

# **THE EFFECTS OF CULTURAL ISOLATION ON ETHICAL PERCEPTIONS: THE CASE OF ALBANIA**

Petros Tomaras, TEI Athens

John Tsalikis, Florida International University

Phillip Shepherd, Florida International University

*The present paper compares the ethical perceptions of native Greeks and immigrant Albanians working in Greece. Two samples were presented with two scenarios manipulating three factors: sex of the transgressor, organizational status of the transgressor, and magnitude of the transgression. For each scenario, conjoint analyses were performed on six ethical measurements. The relative importances of the Greek sample were compared with those of the Albanian sample. The results showed that the relative importances of the two samples were quite similar. Both cultures paid more attention to the dollar amount involved and less attention to the organizational status of the transgressor. The sex of the transgressor was the least important factor in both instances.*

With the collapse of communism, economic upheaval came to most Eastern European former communist countries. Many people, faced with severe economic hardships in their native lands, fled to the more affluent countries of Europe. In Albania, the communist party, which held the country in complete economic and cultural isolation for more than 40 years, collapsed. A pyramid scheme in the banking system, which followed, wiped out the savings of most Albanians. This situation forced many Albanians to cross the border to Greece and seek any type of employment available. These immigrants present an excellent opportunity to

study the effects of this economic and cultural isolation on ethical perceptions.

The present study will compare the ethical perceptions of Greeks with the ethical perceptions of Albanians working in Greece. A related study by [Kennedy & Lawton \(1996\)](#) compared the ethical reactions of Ukrainian students versus American students. They reported a higher willingness to behave unethically by the Ukrainians. According to Kennedy and Lawton, their findings were consistent with [Laczniak & Naor's \(1985\)](#) proposition that:

Concern for ethics seems to rise proportionately with the degree of a country's overall development. The higher the country's economic, social, and technological development, the greater are the pressures in that country for higher standards of ethical business conduct. Conversely, the less advanced the level of economic development, the lower will be the concern within those countries with the ethics of business conduct.

[\(Laczniak & Naor, 1985, p. 6.\)](#)

In addition to the traditional comparison of the average ethical reactions by different cultural groups (typically using t-tests), the present paper compares the relative importance measures created by conjoint analysis. Conjoint analysis provides a new platform for the comparison of ethical perceptions among different cultures. The technique allows for the comparison of the relative importances of the various factors affecting ethical evaluations.

## 1. CONJOINT ANALYSIS

Conjoint analysis is a method that has been used extensively in marketing research to investigate the inevitable

trade-offs that consumers make in choice decisions. Specifically, choice or evaluation alternatives are presented as varying bundles of attributes, each of which is assessed in turn. Conjoint analysis is particularly suited to an environment where a decision-maker is faced with a multi-attribute set of alternatives.

Conjoint analysis is a “within subjects” design, which examines the evaluative processes of respondents who are presented with a series of profiles (cards) that represent designed manipulations of the core ethical scenario. Typically, the experimental design is “main effects only” or orthogonal, which allows the investigation of complex designs without putting an excessive burden on respondents. The assumption in this case is that the overall assessment of the ethicality of an action is the sum of the individual components, *i.e.*, is additive.

When respondents provide a series of profile ratings as their conjoint data, the output of the model consists of a constant term, which represents the mean response to the profiles and a set of part-worths corresponding to the contribution of each level of each factor (independent variable) to overall utility. For each factor, part-worths add to zero and are measured on the same scale, facilitating direct comparison between samples. From the part-worths, the technique is able to calculate the “relative importance” of each factor in the design. A unique characteristic of conjoint analysis is that it can calculate “relative importances” for each individual respondent. This allows for the comparison of “relative importances” between different samples/cultures. Comprehensive discussions of conjoint analysis are available (Green & Wind, 1975; Green & Srinivasan, 1978; Green & Srinivasan, 1990; Hair *et al.*, 1998).

## 2. THE TRADITION OF SCENARIO RESEARCH

A plethora of articles in ethics uses the scenario/vignette approach (Dubinsky & Gwin, 1981; Fritzsche & Becker, 1983). This approach presents the respondent with a short story describing an ethically loaded situation and then asks the respondent to evaluate this situation on various ethical scales. The two scenarios used in the present study are presented in Exhibit 1.

