing the moral aspects of a situation. He explains that this first step is rather a process of personal interpretation, in which the individual may or may not recognize that s/he is facing moral problems and that some moral principles should be applied. Furthermore, a second step is *moral judgment* and consists in deciding the potential actions that could be taken in a moral and just way. To continue, the third step is *moral intent*, which is the individual's decision to give priority to moral values over other values and, afterwards, the final step, the actual engagement in the moral behaviour: *moral action*.

Hence, in order to make an ethical decision, an individual has to go through these four stages: identify the moral issues, make a moral judgement, establish a moral intent and take a moral action. Each of these steps holds an equal importance for the final outcome, but the first step is believed to be the essential one, as it is the first indicator of one's chances of having an ethical conduct. As Treviño *et al.* (2000) argue, "*Moral awareness is a critical first*

step in an unfolding ethical decision-making process because issue interpretation is likely to set the premises within which subsequent thought processes are taken place” (p. 983).

The issue of interpretation seems to be a key operation in the process of ethical decision making. An example of issue interpretation can be considered the ethical predisposition. Ethical predisposition is a concept which represents the cognitive framework that an individual prefers to use when making an ethical decision (Brady & Wheeler, 1996). The research so far has mainly focused on two frameworks: *utilitarianism and formalism*. The **utilitarian view** is part of the teleological theories and originates from the work of John Stuart Mill (1863). It is focused on the consequences of an act and states that a moral act is the one which creates the greatest good (Brady, 1985). Individuals who are taking this approach will judge the moral aspects of a situation only from the perspective of its outcomes and the values they associate with them. However, this framework does not specify its elements, nor does it say what is considered to be a good consequence, nor to whom it is applied. The second view, **the formalism**, represents a deontological approach to ethics and originates from the work of Kant (1785). In order to determine moral behaviour, formalism uses different patterns, rules of behaviour, principles or, in general, formal features of ethics (Brady & Wheeler, 1996).

Thus, the most significant difference between the formalist and the utilitarian view is that while formalists judge a moral behaviour through the individual’s intentions and the principles used in making the decision, the utilitarianists will rely on consequences to organize and judge moral issues. Although both are determinants of moral awareness, research has been shown that formalism holds a greater capacity for accessibility and it influences moral awareness more broadly than utilitarianism (e.g., Reynolds, 2006). Determinants of moral awareness are beyond the scope of this paper. However, cognitive framework theory provides us with arguments to understand that moral awareness and ethical decision making are also influenced by the development level of moral cognition.

For example, a theory reflecting the essence of cognitive moral development (CMD) is the one of Kohlberg (1984). Through this theory, he has provided a theoretical ground on which models of ethical decision making in business have been built (e.g., Ferrell & Gresham, 1985; Hunt & Vitell, 1986; Treviño, 1986; Jones, 1991). **Kohlberg’s model** focuses on the aspects of reasoning in the moral decision making process, showing how the cognitive process becomes more complex along with the development of the human being, from childhood to adulthood. More to the point, he states that throughout life, individuals’

cognitive abilities develop and the way individuals make decisions is highly influenced by this level of development.

Kohlberg's framework consists in three levels of cognitive moral development: the pre-conventional level, the conventional level and the post-conventional level. With each successive stage, the individual's moral judgement is less dependent on outside influences. In addition, the individual's conception of what is right, moves from a self-centred view to a broader understanding of the importance of social contracts and principles of justice and rights. According to Kohlberg, these stages are very structured and individuals are consistent in their level of moral judgment. Moreover, he argues that the sequence of these stages is always invariant and irreversible across all cultures.

Kohlberg's work has been criticized by many researchers (e.g., Ferrel, Mansfield & Loe, 2000) as being biased either towards gender, because of his entirely male sample, or towards a type of moral philosophy, because the "right and justice" principles were the only ones considered. Another limitation of his model is that moral judgements are tested only from a cognitive point of view (how individuals think about moral dilemmas) and not from a behavioural point of view (how they would actually behave or decide) (Treviño, 1986). Moreover, researchers (Ferrel, Mansfield & Loe, 2000; Jones, 1991) seem to be sceptical also about the inflexible evolution of one's moral development. They state that Kohlberg's theory may become unsupported if there is evidence that individuals regress in their CMD or use different moral reasoning strategies depending on situations.

Jones' theory (1991) is one which strengthens this last question, as he argues that individuals take decisions depending on how intense they perceive the moral issues in cause. Therefore, he states, individuals use different levels of CMD in different situations, depending on the moral intensity of those issues. He defines *moral intensity* as a multi-dimensional construct comprising six characteristics of the moral issue: (1) magnitude of consequences, (2) social consensus, (3) probability of effect, (4) temporal immediacy, (5) proximity and (6) concentration of effect. Moreover, he mentions that this concept is highly connected to the moral issue and not to the moral agent or the organizational context.

Jones' model is based on Rest's four-component model (1986), and he argues that each of the four stages of the ethical decision making process (moral issue recognition, moral judgment, moral intent, moral behaviour) will be influenced by the characteristics of moral issue, as the ethical decision making is issue contingent.

2. Relating moral awareness and ethical decision making

Moral awareness has been defined as a “*person’s recognition that his/her potential decision or action could affect the interests, welfare or expectations of the self or others in a way that may conflict with one or more ethical standards*” (Butterfield, Treviño & Weaver, 2000, p. 982). In other words, these authors state that an individual is moral aware when s/he acknowledges that his/her decisions will have an effect on others and may interfere with some ethical principles. Reynolds (2006) synthesized previous definitions and stated that moral awareness represents “*a person’s determination that a situation contains moral content and legitimately can be considered from a moral point of view*” (p. 233). His definition is in line with Rest’s definition (1986), which states that moral awareness is “*an interpretive process wherein the individual recognizes that a moral standard or principle is relevant to some set of circumstances*” (Reynolds, 2006, p. 233). Both Reynolds and Rest hold that a person is moral aware in a given situation when that person recognizes the ethical aspects of the situation and therefore the situation can be judged from a moral point of view.

