Differences in the Ethical Orientations of Upper Level U.S. and Mexican Business Students

Jennifer E. Spencer

Victor E. Sower

Mitchell J. Muehsam

Sam Houston State University

ABSTRACT

This study is an investigation of cross-cultural ethical orientations of upper level business students from universities in Mexico and the United States using retail environment scenarios. The study controlled for the potentially confounding variables of age, gender, retail experience, and type of university. Significant differences in three ethical dimensions (customer-related, peer-related, work-related) were found to exist between US and Mexican students. No significant differences were found in ethical orientations between students in secular and Catholic universities in the United States; however, significant differences were found in ethical orientations between secular and Catholic university students in Mexico.

Introduction

With today's expanding global marketplace and the increasing tendency of multinational firms to transcend their borders and become transnational firms, universities should prepare their business students to not only work with other cultures, but to understand and acknowledge cultural differences in order to avoid ethnocentric attitudes and ethical dilemmas. Geographical distances have become less significant restrictions to conducting business abroad given the advent of new technologies that bring the world closer together, new trade policies such as NAFTA, and international trade missions (Kullman, 1998). Yet cultural differences still remain and business students are often not introduced to other countries' business practices prior to being thrust into the global arena.

Likewise, business organizations which fail to recognize and understand cultural differences can encounter difficulties when conducting business abroad. Knowledge of cultural differences should enable organizations to better prepare to deal with host country employees, customers, and suppliers.

Mexico is one of the United States' two nearest international trading partners and has emerged as the top buyer of U.S. products. Mexican companies bought nearly 26.2% of U.S. exports in 1997 (Green, 1999) and with prospects for increasing business ventures and trade, it makes even more sense to understand the cultural differences that exist. The recent meetings between US President Bush and Mexican President Fox included extended discussions on trade between the two countries. NAFTA's primary goal is to reduce barriers to trade between the United States, Mexico, and Canada. American firms seeking to expand into Mexico should not fall prey to the ethnocentric idea that trade with a bordering country will be "business as usual" simply due to geographical proximity. In fact, there are many differences between even the closest of neighboring countries. The results of this study should aid in the understanding of differing cross-cultural ethical orientations between future business leaders in the U.S. and Mexico, specifically retail managers. The study excluded any normative values associated with any culture or belief system, but rather utilized a cultural relativistic approach.

Background

Ethical orientation, as used in this study, is defined as a measure of perceived ethical dilemma absent the influence of situational moderators. A number of studies (Robertson and Fadil, 1991; Kohlberg, 1984; Schneider and Meyer, 1991) have proposed that situational moderators such as the number of crisis situations an individual confronts and the individual's potential to react effectively in those situations moderate the individual's ethical behavior. Jones (1991) suggests that the intensity of the ethical dilemma with which an individual is faced can influence the individual's ethical decision. Ethical orientation falls between ethical values and ethical intent. Ethical intent moderated by situational variables results in ethical behavior. This is consistent with models such as those of Robertson and Fadil (1999) and Wines and Napier (1992) which link cultural values to ethical behavior through a path consisting of individual ethical values and ethical intent moderated by individual and situational variables.

Various studies have noted differences in cross-national ethical orientations, especially in the area of business. For instance, Nyaw and Ng (1994) conducted a study that examines cross-cultural (Canadian and Asian) business students' reactions to ethical dilemmas. The study concluded that the national origin of the student does impact their reactions to particular ethical dilemmas. Tsalikis and LaTour (1995) reported similar results in a study of American and Greek business students. Others such as Preble and Reichel (1988), Lysonski and Gaidis (1991), and Tsalikis and Nwachukwu (1991) have compared American students' ethical beliefs to those of students in Israel, Denmark, New Zealand, South Africa, and Nigeria (Nyaw et. al., 1994). Of the many studies devoted to examining cross-national ethical orientations, Sower, Abshire, and Shankman's (1998) study was the only one found dealing specifically with the United States' closest neighbor, Mexico.

Hofstede (1983) and Schwartz (1992) have identified significant differences in the cultures of the United States and Mexico. Dubinsky, Jolson, Kotabe, and Lim (1991) cite a number of studies (Bartels, 1967; Ferrell and Gresham, 1985; Hunt and Vitell, 1986; Wotruba, 1990) finding that different cultures produce different expectations and dissimilar ethical standards. Robertson and Fadil (1999) contend that individuals from different cultures view ethical issues differently.