The first scenario involves a customer overpaying for a suit and the store personnel not returning the money, even though they are aware of the overcharge. The second scenario involves a health club, about to go out of business, but still selling memberships to new customers. Several scenarios were pre-tested and the two deemed relevant to both Greeks and Albanians were selected. The scenarios manipulate three factors in a conjoint design (1) the gender of the transgressor, (2) the organizational status of the transgressor, and (3) the magnitude of consequences. The selection of factors was based on the research model for ethical research by Tsalikis *et al.* (2001).

**1. The gender of the transgressor:** Schminke (1997) used a scenario approach where he manipulated the gender of the transgressor. Schminke's findings suggest that there is no difference on the perception of the questionable act whether committed by a male or a female. Non-significant differences were also reported in a similar study by McCuddy & Peery (1996).

Maher & Bailey (1999) argued that most gender studies focused on the gender of the evaluator and not the transgressor. They developed an experimental study to investigate the effects of the transgressor's gender on judgments of ethical behavior. They reported that evaluators do not perceive males as having different ethical standards than females. A similar study was reported by McNichols & Zimmerer (1985), in which students were pre-

*Exhibit 1: Scenarios Used***Scenario 1: Clothing Store**

A **man\*** is the **owner\*\*** of a clothing store. He recently sold a suit to a customer for \$300.00. After the sale he realized that he had inadvertently overcharged the customer **1500 drachmas\*\*\***. The customer, who paid in cash, did not notice the overcharge. The manager made no attempt to return the overcharge to the customer.

**Scenario 2: Health Club**

A **woman\*** is the **salesperson\*\*** of a health club. She is paid on a commission basis. She knows that the club has financial problems and chances are it will have to close within a week. Despite this, she sold a yearly membership worth **7500 drachmas\*\*\*** to a new customer.

\* This term alternated between man and woman.

\*\* This term alternated between salesperson, general manager and owner.

\*\*\* This amount alternated between 1500dr, 12000dr, and 24000dr, for the clothing store scenario, and 7500dr, 60000dr, and 210000dr for the health club scenario.

Dollar equivalency at the time of data collection:

1,500dr = \$5	24,000dr = \$80
7,500dr = \$25	60,000dr = \$200
12,000dr = \$40	210,000dr = \$700

sented with scenarios where the names of the transgressors were either male or female. McNichols and Zimmerer also did not find

any differences in the way male and female transgressors were perceived.

Related evidence from the organizational literature indicates that evaluators do have a gender bias (read pro-male) (Eagly *et al.*, 1992; Nieva & Gutek, 1980; Shore, 1992). On the other hand, Eagly & Mladinic (1989) reported evaluators held more favorable attitudes for females than males. Some of the difference in perceptions of males vs. females might stem from the fact that males are perceived as more aggressive than females (Swim, 1994).

**2. The organizational status of the transgressor:** Murphy & Laczniak (1981) reported that the general public perceives salespeople as dishonest and unethical. Wotruba (1990) argued that salespeople are faced with many ethically sensitive situations, because of the nature of their job (isolation from peers, limited direct supervision, and extreme performance pressures). According to Kopp (1993) personal selling is inherently unethical, because salespeople are paid to promote not what they actually believe, but what they are paid to believe. Finally, Seibold (1988) contends that the preexisting public suspicion of salespeople is reinforced by a plethora of negative stereotyping in literature and the media. Other research on salespersons' ethical perceptions include Dubinsky *et al.* (1980) and Singapakdi & Vitell (1991 and 1992).

Sparks & Johlke (1996) studied whether perceptions of salespersons' unethical behavior differ by the dimensions of the sales job and the individual performing it. In an experimental scenario approach, Sparks and Johlke manipulated the description of the salesperson along three dimensions: (a) firm (low vs. high tech), (b) sales task (new account development vs. account maintenance), and (c) the gender of the salesperson. They reported mixed results for all three dimensions.

Dornoff & Tankersley (1975) studied how retail store managers perceive social responsibility. Three types of retail stores were studied: department stores, discount stores and specialty stores. Similarly, Takala & Uusitalo (1995) studied privately owned stores vs. members of a chain or a trading group. An interesting finding by Takala and Uusitalo is that retailers perceived their customers as exhibiting behavior that “leaves a lot to be desired” (p. 905). Dubinsky & Levy (1985) studied retail sales personnel from two types of store (a major department store and a national specialty store chain). The results suggested that salespeople do not see many of the situations examined as involving ethical issues. Moreover, the salesperson’s gender, their experience and time with the company did not influence their ethical beliefs.