There seems to be a conceptual difference of what moral awareness is in the views of Treviño *et al.*, on one hand, and Reynolds and Rest, on the other hand. The main reason is that Treviño and her colleagues take into account only the decisional part of the process and the consequences associated with it. They do not mention anything about identifying moral aspects, which, in theory at least, stands before taking a certain decision. Moreover, the impact of the decision and its evaluation as being in conflict with ethics or not, should also appear after the individual identified the aspects a situation presents. Contrarily, through their definitions, Reynolds and Rest highlight the essence of this concept by saying that ethical aspects need to be identified and then reasoned from a moral point of view. Briefly, if ethical decision making is seen as a process, then Reynolds and Rest described its first stage, the aspects’ identification, while Treviño *et al.* described the immediate stage, the reasoning.

However important the first step might be, even if the moral issues are recognized in a given situation, it is hard to believe that these moral issues are determinants of decision making if the individual does not perceive them as important (Jordan, 2008). Therefore, the moral issues are more likely to be replaced by personal values on which the individual places more importance (Hunt & Vitell, 1992). Moreover, the research done so far have found that various factors (e.g., individual factors, organizational factors, ethical predisposition) can have an influence on the process of ethical decision making.

For example, Butterfield, Treviño and Weaver (2000) studied the influence of issue-related factors and social context-related factors on moral awareness. Using two scenarios as research method, they found that individuals are more likely to recognize the moral nature of an issue when: 1) it may have significant negative consequences, 2) when issues are framed using moral language, 3) when there is a social consensus within the organization/profession that the activity in cause is ethically problematic and 4) when the environment presents highly aggressive competitive practices. The results showed that the respondents involved in this study were indeed influenced by these factors. Consequently, the authors suggest that management can increase the moral awareness of the employees in the workplace by: providing training to employees so they are more sensitive to the consequences of their actions, encouraging them to take responsibility for these consequences, providing training for recognizing moral issues, creating codes of conduct which present those ethical issues most likely to appear in their organizational setting, etc.

Also, Treviño and Youngblood (1990) hypothesized social learning conditions (vicarious reward, vicarious punishment, and control), stage of cognitive moral development (CMD) and locus of control to have an influence on ethical decision making. Their results showed that CMD directly influences the ethical decision making process, locus of control influences ethical decision making both directly and indirectly through outcome expectancies, while social learning influences the process only indirectly, through the outcome expectancies of vicarious reward condition. In the nutshell, their results suggest that outcome expectancies have a direct effect on ethical decision making.

Again Treviño (1986), proposed for researchers to test an interactionist model according to which, ethical decision making in organizations is explained by the interaction of individual and situational components. Another proposal came from Hunt and Vitell (1986) who developed a multi-staged theory of marketing ethics. They state that environmental factors (cultural, industrial, and organizational) and personal experiences affect the perception of existence of an ethical problem. In turn, these perceptions lead to both deontological (formalist) and teleological (utilitarian) evaluations, which, in the end, lead to ethical judgements. Then, judgement affects intentions, which, along with situational constraints, affect behaviour.

Nonetheless, in theory, if one does not recognize the ethical aspects involved in a situation, then it is less probably that s/he will engage in the end in a moral behaviour. Therefore, it is proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Moral aware individuals will take ethical decisions.

3. Culture

As shown, diverse factors influencing ethical decision making have been researched, such as individual and situational factors. However, the body of research done so far has not investigated culture as a factor influencing ethical decision making. Nonetheless, Vitell, Nwachukwu and Barnes (1993), for example, have proposed that culture is an important factor in the ethical decision making process, and knowing how it influences the process is even more important. Therefore, through their paper, they develop propositions concerning the influence of various cultural dimensions based on Hofstede's typology and encourage future research to empirically test them.

To begin with, *culture* is a term that was originally developed in the field of anthropology, and has become a prevalent research area in organizational studies (Smircich, 1983). Unfortunately, a consistent definition of this concept is extremely difficult to find, especially in a business context. However, Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) attempted to give a more broad definition to the concept of "culture". In their view, "*Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behaviour acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiment of artefacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (e.g. historically derived and selected) ideas and attached values*" (p. 181).

Most research done so far about the relationship between culture and ethical decision making has regarded culture from a national perspective (e.g., Vitell, Nwachukwu & Barnes, 1993; Robertson & Fadil, 1999). Usually, these studies are based on Hofstede's theory (1984), according to which societies differ along four major cultural dimensions: power distance, individualism, masculinity and uncertainty avoidance. Consequently, these studies imply that if societies differ with regards to these cultural dimensions, so will the various components of their ethical decision making differ. While this rationale is valid, still some questions are raised concerning the generalizability of cultures. Nonetheless, little empirical research has tested this relationship, most studies proposing hypotheses rather than testing them (e.g., Vitell, Nwachukwu & Barnes, 1993; Robertson & Fadil, 1999).

While these studies consider culture from a national level, the model researched here involves culture from an individual level. More to the point, this paper studies the construal self theory as a cultural factor in order to determine the individualistic or collectivistic typologies of individuals. The reason to choose this approach was to avoid any generalization about cultures, especially because the respondents involved in this study originate from

different countries and their unequal distribution throughout the sample would have not allowed making reliable allegations regarding their characteristics.

Culture: individualistic vs. collectivistic

In their article about culture and the self, Markus and Kitayama (1991) make an overview of the theory of the construal self. They present two aspects of the self: the independent, or individualistic type, and the interdependent, or collectivistic type. They argue that even though it is true that some aspects of the self can be seen as universal, other can rather be seen as culture specific. Thus, they state, the difference between these two types consists in the relationship between the self and the others, specifically, the degree to which individuals see themselves as separate from others or connected with them (others). More to the point, the extent to which an individual, when defining the self, assigns to the other depend on the cultural values.

The Independent Construal

An independent self is one whose thoughts, actions and behaviour are adapted primarily in reference to one's needs and feelings rather than in reference to the needs and feelings of others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). This view of the self is based on the belief of the wholeness and uniqueness of each individual, who has his/her own attributes (Johnson, 1985; Sampson, 1985). It is assumed that this kind of construal is more present in the Western cultures than in non-Western cultures. However, even in a specific culture, individuals will vary in the extent to which they possess such beliefs.