The purpose of this study is to investigate differences in the ethical orientations between the United States and Mexico using upper level business students as subjects. Based on the studies cited above it is reasonable to expect that ethical orientations in the United States might differ systematically from those in Mexico. The study controls for the potentially confounding variables of age, gender, education, experience, immigration, and type of university.

Methodology

This project could be termed a study in "applied ethics," according to the definition by a report from the Hastings Center (1979):

> "Applied ethics is moral inquiry directed to making actual choices in moral conflicts . . . It cannot ignore the psychological, political, and other factors affecting human conduct; it also studies questions of institutional or social choice" (15).

The instrument used for this study in applied ethics was derived from one by Dubinsky and Levy (1985) and consists of a series of hypothetical retail situations involving potential ethical dilemmas, with respondents ranking answers, via Likert scale to the following questions:

Do you believe the situation presents an ethical question for you? That is, do you feel the situation pressures you into taking actions that are inconsistent with what you feel to be right?

The modified Dubinski and Levy instrument used in this study (Sower, et al., 1998) consists of three scales used for measuring different dimensions of possible ethical dilemmas (copy in Appendix). All are multi-item scales which "allow measurement errors to cancel out against each other and thus the reliability of the scale is increased" (Peter, 1979). The three scales measure the ethical orientation of respondents toward peers, toward customers, and toward work. The peer-related scale contains four items. Examples of these items are "Pressure from fellow sales associates not to report theft," "Take away sales from a fellow sales associate." The customer-related scale contains ten items. Examples of these items are "Sell a more expensive product when a less expensive one would be better for the customer," "Charge full price for a sale item without the customer's knowledge." The work-related scale has eight items. Examples of these items are "Hide merchandise that you want and are waiting for the store to mark down," "Sign time sheet incorrectly for time worked." Answer choices are in the form of a Likert, 7-point rating scale, with answers ranging from 1, "Definitely No," to 7, "Definitely Yes," with 4 representing "Neutral." The survey instrument has been validated in previous studies using similar samples in Mexico, Canada, and the United States (Sower et.al., 1998). This instrument is particularly appropriate for studying business ethics using students as subjects because it uses scenarios in a retail context with which students are likely to be familiar. Some other instruments would be less well suited for student subjects because they use scenarios based on commercial transactions or strategic decision making which are likely to be less familiar to students.

The population of interest is upper level business students in universities in the United States and Mexico, specifically junior, senior, or graduate level students. The choice of population controls for possible age and education effects. The sample for this study was taken from two universities in the United States and two universities in Mexico. Universities at least 250 miles from the U.S. – Mexican border were chosen in order to avoid sampling bias due to possible hybrid respondents. The universities selected to participate were of similar student population size, 5,000 to 15,000, to maintain the homogeneity of the sample population**.** One university in each country was Catholic-affiliated and one in each country was secular to control for possible differences due to type of university. The schools in each country are sufficiently distant from one another (over 250 miles apart) to avoid respondents discussing the survey instrument with one another. Responses utilized in this study were solicited only from students native to the country in which they attended university. This was done to control for potentially confounding effects of immigration on ethical orientation.

The hypothesis for this study is stated as the null:

> H_o: American and Mexican business students will not react differently to potentially troublesome retail sales situations.

The hypothesis was investigated for the three category scales representing the three dimensions of retail business ethics: customer-related, peer-related, and work-related.

Questionnaire Validation

Collaborators at each of the four universities administered the questionnaire to business students in their classes who were natives of the country in which the university is located. A total of 234 responses were obtained. The overwhelming majority of respondents (99.1%) are upper level business students. A 100% response rate was possible since the surveys were distributed in class and collected within the class period. Validity and reliability of the instrument, including translation to Spanish (via a back-translation method), were previously assessed (Sower, et al., 1998) and found to be satisfactory. Dubinsky and Levy (1985) established content validity and the Sower et al. study (1998) established content, construct, and external validity and reliability.

Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951) was used to test for internal consistency reliability for each of the three scales. It shows the degree to which scale items measure the same construct and is appropriate for use with 7-point Likert scale data (Sower, et al., 1998). Nunnally (1978) suggests that alpha levels of .70 or higher represent good internal consistency reliability for basic research. Alphas of .50 or .60 are sufficient for exploratory research such as this study. Table I shows the alphas for all three scales for each of the universities. Only one coefficient alpha (Mexico: Catholic-affiliated, peer related at .67) was below Nunnally's suggested benchmark. All others were in the .8 to .9 range indicating high levels of reliability.

Table I
Scale Internal Consistency Reliability

Scale	n	Reliability Cronbach alpha
United States (Secular)	51	
Customer-related		0.9438

Peer-related		0.8895
Work-related		0.8854
Mexico (Secular)	54	
Customer-related		0.8918
Peer-related		0.7857
Work-related		0.8832
United States (Catholic)	73	
Customer-related		0.9428
Peer-related		0.8681
Work-related		0.9084
Mexico (Catholic)	56	
Customer-related		0.9144
Peer-related		0.6688
Work-related		0.8209
Total	234	

Results and Findings

ANOVA (Table II) found highly significant differences between U.S. versus Mexican responses for all three scales without taking into account university type or demographic factors ($p < 0.001$). For all three category scales, U.S. respondents had higher mean scale scores than the Mexican respondents. These findings are consistent with those of Sower, Abshire, and Shankman (1998). (Note: the terms “higher” and “lower” here do not imply a normative judgement of ethical orientation. They are strictly used to denote a higher or lower numerical scale score.) Therefore, it can be concluded that the ethical orientations of U.S. and Mexican business students are, indeed, different, thus rejecting H_o for *peer-*, *customer-*, and *work-related* scales.

Table II
ANOVA Results
Mexico vs. US

Scale/Item	**Mexico Mean**	**US Mean**	**F-value**	**P-value**	**n Mexico/US**
Customer-related	**2.99**	**4.54**	**42.544**	**<.0001**	**107/124**
Sell expensive	3.40	4.69			
Ignore	3.11	4.51			
Promise	2.72	4.47			
Hoard	3.09	4.26			
Incorrect change	2.64	4.61			
Refuse return	2.92	4.69			

Truth	3.15	4.81			
Charge full	2.91	4.78			
Pressure customer	3.38	4.42			
Telephone customer	2.72	4.33			
Peer-related	**2.76**	**4.47**	**51.07**	**<.0001**	**108/122**
Report theft	3.00	4.94			
Take sales	3.29	4.38			
Try quit	2.92	4.31			
Not work	1.85	4.19			
Work-related	**3.15**	**4.42**	**35.10**	**<.0001**	**106/120**
Hide merchandise	3.23	4.37			
Time sheet	2.92	4.76			
Training	3.11	4.20			
Sell exclusive	3.32	4.68			
Don’t sell	3.51	4.30			
Check auth.	2.86	4.13			
Workload	3.13	4.57			
Not quality	3.13	4.53			
Scale/Item Score = 1 indicates definitely not an ethical question.					
Scale/Item Score = 7 indicates definitely raises an ethical question.					

The mean item scores for all items are below the scale neutral mid-point (4) for Mexico, and above the scale neutral mid-point for the United States. For all but one of the items, the separation between the Mexican and US items means is greater than one scale point.

Demographics of Survey Respondents

A summary of the demographic data for the respondents is presented in Tables III and IV. Demographic data for this study can be broken down into 4 main categories based on the location and type of university: U.S. secular and Catholic; Mexico secular and Catholic. All four samples had a slight female majority. The U.S. had a slightly greater proportion of older students but the ages varied over a very narrow range. The overwhelming majority (99.1%) of respondents from all four categories were upper level business students. A somewhat greater proportion of Mexican students, both Catholic and secular, had no retail experience as compared with the U.S. samples. In secular schools, 74% of students in Mexico had no retail experience as compared to 25% who did not in the United States. Among Catholic schools the differences were much smaller, with 50% in Mexico having no retail experience and 42% in the U.S. having none.