Given this generally negative view of the ethicality of salespeople, “salesperson” was chosen as the baseline of organizational responsibility. Increasing levels of organizational responsibility were operationalized by “store manager” and “store owner.” The issue of interest was whether the general negative perception of salespeople would dominate, or be dominated by, the increasing accountability of “manager” and “owner.”

**3. The magnitude of consequences:** Magnitude of consequences is the main tenet of utilitarianism, which judges an action in terms of the greatest net benefit for the greatest number of people. Cavanaugh (1990) contends that utilitarianism is the dominant criterion for 90% of all business decisions. Forsyth (1985) reported that ethical judgments were influenced by the consequences of the act.

Fritzsche & Becker (1983) contended that serious consequences should prompt more ethical behavior than less serious consequences. Fritzsche (1988) found that vignettes with serious consequences were viewed as more unethical than vignettes with less serious consequences. Weber (1993) also found

a significant relationship between moral reasoning and the magnitude of consequences. York (1989) found a positive relationship between judgments of sexual harassment and job consequences for the victim.

Hunt & Vasquez-Parraga (1992) reported that people evaluated questionable acts as more unethical when the consequences were perceived to be negative than when they were positive. Dabholkar & Kellaris (1992) studied which sales practices were considered most unethical by students. Sales practices with direct monetary consequences and those negatively affecting the customer were perceived as the most unethical.

### 3. THE EXPERIMENT

#### *Experimental design*

Using an orthogonal conjoint design, thirteen versions (cards) were created for each of the two scenarios. The thirteen cards were based on three experimental variables or factors. The three factors and their respective levels were:

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Level</u>
Gender of the transgressor	male, female
Organizational status of the transgressor	salesperson, general manager, owner
Financial magnitude of consequences	<i>for the clothing store scenario:</i> 1500dr=\$5 12000dr=\$40 24000dr=\$80 <i>for the health club scenario:</i> 7500dr=\$25 60000dr=\$200 210000dr=\$700

*Exhibit 2: Instructions*

We have provided you with 13 scenarios depicting a real life business situation. Each of these scenarios incorporates the following three attributes:

1. Gender of the decision maker:

- male
- female

2. Status of the decision maker:

- owner
- general manager
- salesperson

3. Amount of money involved

Although these scenarios appear very similar, each of them represents a unique set of circumstances. We ask you to evaluate these scenarios as a whole, recognizing that there are tradeoffs involved. In evaluating the scenarios please follow the following steps:

1. Carefully review all thirteen scenarios by noticing the combination of the above variables (gender, status, amount of money).
2. Evaluate each scenario on the scales provided.

*Procedure*

The respondents were presented with one scenario at a time. The scenarios and the thirteen versions of each scenario were presented in random order in order to account for any order effect.

Respondents were presented with the instructions in [Exhibit 2](#) and then asked to reply to a series of ethical scales.

*Scales*

Based on previous research on ethical measurement ([Reidenbach & Robin, 1988](#)), the following six measurements (dependent variables) were selected:

1. An overall measurement of ethicality:

**The act is:**  
**Unethical -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 Ethical**

2. A measurement of whether the act is culturally acceptable:

**The act is culturally acceptable.**  
**Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Disagree**

3. A measurement of whether the transgressor was obligated to act this way:

**The saleswoman was obligated to act this way.**  
**Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Disagree**

The word saleswoman was changed to salesman/manager/owner where appropriate.

4. A measurement of whether the act was justified because the transgressor would be able to provide for his/her family:

**The act is justified because she will  
be able to provide for her family.  
Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Disagree**

The pronoun was changed for the male transgressor version.

5. A statement of intentions to act similarly:

**I would do the same 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 I would NOT do the same**

Hunt & Vitell (1986) suggested that instead of asking respondents about the ethicality of an act we should ask what they would have done in the same situation. Thus it provides an indirect measure of ethicality.

6. A measurement of *caveat emptor*.

**The consumer should be more careful.  
Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Disagree**

All measures were obtained using nine-point scales. Following the assessment of all 13 versions of the scenario, standard demographic variables were gathered for each observer.

#### 4. SAMPLE

##### *Greek sample*

Several business students were assigned to gather a convenience sample of 309 Greeks. For various reasons, 15 respondents were dropped, leaving a usable sample of 294. The mean age of the respondents was 36.1. Fifty-two percent of the respondents were female. Fifty percent were from Athens, 16% from other major cities, and 32% from rural areas. Less than one

percent did not go to school while 11% finished elementary school, 36% finished high school, and 33% finished college.