The Interdependent Construal

According to Markus and Kitayama (1991), the core belief of this concept consists in the fundamental need of individuals being connected with others, creating and maintaining interdependence with them. Thus, the individual is seen as one being part of a group, of a social relationship, in which his/her behaviour is mainly moderated by the needs and actions of the others involved in that relationship. Hence, the self is defined through the relationship the self has with others. However, the authors stress that it should not be understood that the interdependent self has no personal characteristics, opinions and judgements, but they are regulated by the need of being connected with the others. Therefore, their characteristics are contingent upon the situation and context, thus making them rather unreliable.

The interdependent construal gives less importance to autonomy and its expression than the independent construal. Moreover, the interdependent self will act and behave according to the anticipated expectations of others, while putting aside the personal wishes. Also, in one of

her papers about ethical leadership in organizations, Kanungo (2001) argues that altruistic motives, characteristic to the interdependent individual, are part of being an ethical leader. She states that the ethical leaders are effective when their actions derive and are motivated from a concern for others, even if that would affect their own good.

Thus, it can be inferred that an ethical leader is an altruistic therefore a collectivistic individual. This idea is also strengthened by Brown *et al.* (2005), who articulate that ethical leaders are people oriented and very considerate with their employees, having a nurturing relationship with them. Moreover, in the model proposed, Kohlberg (1981, 1984) argues that the less self-oriented a person is, the more likely that person is to have an advanced level of moral cognition therefore to take ethical decisions.

To sum up, these researchers have shown through their studies that in order for a person (or leader) to be considered ethical, that person should possess altruistic values and concern for others when making a decision.

Therefore, it is proposed:

Hypothesis 2: The positive effect of moral awareness on ethical decision making is stronger when people are collectivistic and weaker when people are individualistic.

Research Methods

Sample and procedure

The sample consisted of 122 students in Business and Economics, out of which 61.5% were males and 38.5% females, either completing a Bachelor degree (33.6%) or a Master degree (65.6%). On average, their age was 23.81 years (range 18-34 years), with a mean work experience of 1.34 years, working 26.52 hours per week (range 0-50 hours). Out of the entire sample, only 31.1% attended business ethics courses. The students were from different countries, having nationalities as it follows: Dutch and Romanians each hold 26.2% of the sample, 9.8% Chinese, 5.7% Germans, 4.9% Bulgarians, the same proportion Italians, and 4.1% Spaniards. The sample was chosen to be made up of students because they are the future leaders in the business organizations and therefore will have to take many (ethical) decisions for the companies' and society's benefit.

The survey consisted in a combination of a questionnaire and two scenarios already tested by researchers (Weber, 1991; Awasthi, 2008). All the surveys were addressed in English, thus all respondents had English as a second language, so there was no difference in the comprehension level. The purpose of the questionnaire was to identify the respondent's typology, their culture, while the scenarios had the goal to test whether the respondents were moral aware and their likeliness of taking ethical decisions. In order to complete the survey, a respondent needed 15 minutes in average. The survey was addressed either on paper (43) or electronically, via e-mail (79); either way, their confidentiality was assured.

Measures

1. Culture.

Culture was assessed by 25 items from Triandis and Gelfand (1998), which were aimed to identify if the respondent has a collectivistic or individualistic personality. The respondents had to score the extent to which they agree with each of the statements by choosing one of the five response scales: *Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree*. The questions were about the way the respondents perceive society and how they interact with others (family, friends, and colleagues). For example: *"If the group is slowing me down, it is better to leave it and work alone"*, or *"Usually, I offer my help even if I was not asked for it"*, or *"I prefer helping only my closest friends with issues that require time and attention"*. The individualistic and collectivistic typologies were seen as the ends of a

continuum, within a range from 1 to 5: the closer the score was to 1, the more individualistic the respondents were, and the closer to 5, the more the collectivistic the respondents were.

2. Moral awareness and Ethical decision making

Both concepts were assessed using two scenarios already tested by researchers (Weber, 1991; Awasthi, 2008). Scenarios have often been used in the business ethics research, as it seemed to be the most comprehensive method to use when concepts like ethical reasoning (Fritzsche & Becker, 1984), ethical judgements and decision making preferences (Baumhart, 1961), or a subject's intent to behave in an ethical or unethical way (Laczniak & Inderrieden, 1987; Zinkham, Bisesi & Saxton, 1989) had to be measured.

One of the scenarios of the survey, named "Foreman scenario", presented the case of a working team who was having working-related problems and the way the team was handling those problems; here, the respondents had to evaluate the ethical aspects of the team's decision (see Appendix). The other scenario, which I called "Roger scenario", presented a case of an employee who had to make a decision regarding his work, decision which involved ethical issues. In this case, the respondents were supposed to make a decision in the employee's place, to say how they think the employee should behave (see Appendix).

The subjects had to first read the scenario and then answer three questions about it; then, read the second scenario and answer other three questions. The scenarios were positioned alternatively in the survey, so their sequence would not influence the students' answers. Open ended questions were chosen in both scenarios so that respondents will not limit their answers and be put in the position to adopt a "black or white" behaviour, and also not to point the respondents to ethics. Their answers were then interpreted by two researchers who rated both *moral awareness* and *ethical decision making* with either **0** ('not moral aware'; 'not making an ethical decision') or **1** ('moral aware'; 'making an ethical decision'). Where their evaluation did not coincide, both researchers discussed the cases and came to an agreement.

Moral awareness was assessed with the following question: "*What are the most important aspects discussed in this case?*" In the Foreman scenario, if the respondent mentioned "(lack of) responsibility", "work ethics", "blackmail", "violate the contract" or "cheating", then s/he was considered as being aware of the moral issues involved in the case and therefore rated with 1. If, on the contrary, the subject did not mention any of the above aspects, or did not seem to see a problem in the case, then s/he was considered not being aware of the moral dilemmas and consequently rated with 0. In the Roger scenario, in order for a respondent to be evaluated as moral aware, then s/he should have mentioned aspects like

“responsibility”, “work ethics”, “fraud”, “integrity” or “corruption”. Similarly as in the other case, if s/he did not say anything about these aspects, or moreover, did not seem to see the case as questioning the ethical conduct, then s/he was rated with 0, being considered unaware.