Table III
Respondent Characteristics by Count

Characteristic	U.S. Secular	U.S. Catholic	Mexico Secular	Mexico Catholic
Gender				
Male	22	36	22	19
Female	29	37	32	37
Age Range				
18-19	1	0	0	1
20-21	14	29	36	19
22-23	23	31	16	26
24-25	7	3	0	7
26 +	6	10	2	3
Academic Level				
Freshman	0	0	0	1
Sophomore	0	0	1	0
Junior	6	1	4	15
Senior	45	70	46	20
Graduate	0	2	1	17
Retail Experience				
None	13	30	40	28
0-1	11	16	5	14
1-2	7	11	5	5
2-3	9	8	1	0
4 +	11	7	3	9
For those with retail experience:				
No retail training	11	30	24	23
Yes	23	27	3	10
No	13	13	10	15
Course in Ethics				
Yes	19	64	18	31
No	32	8	32	25

Table IV
Respondent Characteristics by %

Characteristic		U.S.		Mexico	
		Secular	Catholic	Secular	Catholic
Gender					
	Male	43%	49%	41%	34%
	Female	57%	51%	59%	66%
Age Range					
	18-19	2%	0%	0%	2%
	20-21	27%	40%	66%	34%
	22-23	45%	42%	30%	46%
	24-25	14%	4%	0%	13%
	26 +	12%	14%	4%	5%
Academic Level					
	Freshman	0%	0%	0%	2%
	Sophomore	0%	0%	2%	0%
	Junior	12%	1%	8%	28%
	Senior	88%	96%	88%	38%
	Graduate	0%	3%	2%	32%
Retail Experience					
	None	25%	42%	74%	50%
	0-1	22%	22%	9%	25%
	1-2	14%	15%	9%	9%
	2-3	18%	11%	2%	0%
	4 +	21%	10%	6%	16%
For those with retail experience:					
	No retail training	23%	43%	65%	48%
	Yes	49%	38%	8%	21%
	No	28%	19%	27%	31%
Course in Ethics					
	Yes	37%	89%	36%	55%
	No	63%	11%	64%	45%

Effects of Type of University

To test for the possible effects of university type on the results, Tables V and VI repeat the above analysis of comparing U.S. versus Mexican ethical orientations by university type (secular and religious). In both cases, highly significant differences were found for all three scales (p<.001) in both secular- (Table V) and Catholic-affiliated groups (Table VI) between the U.S. and Mexico, with the U.S. respondents having higher mean scale scores. These findings are consistent with the aggregate findings.

TABLE V

ANOVA results
Secular: U.S. vs. Mexico

Category Scale Mean Scores				
Category scale	Scale Score	F-value	P-value	n
Customer-related				
U.S.	4.43	29.98652	<.0001	49
Mexico	2.67			49
Peer-related				
U.S.	4.25	19.39068	<.0001	50
Mexico	2.69			52
Work-related				
U.S.	4.17	24.04911	<.0001	51
Mexico	2.71			52

Scale Score = 1 indicates definitely not an ethical question.
Scale Score = 7 indicates definitely raises an ethical question.

TABLE VI

ANOVA results
Catholic: U.S. vs. Mexico

Category Scale Mean Scores

Category scale	Scale Score	F-value	P-value	n
Customer-related				
U.S.	4.74	17.59322	<.0001	73
Mexico	3.39			56
Peer-related				
U.S.	4.62	30.30339	<.0001	72
Mexico	2.83			56
Work-related				
U.S.	4.62	14.05466	0.000269	73
Mexico	3.57			56

Scale Score = 1 indicates definitely not an ethical question.
Scale Score = 7 indicates definitely raises an ethical question.

Within country ANOVAs for the U.S. revealed no significant differences ($p > 0.05$) in any of the three scales for secular versus Catholic (Table VII). However, two of the three scales for the within-country analysis of the Mexican secular- versus Catholic-affiliated responses showed significant differences between respondents' ethical orientations. ANOVA results (Table VII) reveal a significant difference in the *customer-related* scale ($p < 0.05$) and a highly significant difference for *work-related* ($p < 0.01$). In both of these cases where significant differences exist, students at Catholic universities had higher mean scale scores than those attending secular universities.