#### *Albanian sample*

A convenience sample of 128 Albanians working in Greece was gathered in Athens. For various reasons, 6 respondents were dropped, leaving a usable sample of 122. The mean age of the respondents was 34.5. Only thirty-six percent of the respondents were female, because most of those who leave their country to seek a better working environment are males. Only two percent did not go to school, while 23% finished elementary school, 63% finished high school, and 11% finished college. All of the Albanians were bilingual and the interviews were conducted in Greek.

A t-test showed no significant difference on the average age of the two samples. However, the two samples were not matched on the variables of education and gender (chi-square tests on the distributions of education and gender were significant).

## 5. RESULTS

#### *Conjoint Analysis Results*

A series of 24 conjoint analyses were performed (2 scenarios X 2 nationalities X 6 measurements) using SPSS for windows. The relative importance measures are presented in [Table 1](#). With minor variations, the two cultures have similar relative importance distributions. For all six measurements and both scenarios, the AMOUNT factor has the highest relative importance, with STATUS second and SEX a distant third. This dominance of the AMOUNT factor diminishes slightly for the measurements of “provide for family” and “obligated to act this way.” For these two measurements, the relative importance of the factor STATUS almost equals or surpasses that of AMOUNT.

For all six measurements and both scenarios the conjoint utilities revealed that:

- the sex of the transgressor did not significantly influence the ethical evaluation of the situation.
- transgressions committed by the owner received the most negative ethical evaluations, followed by the general manager and the salesperson.
- transgressions involving the highest amounts received the most negative ethical evaluations.

The relative importance scores for the two cultures might be similar, however the constant terms were significantly different (see Table 1). This led to the comparison of the individual measurements presented in Table 2.

#### *Comparison of Individual Ethical Measurements*

As shown in Table 2, for scenario 1 (Clothing store), all but one ethical measurement (“consumer should be careful”) are significantly different between Greeks and Albanians. More specifically:

- Greeks disagree more than Albanians that the act is culturally acceptable.
- Greeks disagree more than Albanians that the act is justified because the transgressor will be able to provide for his/her family.
- Greeks disagree more than Albanians that the transgressor was obligated to act this way.
- Greeks perceive the act as more unethical than the Albanians do.

- Greeks' intentions not to commit the same transgression were stronger than the Albanians'.
- Greeks and Albanians do not differ on their perception that the consumer should be more careful.

The strength of the differences among Greeks and Albanians observed in scenario 1 (clothing store) are weaker in scenario 2 (Health club). More specifically:

- For most specific ethical situations (cards), the perception of whether the transgression is culturally acceptable is not significantly different between the two cultures.
- The direction of the relationship for measurements "obligated to act this way," "ethical" and "do the same" is same as in scenario 1, however the significance levels are lower. For all three measurements there is no significant difference for the first card (female, salesperson, \$25—the least ethically offensive situation).
- The difference of perception between Greeks and Albanians remained the same for measurement "provide for family."

As with scenario 1, "consumer should be more careful" was not significantly different between Greeks and Albanians.

These findings seem to corroborate [Laczniak & Naor's \(1985\)](#) assertion that the higher the country's economic and technological development, the greater the pressures for higher standards of ethical business conduct.

## CONCLUSIONS

Consistent with Schminke's (1997) findings, the gender of the transgressor did not influence significantly the respondents' ethical evaluations of the situation. The gender of the transgressor was also the least important factor when evaluating the ethicality of the two scenarios. In addition, the gender of the respondent did not significantly affect their ethical evaluations of both scenarios. Both cultures viewed an act performed by a salesperson as less ethically offensive than when the same act was performed by an owner. This provides evidence on the relativistic nature of ethical evaluations (Ferrell and Gresham, 1985; Trevino, 1986; Jones 1991). For both cultures, the organizational status of the transgressor was the second most important factor in evaluating the ethicality of both scenarios. The importance of the organizational status of the transgressor in evaluating the ethicality of the scenarios increased when the ethical measurements dealt with the transgressor's ability to provide for their family and their obligation to act this way. This adds another dimension of relativism to the ethical evaluation scheme.