Ethical decision making was assessed in the Foreman scenario with the following questions: *“How would you rate the foreman’s decision of accepting the order, acceptable or unacceptable? Please state why”* and *“Overall, should the foreman have made the decision of expediting the order?”* If the respondents answered that accepting the order was not necessarily a bad decision, but expediting it only 80% inspected would have violated the contract (law) and the ethical conduct, then they were considered taking an ethical decision and therefore rated with 1. An example of such an answer would be: *“I don’t think the foreman should have shipped the order because it’s an order that can cause a lot of trouble to the company. Also, the foreman has to take into consideration the moral issues that come in place when he wants to deceive the client, and let’s not forget the legal issues”* If, on the contrary, they argued giving an answer similar to *“Of course the foreman should have shipped the order; it’s better to do the 80% of the objective than 0%”*, then they would not have been considered taking an ethical decisions and rated with 0.

In what ethical decision making concerns the Roger scenario, it was assessed with questions like *“What do you think Roger should decide? Please state why”* and *“Roger decides to shred the papers. Would that be an unethical decision? Please explain”*. Usually, respondents who gave answers like *“If it takes care of most people’s interests then it’s not an unethical decision”* or *“Theoretically, it’s an unethical decision. But sometimes you have to do the things you have to do”* or *“If I were Roger, I would listen to the boss: I would shred the papers but then quit the job”* were not considered taking an ethical decision and rated with 0. Contrarily, answers like *“I think Roger should do his job and apply the law because it is not fair to apply different rules to one or another just because “is an important client.””* , *“If I were Roger, I would obey the law even if in the end I would lose my job”*, or *“In my opinion, it’s really unethical [shredding the documents]. Business should find out the benefit by ethical and legal approaches”* were rated with 1.

Results

1. Pearson product-moment correlations for the Foreman scenario

The relationship between “moral awareness” and “ethical decision making” in the Foreman case was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. Thus, it was found a moderate and positive correlation between the two variables [$r = .291$, $p = .001$], high levels of moral awareness associated with high levels of ethical decision making. However, the strongest correlation showed by moral awareness in the Foreman case was related to the reasoning respondents used when taking ethical decisions. With a coefficient that suggests a rather moderate but positive correlation [$r = .319$, $p = .000$], high levels of moral awareness were strongly associated with ethical reasoning. Moreover, reasoning was found to have a positive and strong correlation with ethical decision making [$r = .596$, $p = .000$], suggesting that ethical decisions were associated with ethical reasoning.

Also, a very small correlation was found, on one hand, between construal and ethical decision making [$r = .176$, $p = .030$], and on another hand, between construal and reasoning [$r = .156$, $p = .048$]; this suggests that collectivistic people use high levels of ethical reasoning in taking ethical decisions. However, there was no statistically significant correlation between construal and moral awareness, and no correlation in the relationship between individualistic or collectivistic countries and all the other variables. This means that these variables do not hold any influence on moral awareness.

Table 1: Pearson product-moment correlations for the Foreman scenario

Measures	1	2	3	4	5
(1) Moral Awareness					
(2) Ethical Decision Making	.291**				
(3) Reasoning	.319**	.596**			
(4) Construal	-.078	.176*	.156*		
(5) Construal I/C	.022	.145	.142	.744**	
(6) I/C countries	.033	.074	.021	.063	.087

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

2. Pearson product-moment correlations for the Roger scenario

Unexpectedly, in this scenario, moral awareness was positively yet not significantly related with ethical decision making [$r = .127$, $p = .086$]; however, moral awareness was found to be significantly related to reasoning [$r = .175$, $p = .032$], meaning that high levels of moral awareness were associated with ethical reasoning. Moreover, reasoning was positively and strongly correlated with ethical decision making [$r = .588$, $p = .000$], meaning that ethical reasoning was associated with ethical decision making. However, construal did not seem to be much correlated with any of the variables, displaying only small correlations, yet insignificant, with moral awareness [$r = .128$, $p = .082$] and reasoning [$r = .117$, $p = .108$], while showing almost no relationship with ethical decision making.

Table 2: Pearson product-moment correlations for the Roger scenario

Measures	1	2	3	4	5
(1) Moral Awareness					
(2) Ethical Decision Making	.127				
(3) Reasoning	.175*	.588**			
(4) Construal	.128	.025	.117		
(5) Construal I/C	.043	.056	.073	.744**	
(6) I/C countries	-.124	.002	-.031	.063	.087

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

Also, it was surprising to see almost no correlation between variables like gender, business ethics courses, work experience or degree and all the other variables: moral awareness, ethical decision making and reasoning.

3. Comparison between the Foreman scenario and the Roger scenario

Comparing the two scenarios and studying the correlation between them, interesting results have emerged. Besides the expected correlations between variables (moral awareness, reasoning, ethical decision making) within the same scenario, it also resulted an interaction between variables from both scenarios. For example, it seems that the moral awareness perceived in the Foreman scenario was positively and strongly correlated with the moral awareness perceived in the Roger case [$r = .217$, $p = .009$]; this denotes that high levels of moral awareness in the first case were associated with high levels of moral awareness in the

second case. This result was rather unexpected because the respondents' awareness could have differed from a scenario to another, depending on, for example, how important they found the issues involved. Nonetheless, such result is positive because it means that the respondents were constant in their moral identification and generally sensitive to the moral issues.

Also, a moderate and positive correlation appeared between the moral awareness in the Roger case and the reasoning in the Foreman case [$r=.241$, $p=.005$]; at the same time, moral awareness in the Foreman case also displayed a positive and significant correlation with the reasoning from the Roger case [$r = .173$, $p = .033$]. Equally interesting, the reasoning in one scenario is related to the ethical decision making in the other scenario. As it can be seen in the Table 3, there was a moderate and positive correlation between the reasoning in the Roger case and the ethical decision making in the Foreman case [$r=.296$, $p=.001$], and also between the reasoning in the Foreman case and the ethical decision making in the Roger case [$r=.196$, $p=.019$].

However, in what the relationship between moral awareness and ethical decision making is concerned, the interaction result was not significant. Specifically, the moral awareness in the Foreman case and the ethical decision making in the Roger case were small and insignificantly correlated [$r=.100$, $p=.141$]; also, the moral awareness in the Roger case had a small and insignificant correlation with the ethical decision making in the Foreman case [$r=.118$, $p=.105$]. Therefore, the interaction relationship between these two variables was not statistically significant.