TABLE VII

ANOVA Results
Secular vs Catholic

	Category Scale Scores							
	U.S.				Mexico			
Category scale	Scale Score	F-value	P-value	n	Scale Score	F-value	P-value	n
Customer-related								
Secular	4.43	0.892493	0.346701	49	2.67	4.943359	0.028375	49
Catholic	4.74			73	3.39			56
Peer-related								
Secular	4.25	1.030126	0.312171	50	2.69	0.212455	0.645794	52
Catholic	4.62			72	2.83			56
Work-related								

Secular	4.17	2.187202	0.141739	51	2.71	10.04805	0.001994	52
Catholic	4.62			73	3.57			56

Scale Score = 1 indicates definitely not an ethical question.
Scale Score = 7 indicates definitely raises an ethical question.

Discussion

Hofstede (1991), Serwinek (1992) and others caution that subcultures and demographic variables can help account for differences within and between cultures. Schwartz and Sagiv (1995) point out that in order to assure validity in cross-cultural studies, controls for subsample differences are essential. In cross-cultural studies such as this one, it is therefore important to control for as many of the demographic variables as possible.

This study found significant differences between the ethical orientations of U.S. and Mexican upper level business students regardless of the type of university the students attended. The within country ANOVAS showed that students at Catholic and secular universities with in the U.S. did not differ significantly. However, significant differences were found between these two groups in Mexico. In both countries students attending Catholic universities were more likely to have taken a course in ethics than students in secular universities (Tables III and IV).

An area for future study could involve whether ethics courses in Mexican universities have a greater impact on students than those in U.S. universities. The research on the issue of whether ethics courses impacts student behavior and attitudes is mixed.

Weber (1990) reviewed four empirical studies that assessed the impact of ethics courses on business students' ethical awareness. Three of the four studies (Boyd, 1981-82; Arlow & Ulrich, 1983; Arlow & Ulrich, 1985; and Stead & Miller, 1988) found "significant improvement in moral reasoning, ethical behavior, and/or perception of social issues after completion of the courses" (Eastman & Eastman, 1997). Another study by Glenn (1992) also found that taking an ethics course showed significant "improvement" in ethical judgment. Other studies (Cole & Smith, 1995; Martin, 1981-1982) show no significant influence of ethics courses on scores on ethical questions.

Many studies (Hofstede, 1991; Miesing et al., 1985, Weeks, et al., 1999; Kreie, et al. 1998) have identified gender as a key demographic variable in ethics studies. The U.S. and Mexican samples differed only slightly in gender composition. Gender is unlikely to have skewed the study results.

Serwinek (1992) argues that age must be considered in cross-cultural research in order for the results to be meaningful. Many researchers (Hofstede, 1991; Harris, 1990; Mason et al., 1996; Singhapakdi et al., 1999) have documented relationships between age and ethics. The general finding is that as age increases respondents become "more" ethical. However, the age range examined in these studies is generally quite large. The age range in this study, which uses students as subjects, is quite narrow with 85 – 95% of the sample being between 18 and 25 years old. Therefore the subjects of this study are relatively homogeneous relative to age.

Time elapsed since immigration has been shown to be a significant variable in studies of cultural values. Assimilation into the new culture occurs gradually over time and tends to be one way. Immigrants tend more to replace values from the old culture with those of the new culture (Kumar & Thibodeauz, 1998). New immigrants who are included in a study can introduce significant characteristics from their “old” culture into the study. In this study only students who were native to the country in which they attended university were included.

Given these control measures, it is reasonable to conclude that the differences found between the U.S. and Mexican students are real. The U.S. students’ mean scale scores were over 1 full point different than those of their Mexican counterparts. Perhaps more significantly, the two samples were on opposite sides of the scale midpoint (4) which represents neutrality. Differences in the customer-scale might relate to the greater prevalence of bargaining in Mexican retail transactions reflecting the buyer’s responsibility to assure “fairness” in the transaction as opposed to transaction “fairness” being more the responsibility of the seller in the United States. Neither approach is necessarily “better” or “worse” than the other so long as both sides understand the nature of the retail environment within the country in which the transactions take place.

The difference in scores on the customer-related scale may provide an indication of where the responsibility is perceived to rest for ensuring the fairness of the retail transaction. The lower scale mean seems to indicate that Mexican respondents perceive that the responsibility rests with the customer. The higher scale score seems to indicate that US respondents perceive that the responsibility rests with the salesperson. This is reinforced by the differences in the work-related scale scores. Practices which affect the customer-salesperson encounter are perceived quite differently in the two countries.

The differences in the peer-related scale scores indicate quite a different view of the appropriate relationship among peers. Mexican students appear to be less likely to report rule violations of other employees to management than US students. This may reflect a different perspective of where the responsibility for rule enforcement rests. In Mexico, it appears that this is viewed as more exclusively the responsibility of management. In the US it appears that this responsibility is viewed as being shared with peer employees.

Retail organizations designing training programs for newly hired retail employees outside the home country should take the differences in ethical orientations into account when designing the programs. Since the newly hired retail employees in the two countries have significantly different ethical orientations toward customers and work, it is unlikely that the same training program will yield the desired behavior with customers in the two countries.

Conclusion

Because we live in a pluralistic society with the apparent trend of tolerance and appreciation of differences (cultural and otherwise), we should prepare business students for differences in ethical orientations across cultures so that they can be better equipped for the increasing globalization of business. A shift in business pedagogy may be necessary to include courses geared towards investigating cultural-related values and ethics. McCabe, et al. (1994) suggest that "the MBA curriculum remains a value-neutral experience" and by contrast, other programs within universities (such as law school programs) have a "significant impact on both values and ethical decision making." By studying the possible effects of cultural differences on ethical orientation as this study has done, we can at least teach business students to attempt to achieve cultural synergy in cross-cultural dealings (Adler, 1983). That is, we can teach them to recognize cultural differences and treat those differences as an advantage in the business world rather than a disadvantage. The quest for cultural synergy will play an increasingly important role in creating worldwide organizations for the future and the success of these organizations may be a direct result of understanding and adhering to codes of ethical behavior (Solomon et al., 1985).

Perhaps determining the actual predictor variables for differences in ethical orientation between cultures is not as important as acknowledging that differences do exist. By studying what factors are important in determining ethical orientation, we are at least striving to understand the world around us.

To the extent that the study findings can be generalized to the population in general they have implications for Mexican and US retail businesses planning new locations in the other's country. Given these findings it is unrealistic, for example, to assume that the same policies and employee training programs would be equally effective given the differences in ethical orientations between the two cultures. Companies operating retail outlets on both sides of the border must realize that differences in ethical orientations toward customers can manifest in significantly different interactions with customers. In order to maintain the types of customer interactions that are consistent with company policy, changes should be made in employee training to assure acceptance of company culture and values.

Differences in ethical orientations toward work and peers could create the need for more explicit explanation of what the individual company considers to be acceptable and unacceptable behavior within the work environment. Simply assuming that employee values are more or less consistent with company values is tenuous within a culture. That assumption becomes more tenuous when dealing across cultures.

The specific findings of this study have implications for companies hiring entry level retail managers for their cross-border operations. Two important sources of entry-level retail managers are individuals who have moved up through the ranks and recent college graduates. Based on this study, senior level business students (soon to be college graduates) from the two countries differ significantly in their ethical orientations toward customers, peers, and work necessitating differences in the training program for newly hired retail clerks and managers.

This study also has implications for the selection and training of expatriate managers for cross-border retail operations. A better understanding of the general ethical orientations of employees in the host country will enable the new expatriate manager to better manage those employees.

Among the areas for future research would be to determine the extent to which companies modify their employee training programs in recognition of cultural differences and how effective these changes are. Another area for future research would be to simultaneously measure values and ethical orientations to determine the extent to which differences in ethical orientations can be explained by differences in cultural values. A third area for future research would be to assess the extent to which differences in ethical orientations actually manifest as differences in ethical behavior and examines the effects of situational moderators.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the collaborations of Dr. Richard Menger and Dr. Frieda Koenniger in distribution of the survey. Special thanks are extended to Maestro Rey David Navarro Martino and Dr. Frieda Koenniger for their contribution to understanding cultural differences between Mexico and the United States.

Appendix

Modified Dubinsky and Levy Items

Do you believe the situation presents an ethical question for you? That is, do you feel the situation pressures you into taking actions that are inconsistent with what you feel to be right?

Q1. Sell a more expensive product when a less expensive one would be better for the customer.