Table 3: Pearson product-moment correlations – interaction between Foreman and Roger scenarios

Measures	1	2	3	4	5
(1) Moral Awareness Foreman					
(2) Reasoning Foreman	.319**				
(3) Ethical Decision Making Foreman	.291**	.596**			
(4) Moral Awareness Roger	.217*	.241*	.118		
(5) Reasoning Roger	.173*	.292**	.296**	.175*	
(6) Ethical Decision Making Roger	.100	.196*	.215*	.127	.588**

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

Moreover, comparing the two scenarios, it was observed that even though students were more moral aware in the Roger scenario (82%) than in the Foreman scenario (53.3%), they did not keep the same proportions when taking ethical decisions (see Table 4); it seems that the students took more ethical decisions in the Foreman scenario (60.7%) than in the Roger scenario (54.9%). This result is even more surprising when taking into consideration the reasoning respondents used when deciding: 42.6% of them used an ethical reasoning when making the final decision in Roger case, compared to 23% in Foreman case. This means that despite that subjects were more moral aware and used an ethical reasoning in the Roger case (in percentage), they did not take more ethical decisions (as frequency) than in the Foreman case.

These results suggest that if an individual is aware of the moral issues involved in a situation and uses an ethical reasoning, s/he still cannot be predicted to take ethical decisions in the end. Therefore, moral awareness and ethical reasoning are not sufficient attestors for ethical decision making. Consequently, Hypothesis 1, which stated that moral aware individuals will take ethical decisions, was only partially supported, since the relationship between moral awareness, ethical reasoning and ethical decision making was strong and statistically significant only in the Foreman scenario.

Table 4: Frequencies of moral awareness and ethical decisions in the scenarios

Measures	Foreman Scenario		Roger Scenario	
	+	-	+	-
Moral Awareness	53.3%	45.1%	82%	16.4%
Ethical Decision Making	60.7%	33.6%	54.9%	41.8%

“+”: moral aware; “-”: not moral aware
“+”: taking ethical decisions; “-”: not taking ethical decisions
Note: percentage is not complete because of missing values

Table 5: Frequencies of the level of reasoning used in the scenarios

Cases	Reasoning		
	+	0	-
Foreman scenario	23%	59%	12.3%
Roger scenario	42.6%	28.7%	24.1%

“+”: using ethical reasoning when taking a decision
“0”: using neither an ethical nor an unethical reasoning when taking a decision
“-”: using an unethical reasoning when taking a decision

4. The regression analysis

In order to test the second hypothesis, according to which the process of ethical decision making is influenced by individualistic or collectivistic typologies, a regression analysis for

each of the scenarios is conducted. For both scenarios moral awareness, individualistic vs. collectivistic typologies, and business ethics courses are considered independent variables, while ethical decision making is seen as a dependent variable. Attendance of business ethics courses was considered to hold a contribution in the process of ethical decision making because students taking such courses are supposed to be more familiar with ethical settings and sensitive to them.

In the Foreman scenario, the results of the analysis showed that the above mentioned independent variables explain 10.8% [R square=.108] of the variance in ethical decision making. Of these three variables, moral awareness makes the largest unique contribution [$\beta=.284$, $p=.002$], while the contributions of self construal [$\beta=.139$, $p=.128$] and business ethics courses [$\beta=-.063$, $p=.487$] are lower and insignificant. In other words, the model proposed through this analysis does not entirely hold an explanation in predicting ethical decision making.

In what the Roger scenario is concerned, the situation is very similar, only that the results hold even less importance in predicting ethical decision making. More to the point, here, the independent variables explain only 2.3% of the variance in ethical decision making. Similar to the other results, moral awareness hold the greatest contribution of all the independent variables [$\beta=.122$], although it is insignificant [$p=.193$]. The business ethics course variable and the self construal have very low β values, .062 and .050 respectively. Therefore, neither in this scenario the independent variables explained the variance in ethical decision making.

5. The two-way ANOVA analysis

A two-way ANOVA test was conducted in order to check for the possibility of an interaction effect between construal, moral awareness and ethical decision making (the influence of moral awareness on ethical decision making depends on whether one has an individualistic or collectivistic typology).

For the Foreman scenario the results showed that the interaction between moral awareness and construal was close to be significant, the level of significance being at .067. However, this result suggests that there is no significant difference in the effect of moral awareness on ethical decision making for individualistic and collectivistic respondents. Nonetheless, when checking the significance levels for the variable “moral awareness” and “construal” it can be seen that there is a significant main effect for moral awareness ($p=.035$), but no significant main effect for construal ($p=.170$). This means that individualistic and collectivistic people do

not differ in terms of making ethical decisions, but there is a difference in scores for moral aware and not moral aware subjects (see Table 6).

When conducting two-way ANOVA for the Roger scenario, the situation was very similar. In this case, the interaction between construal, moral awareness and ethical decision making was insignificant ($p=.334$). This indicates that there is no significant difference in the effect of moral awareness on ethical decision making for individualistic and collectivistic subjects. Moreover, when checking the significance levels for moral awareness ($p=.199$) and construal ($p=.326$) separately, no significant main effect appears. Therefore, in this case, the individualistic and collectivistic respondents, either moral aware or not moral aware, did not differ in making ethical decisions.

Table 6: Two-Way ANOVA – Tests of between-subjects effects

Measures	Foreman Scenario (p value)	Roger Scenario (p value)
Moral Awareness (MA)	.035	.199
Construal I/C	.170	.326
MA*Construal I/C	.067	.334

*Dependent Variable: Ethical decision making

To conclude, the second hypothesis, testing that individualistic and collectivistic people will differ in the ethical decision making process, was not supported. Specifically, the regression analysis showed that construal did not hold any significant explanation in the variance of ethical decision making in none of the scenarios. However, moral awareness seemed to have a strong contribution in explaining the variance of ethical decision making, but only in the Foreman scenario. Also, when conducting the two-way ANOVA analysis to check for interaction effects, only the Foreman case showed that moral aware and not moral aware individuals differ in their decision making; however, construal did not have a level significant enough to make a difference in the decision making process. Therefore, it can be concluded that culture has no considerable effect on the process of ethical decision making.