Q2. Ignore a prospective customer for one you believe will be a better one.

Q3. Hide merchandise that you want and are waiting for the store to mark down.

Q4. Make a promise you cannot keep regarding the time when something will be ready.

Q5. Sign time sheet incorrectly for time worked.

Q6. Perform your job with inadequate job information or training.

Q7. Sell the product as an exclusive, when it is in fact available in other stores.

Q8. Pressure from fellow sales associates not to report theft.

Q9. Hoard free samples that are meant for customers.

Q10. Give incorrect change to customers on purchases.

Q11. Don't sell the last unit because you want to purchase it yourself.

Q12. Refuse return by customer when you think the item should be accepted.

Q13. Don't tell the complete truth to customer about the characteristics of a product.

Q14. Charge full price for a sale item without the customer's knowledge.

Q15. Take away sales from a fellow sales associate.

Q16. Pressure customers into making a sale.

Q17. Don't get a check authorization when required.

Q18. Telephone customer wants help, but you decide not to assist him/her.

Q19. Try to get an employee to quit.

Q20. Salesperson not working or selling up to his/her potential so as not to offend another employee.

Q21. Inexperienced salesperson receives an unfair workload.

Q22. Sell merchandise that is not good quality.

References

Adler, N. J. (1983). Cross-Cultural Management: Issues To Be Faced. International Studies of Man. & Org., XIII (1-2), 7-45.

Arlow, P., & Ulrich, T. (1983). Can Ethics Be Taught to Business Students? The Collegiate Forum, 14-17.

Arlow, P., & Ulrich, T. (1985). Business Ethics and Business School Graduates. A Longitudinal Study. Akron Business and Economic Review, 16, 13-17.

Bartels, R. (1967). A Model for Ethics in Marketing. Journal of Marketing, 31, 20-26.

Boyd, D. (1981-1982). Improving Ethical Awareness Through the Business and Society Course. Business and Society, 20-1 & 21-1, 27-31.

Business Ethics Quarterly (special report). (1997, July). International Business Ethics, 1-70.

Cronbach, L.J. (1951, Sept.). Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests. Psychometrika, 16, 297-334.

Dubinsky, A., M. Jolson, Kotabe, & Lim. (1991). A Cross-National Investigation of Industrial Salespeoples' Ethical Perceptions. Journal of International Business Studies, *22*(4), 651-670.

Dubinsky, A. J. & Levy, M. (1985). Ethics in Retailing: Perceptions of Retail Salespeople. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 13, 1-16.

Eastman, J., & Eastman, K. (1997). The Ethics of Insurance Agents vs. Insurance Students: The Educational Implications. CPCU Journal, 50(2), 104-121.

Ferrell, O.C., & Gresham, L.G. (1985, Summer). A Contingency Framework for Understanding Ethical Decision Making in Marketing. Journal of Marketing, 49, 87-96.

Glenn, J. (1992). Can a Business and Society Course Affect the Ethical Judgment of Future Managers? Journal of Business Ethics, 11, 217-223.

Green, P. (1999, April). Asia Woes Stunt Growth of US Textile, Apparel Exports. Journal of Commerce, 17A.

Harris, J. (1990). Ethical Values of Individuals at Different Levels in the Organizational Hierarchy of a Single Firm. Journal of Business Ethics, 9, 741-750.

Hastings Center Report. (1979). The Teaching of Ethics in Higher Education.

Hofstede, G. (1991). Cultures and Organizations—Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance to Survival. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (1983). National Cultures in Four Dimensions. International Studies of Management & Organization, *13*, 46-74.

Hunt, S.D. & Vitell, S.J. (1986). A General Theory of Marketing Ethics. Journal of Macromarketing, 6, 5-16.

Jones, T. (1991). Ethical Decision Making by Individuals in Organizations: An Issue-Contingent Model. Academy of Management Review, 16, 366-395.

Kohlberg, L. & Candee, D. (1984). The Relationship of Moral Judgment to Moral Action. In W.M. Kurtines & J.L. Gerwitz (Ed.), Morality, Moral Behavior and Moral Development (pp. 52-73). New York: Wiley.

Kreie, J. & Cronan, T.P. (1998, Sept.). How Men and Women View Ethics. Communications of the ACM, *41*(9), 70-76.

Kullman, P. (1998, July). High-Technology Trade Mission Will Head to Southeast Asia. Business America, 17-21.

Kumar, K. & Thibodeauz, M. (1998). Differences in Value Systems of Anglo-American and Far Eastern Students: Effects of American Business Education. Journal of Business Ethics, 17, 253-262.

Lysonski, S. & Gaidis, W. (1991). A Cross-Cultural Comparison of the Ethics of Business Students. Journal of Business Ethics, 10, 141-150.

Martin, T. (1981-1982). Do Courses in Ethics Improve the Ethical Judgment of Students? Business & Society 20-1 & 22-1, 17-26.

Mason, E., & Mudrack, P. (1996). Gender and Ethical Orientation: A Test of Gender and Occupational Socialization Theories. Journal of Business Ethics, 15, 599-604.

McCabe, D. L., Dukerich, J.M., & Dutton, J.E. (1994, Sept.). The Effects of Professional Education on Values and the Resolution of Ethical Dilemmas: Business School vs. Law School Students. Journal of Business Ethics, 13(9), 693-700.

Miesing, P., & Preble, J.F. (1985). A Comparison of Five Business Philosophies. Journal of Business Ethics, **4**, 186-187.

Nunnally, J.C. (1978). Psychometric Theory, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nyaw, M. & Ng, I. (1994, July). A Comparative Analysis of Ethical Beliefs: A Four Country Study. Journal of Business Ethics, 543-555.

Peter, J. P. (1979, Feb.). Reliability: A Review of Psychometric Basics and Recent Marketing Practices. Journal of Marketing Research, XVI, 6-16.

Preble, J. F., & Reichel, A. (1998, Dec.). Attitudes Towards Business Ethics of Future Managers in the U.S. and Israel. Journal of Business Ethics, 7(12), 941-949.

Robertson, C. & Fadil, P.A. (1999). Ethical Decision Making in Multi-National Organizations: A Culture-Based Model. Journal of Business Ethics, *19*, 385-392.

Schneider, S., & Meyer, A. (1991). Interpreting and Responding to Strategic Issues: The Impact of National Culture. Strategic Management Journal, 12, 307-320.

Schwartz, S. (1992). Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries. In Zanna, M.P. (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 25, 1-65.

Schwartz, S. & Sagiv, I. (1995). Identifying Culture-Specifics in the Content and Structure of Values. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26, 92-116.

Serwinek, P.J. (1992). Demographic and Related Differences in Ethical Views Among Small Businesses. Journal of Business Ethics, 12(12), 901-917.

Singhapakdi, A., Vitell, S. & Franke, G. (1999). Anticedents, Consequences, and Mediating Effects of Perceived Moral Intensity and Personal Moral Philosophies. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 27 (1), 19-36.

Solomon, R.C. & Hanson, K. (1985). It's Good Business. New York: Harper and Row.

Sower, V.E., Abshire, R.D., & Shankman, N.E. (1998, March). A Cross-Cultural Study of the Ethical Orientations of Senior-Level Business Students. Teaching Business Ethics, 1, 379-397.

Stead, B., & Miller, J. (1988). Can Social Awareness Be Increased through Business School Curricula? Journal of Business Ethics, 7, 553-560.

Tsalikis, J. & LaTour, M. (1995, April). Bribery and Extortion in International Business: Ethical Perceptions of Greeks Compared to Americans. Journal of Business Ethics, 14(4), 249-264.

Weber, J. (1990). Measuring the Impact of Teaching Ethics to Future Managers: A Review, Assessment and Recommendations. Journal of Business Ethics, 9, 183-190.

Weeks, W.A., Moore, C. W., McKinney, J.A. & Longenecker, J.G. (1999). The Effects of Gender and Career Stage on Ethical Judgement. Journal of Business Ethics, 20, 301-313.

Wines, W.A. & Napier, N.K. (1992). Toward an Understanding of Cross-Cultural Ethics: A Tentative Model. Journal of Business Ethics, 11, 831-841.

Wotruba, T.R. (1990). A Comprehensive Framework for the Analysis of Ethical Behavior, with a Focus on Sales Organizations. Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management 10, 29-42.