Concluding remarks

1. Discussion

It appears from the results that moral awareness, ethical decision making and the reasoning used when taking a decision, are correlated and significant. In both scenarios these variables have shown to be in a positive relationship; however, their significance differs from a scenario to another.

In the Foreman scenario, it was found that moral aware individuals used an ethical reasoning and in the end took an ethical decision. Therefore, in this case, the first hypothesis was supported. However, Hypothesis 2, which proposed that individualistic and collectivistic people will differ in making ethical decisions, was not supported. It seems that culture, seen from an individual level, did not have any effect on the relationship between moral awareness and ethical decision making.

In the Roger scenario, none of the hypotheses was supported. Moral awareness was found to be in a positive relationship with ethical decision making, yet not significant enough to be considered related to it. Nonetheless, moral awareness had a positive and strong connection with reasoning and also, reasoning was positively and strongly correlated with ethical decision making. Yet, these were not enough arguments for supporting Hypothesis 1. In what the culture's influence is concerned, it did not hold any explanation in the variance of ethical decision making process. Therefore, neither the second hypothesis was supported.

Overall, in the Foreman case students took more ethical decisions than in the Roger case, even though they were less moral aware and used less of a moral reasoning to reach the final decision in this case than in the Roger case. An explanation for that can be the fact that students used a more utilitarian approach when judging and taking ethical decisions in the Roger scenario than in the other one. In the Roger case, the issues at stake were more obvious (hiding fraud, indulging in an illegal situation, etc), therefore the moral awareness of the respondents was higher. Nonetheless, the tendency of the respondents to embrace an utilitarian approach when taking the final decision might have influenced them. For example, some answers argued that hiding the fraud and shredding the documents would not hurt anyone, while others were saying that if put in such situation, they would shred the papers and then quit the job. Such answers were rated as unethical, so even though moral aware, if the respondents gave such answers, then they were perceived as not taking ethical decisions.

Another reason why moral aware individuals would not always take ethical decisions (and therefore the difference in perception between the two scenarios) can be found in the arguments of Jones (1991). He states that individuals take decisions depending on how intense they perceive the moral issues involved. For example, in the Roger scenario, the students might have been moral aware, but because they did not perceive these issues important (e.g., Roger was not seen as being directly responsible for the fraud therefore they said that shredding the papers would not imprison him and not hurt anyone), they did not take ethical decisions.

An argument for explaining the different results in the perception of the moral issues in the two scenarios resides in the scenarios themselves. Specifically, the Foreman scenario presented a case in which the characters already took a decision, so the subjects only had to judge and comment upon that decision. Roger case, on the other hand, presented a situation without giving any decision, such that the respondent had to take a decision himself/herself. Generally, it is easier for one to judge and criticize other people's actions, therefore the students might have been more ethically sensitive and critical to the actions of others than in the case when they were asked to take a decision. Hence, for this reason, the students took more ethical decisions in the Foreman case than in the Roger case.

The second hypothesis investigated the influence of the individualistic-collectivistic typologies on the relationship between moral awareness and ethical decision making. It was expected that individualistic and collectivistic people would differ in the process of decision making and the reasoning involved in the sense that those collectivistic would have higher rates of moral awareness and ethical decisions than those individualistic. One reason to believe that was because collectivistic people are more altruistic and concerned about others' wellbeing than those individualistic and therefore more willing to take into consideration the consequences of their actions on other people when taking a decision.

Despite the fact that construal was found to be related with ethical decision making in the Foreman case, the regression analysis showed that construal did not hold any contribution in the variance of ethical decision making in none of the scenarios. Moreover, culture (construal) did not have any interaction effect on the relationship between moral awareness and ethical decision making; thus it means that individualistic and collectivistic people do not differ in making ethical decisions.

An explanation for this result can be found in the research made by Triandis (2001) who argues that cultures merge and thus it results a more global culture; as cultures interact, the characteristics of cultures blend together and therefore a process of acculturation is more

likely to appear. Thus, individuals working in an international environment are the most likely to be affected by this process, which translates in changes in job behavior. However, their family behavior or the religious believes are not directly influenced, therefore they are still likely to show cultural differences in these regards. So this can be also the case with the international students involved in this survey; even though they were coming from different countries and having different values and cultures, they were studying in an international environment therefore being influenced by the global culture. Consequently, they would lose their cultural identity and embrace a global culture at least whilst studying in an international environment (their work place).

So, students influenced by the global culture cannot easily be classified in individualistic or collectivistic, since they might have both characteristics at the same time. This might be the case in this study. If one takes a look at the mean of the variable “construal”, one will see that a score of 3.14 (on a scale from 1 to 5) suggests rather a neutral typology. As a consequence, there cannot be seen clear differences in their work habits or in the way they think about the work environment; thus being explained how culture had such a little impact on the moral awareness – ethical decision making relation.

Also, neither the gender, the age and the work experience, nor the attendance of business ethics courses influenced the ethical decision making process. In what the gender is concerned, previous research came to different conclusions regarding the effects of this variable on decision making. Specifically, the studies either determined no significant gender differences, or found females to be more ethically sensitive than males (Loe *et al.*, 2000). Also, the findings of this study were consistent with previous examinations of the effects of work experience and education level, which did not show a significant relationship with the ethical decision making. A reason for that is that the sample under observation did not differ much regarding the work experience or the education level; their work experience varied from 0 to 2 years and the highest degree was either Bachelor or Master. Therefore, there was not much variety in the sample. Future research should take into observation a more varied sample, in order to see if this kind of variables can have an effect on ethical decision making; for example, future studies should include students but also employees from a business environment but with different levels of experience.

2. Limitations and strengths

There are some limitations that can be addressed to this paper. First of all, the sample, being entirely made up of students, means that the variety of age, education level and work experience was rather low, therefore little differentiation could have been noticed in their behavior. However, these business students are the future employees and managers, therefore it is interesting to see how they approach these moral issues and how they reason. Nonetheless, future research should include individuals of different ages, with different education backgrounds and work experiences in order to see differences in their approach or to see if the different characteristics could hold an explanation in the variance of the ethical decision making process.

Second of all, the scenarios from the survey used open-ended questions in order to test the respondents' ethical awareness and decision making. This method holds some disadvantages in coding the data in the sense that some misinterpretations can occur while rating the respondents' answers. For instance, these misinterpretations can be due to a poor vocabulary (given that English was the second language for the respondents) or to a bad use of the language knowledge, so that the researcher does not understand what the respondent wants to say. Yet, asking only closed-end questions is not a solution either; even though this method would allow larger samples to be gathered and misinterpretations would be avoided, still it also presents some disadvantages. The most important one is that closed-end questions would point the respondents to key aspects of the scenarios thus giving them hints about what is expected to write. Hence, future research should find a combination of the two methods which would diminish their insufficiencies.

Nonetheless, the study presents strengths as well. For instance, the survey includes two scenarios in order to test the hypothesized relationships. Thus, it offers the researcher to have a term of comparison when analyzing the data and see the differences in the respondents' approach. Moreover, the scenarios used here presented different situations for subjects; one of them was asking the students to make a judgement upon the characters' decision, while the other one asked the students to make a decision themselves. In this way the researcher can see how the respondents' behavior and approach differ from a situation to another, therefore enriching the analysis.

Despite the limitations, the paper still has a relevant contribution in the field of ethical decision making. Previous research only proposed models to be empirically tested, while through this paper not only a new model was introduced (how culture on individual level influences the process of ethical decision making), but also it was empirically tested. Given

the little empirical evidence in this field, future research is welcome to investigate the influence of different factors on ethical decision making; also, it would be interesting to see if researchers would find different results emerging from the relationship of self construal and ethical decision making.

3. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to investigate, on one hand, the relation between moral awareness and ethical decision making, and on the other hand, the moderation effect of culture on the afore mentioned relationship. The analysis showed that only in one of the scenarios, moral awareness and ethical decision making were significantly correlated; however, in none of the scenarios, culture, from an individual level, did not have a considerable interaction with moral awareness and decision making.

Nonetheless, future research should study the effects of culture either from a different level than individual (e.g., national level) on different samples, or should reinvestigate the present model on more varied samples (e.g., students, employees and managers). Either way, it is important for organizations to know if the cultural aspects of a person can hold an explanation on that person's behavior (e.g., ethical behavior) because in this way companies can search for individuals who are more suited with their organizational culture (e.g., ethically driven culture).

Reference List

- Awasthi, V. N., 2008. **Managerial decision-making on moral issues and the effects of teaching ethics.** *Journal of Business Ethics* 78: 207-223.
- Brady, F. N., 1985. **A Janus-headed model of ethical theory: Looking two ways at business/society issues.** *Academy of Management Review*, 10: 568-576.
- Brady, F.N., Wheeler, G.E., 1996. **An empirical study of ethical predispositions.** *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15: 927-940.
- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., Harrison, D. A., 2005. **Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing.** *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 97: 117-134.
- Butterfield, K. D., Treviño, L. K., Weaver, G. R., 2000. **Moral awareness in business organizations: influences of issue-related and social context factors.** *Human Relations*, 53: 981-1018.
- Dubinsky, A. J., Loken, B., 1989. **Analyzing ethical decision making in marketing.** *Journal of Business Research*, 19: 83-107.
- Ferrel, O. C., Gresham, L. G., 1985. **A contingency framework for understanding ethical decision making in marketing.** *Journal of Marketing*, 49: 87-96.
- Ferrell, O. C., Fraedrich, J., Thorne, D. M., 1994. **Assessing the application of cognitive moral development theory to business ethics.** *Journal of Business Ethics* 13: 829-838.
- Ferrell, L., Mansfield, P., Loe, T. W., 2000. **A review of empirical studies assessing ethical decision making in business.** *Journal of Business Ethics* 25: 185-204.
- Fraedrich, J., Thorne, D. M., Ferrell, O. C., 1994. **Assessing the application of cognitive moral development theory to business ethics.** *Journal of Business Ethics*, 13: 829-838.
- Fritzsche, D. J., Oz, E., 2007. **Personal values' influence on the ethical dimension of decision making.** *Journal of Business Ethics* 75: 335-343.
- Gelfand, M. J., Triandis, H. C., 1998. **Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism.** *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74, no. 1: 118-128.

- Hersh, R. H., Kohlberg, L., 1977. **Moral Development: a review of the theory.** *Theory into practice*, vol. 16, no. 2.
- Hunt, S. D., Vitell, S., 1986. **A general theory of marketing ethics.** *Journal of Macromarketing*, 6: 5-16.
- Jones, T. M., 1991. **Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: an issue-contingent model.** *Academy of Management Review*, 16:2:366-395.
- Jordan, J., 2008. **A social cognition framework for examining moral awareness in managers and academics.** *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- Kant, I., 1994. **Grounding for the metaphysics of morals** (J. W. Ellington, Trans.). In *Ethical Philosophy* (2nd ed.). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing (Original work published in 1785).
- Kanungo, R. N., 2001. **Ethical values of transactional and transformational leaders.** *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 18: 257-265.
- Kohlberg, L., 1981. **The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice.** San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Kohlberg, L., 1984. **The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages.** New York: Harper & Row.
- Kroeber, A. L., Kluckhohn, C., 1952. **Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions.** *Peabody Museum Papers*, 47: 12-22.
- Markus, H. R., Kitayama, S., 1991. **Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion and Motivation.** *Psychological Review*, 98:2: 224-253.
- May, D. R., Pauli, K. P., 2002. **The role of moral intensity in ethical decision making: a review and investigation of moral recognition, evaluation, and intention.** *Business Society*, 41, 84-117.
- Mill, J. S., 1863. **Utilitarianism.** London: Parker, Son and Bourn.
- Rest, J. R., 1986. **Moral development: Advances in research and theory.** New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Reynolds, S. J., 2006. **Moral awareness and ethical predispositions: investigating the role of individual differences in the recognition of moral issues.** *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91:1:233-243.
- Robertson, C., Fadil, P.A., 1999. **Ethical decision making in multinational organizations: a culture-based model.** *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 19, pp. 385-392.

- Roxas, M. L., Stoneback, J.Y., 2004. **The importance of gender across cultures in ethical decision-making.** *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 50, pp. 149-163.
- Smircich, L., 1983. **Concepts of culture and organizational analysis.** *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 339-358.
- Trafimow, D., Triandis, H. C., Goto, S. G., 1991. **Some tests of the distinction between the private and the collective self.** *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60: 649-655.
- Treviño, L. K., 1986. **Ethical decision making in organizations: a person-situation interactionist model.** *Academy of Management Review*, 11:3:601-617.
- Treviño, L. K., Youngblood, S. A., 1990. **Bad apples in bad barrels: a causal analysis of ethical decision-making behaviour.** *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, no. 4, 378-385.
- Triandis, H. C., 2001. **Individualism – collectivism and personality.** *Journal of Personality* 69:6: 907-924.
- Vitell, S. J., Nwachukwu, S. L., Barnes, J. H., 1993. **The effects of culture on ethical decision making: An application of Hofstede's typology.** *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12:10: 753-760.
- Wagner, J. A. III, Moch, M. K., 1986. **Individualism-collectivism: Concept and measurement.** *Group and Organizational Studies*, 11: 280-304.
- Weber, J., 1991. **Managers' moral reasoning: Assessing their responses to three moral dilemmas.** *Human Relations* 43(7): 687-702
- Weber, J., 1992. **Scenarios in business ethics research: review, critical assessment and recommendations.** *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 2:2:137-160.

APPENDIX

The Survey

Dear participant,

This questionnaire is part of my Master Thesis. By filling it out you help me collect data to test my research model. The completion of the questionnaire should take about 10 minutes.

You can count on the confidential treatment of the data.

After you finish, please save the file and send it to: V.Petrachi@student.uva.nl

Thank you for your time!

Violeta Petrachi and Karianne Kalshoven (supervisor)

I. Questionnaire

Please fill out the questions below by scoring your answers with 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neither agree nor disagree), 4 (Agree) or 5 (Strongly agree). Indicate the extent to which the statements are true for you, by clicking in the appropriate tick box : →

. *The questions are about the way you perceive society and others.*

- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. If you want something to be done right, you have to do it yourself. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. If the group is slowing me down, it is better to leave it and work alone. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. I feel good when I cooperate with others. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. I like helping people. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. As a team member, it is important to respect the decisions made by the group. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. I often do the tasks in my own way. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 7. Usually, I offer my help even if I was not asked for it. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. I enjoy meeting and talking to my colleagues every day. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. I rely on myself most of the time. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. I care about other people's wellness. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. I am not interested in knowing what my colleagues really are. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13. I would rather struggle through a personal problem by myself than discuss it with my friends. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14. If a coworker gets a prize, I would feel proud. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 15. I usually do things which are in my best interest, irrespective of their effects on others. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 16. Competition is the law of nature. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 17. I would rather depend on myself than others. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 18. When someone else does a task better than I do, I get tense and aroused. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19. It is important that I do my job better than others. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 20. I prefer helping only my closest friends with issues that require time and attention. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 21. The well-being of my coworkers is important to me. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 22. Winning is everything. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

23. To me, pleasure is spending time with others.
24. In the long run, the only person you can count on is yourself.
25. I like to live close to my good friends.

II. Scenarios

1. Please first read the following scenario and then answer the questions stated below. The case involves two main characters: plant foreman (the leader of a work crew) and plant accountant working at a manufacturing plant.

Stage 1 (November 30, a month before the end of the year)

The manufacturing plant, which had received bonuses in the two previous years, is below target and is not likely to receive a bonus in the current year.

The plant accountant brings to foreman's notice an order large enough to achieve the budgetary target. But the order is a 6-week job that will have to be expedited in the 4 weeks remaining before the year end if they want to receive the bonus. The foreman decides to expedite the order.

Stage 2 (December 15, 2 weeks before the year ends)

The production order is exceeding cost budget and is behind schedule because of equipment problems and over-time payments. The foreman talks with the plant accountant and finds out that no partial shipments are allowed under the contract and the order has to be 100% inspected before shipment. The foreman has doubts whether the order can be completed, but decides to continue expediting hoping to still finish in time.

Stage 3 (December 30, 9 PM)

The foreman tells the accountant that the order has been shipped out but only 80% inspected instead of 100% as required by the contract. Then the foreman asks the accountant to keep quiet and accuses him that he too shares responsibility in this matter.

Questions (please write your answer in the grey boxes below):

1. What are the most important aspects discussed in this case?

2. *How would you rate the foreman's decision of accepting the order? Acceptable or rather unacceptable? Please state why.*
3. *Overall, should the foreman have made the decision of shipping the order 80% inspected? Please state why.*

2. *Please first read the following scenario and then answer the questions stated below. The case is about an audit conducted by Roger, one of the auditors in charge, and his boss.*

**Auditors: independent accountants that examine the financial accounts of a client firm.*

Roger works for a small auditing firm and conducts an annual audit of a machinery manufacturer. During the audit he has discovered that the firm received a large loan from the local savings and loan association. It is illegal for a savings and loan association to make a loan to a manufacturing firm; they are restricted by law to mortgages based upon residential real estate.

Roger took his working papers and a copy of the ledger showing the loan to his boss, the partner in charge of the auditing office. His boss listened to Roger, and then told Roger: "I will take care of this privately. We simply cannot afford to lose a client of this status. You put the papers you have through the shredder."

Questions:

1. *What are the most important aspects discussed in this case?*
2. *What do you think Roger should decide? Please state why.*
3. *Roger decides to shred the papers. Would that be an unethical decision? Please explain.*

III. Demographics

1. Gender:

Female Male

2. Age:

3. Country of origin:

4. Attended Business Ethics Course:

Yes No

5. Work Experience:

None Less than 1 year More than 1 year

6. Do you work at the moment?

Yes No (go directly to question 8)

7. How many hours a week do you work?

hours per week

8. What is the university degree you are currently completing?

Bachelors Masters Other

*Please do not forget to **SAVE** this file and **SEND** it to: V.Petrachi@student.uva.nl*

Should you have any comments or suggestions regarding this questionnaire, please feel free to address them either below or write me at the e-mail address mentioned above.

Thank you!