Consistent with Fritzsche (1988), the magnitude of consequences was the most important factor in evaluating the two scenarios (the relative importance scores are over 50% for most ethical measurements in both countries and for both scenarios). Only for the ethical measurements of "provide for family" and "obligated to act this way" the factor of STATUS approached the importance level of factor AMOUNT.

The two cultures have significant differences when they are compared using the mean scores or the constant scores from the conjoint analysis (with the only exception being the "consumer should be careful" measurement). However, the conjoint results reveal that the underlying decision rules between the two cultures

are very similar (the relative importance distributions are quite similar for both scenarios).

The differences in comparing means versus relative importances become obvious when we compare the results from [Table 1](#) with the results from [Table 2](#). The comparison of means in [Table 2](#) shows the Greeks as being significantly different from Albanians on five of the ethical measurements and for both scenarios. In contrast, [Table 1](#) reveals that, for both scenarios, the relative importances for the Greeks are not significantly different from the Albanians. Relative importances are able to provide an additional dimension for cross-cultural comparison: a dimension that can measure the inner workings of ethical perceptions. In other words, relative importances depict the internal structure of the respondent's ethical perceptions. This is a new area of cross-cultural research that deserves further investigation.

As noted earlier, ethical perceptions are situation dependent ([Fritzsche & Becker, 1983](#)). Clearly, there is a need for investigating the variables of the current research (sex, organizational status, magnitude of consequences) in a broader array of circumstances. Are there underlying dimensions which impact these ethical evaluations? Would the results be different if the subject of the scenario were a "necessity," such as food, in contrast to the more "discretionary" item, such as a health club?

The variable of "sex" is also interesting. While the results were consistent with the literature, in that sex of the transgressor had a very limited impact, the significant interactions are suggestive of a more complex relationship. Further investigation is clearly warranted.

The nature of the relationships between ethical perceptions and the transgressor's organizational status and the magnitude of consequences are also of great importance. Are the relationships linear or do they conform to some alternative configuration? Our

dependent variables focused on the ethics of the transgressor – would a focus on the organization have resulted in a different structure of ethical evaluations?

#### REFERENCES

Cavanaugh, G.F. (1990), *American Business Values*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Dabholkar, P.A. & J.J. Kellaris (1992), "Toward Understanding Marketing Students' Ethical Judgments of Controversial Personal Selling Practices," *Journal of Business Research*, 24:313-329.

Dornoff, R.J. & C.B. Tankersley (1975), "Do Retailers Practice Social Responsibility?," *Journal of Retailing*, 51(4):33-42.

Dubinsky, A.J. & J.M. Gwin (1981), "Business Ethics: Buyers and Sellers," *Journal of Purchasing and Materials Management* 17(4):9-16.

Dubinsky, A.J., E.M. Berkowitz & W. Rudelius (1980), "Ethical Problems of Field Sales Personnel," *MSU Business Topics*, 28:11-16.

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

Eagly, A. & V. Mladinic (1989), "Gender Stereotypes and Attitudes toward Women and Men," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 15:543-558.

Eagly, A., M. Makhijani & B. Klonsky (1992), "Gender and the Evaluation of Leaders: A Meta-Analysis," *Psychological Bulletin*, 111:3-22.

Ferrell, O.C. & L.G. Gresham (1985), "A Contingency Framework for Understanding Ethical Decision Making in Marketing," *Journal of Marketing* 49(3):87-96.

Forsyth, D.R. (1985), "Individual Differences in Information Integration during Moral Judgment," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49:264-272.

Fritzsche, D.J. (1988), "An Examination of Marketing Ethics: Role of the Decision Maker, Consequences of the Decision, Management Position and Sex of the Respondent," *Journal of Macromarketing*, 8:29-39.

Fritzsche, D.J. & H. Becker (1983), "Ethical Behavior and Marketing Managers," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2:291-299.

Green, P.E. & V. Srinivasan (1978), "Conjoint Analysis in Consumer Research: Issues and Outlook," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 5(2):103-123.

Green, P.E. & V. Srinivasan (1990), "Conjoint Analysis in Marketing: New Developments with Implications for Research and Practice," *Journal of Marketing*, 54(4):3-19.

Green, P.E. & Y. Wind (1975), "New Way to Measure Consumers' Judgments," *Harvard Business Review* 53(4):107-117.

Hair, J.F., R.E. Anderson, R.L. Tatham & B.J. Grablovsky: (1998), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Hunt, S.D. & A.Z. Vasquez-Parraga (1992), "Organizational Consequences, Marketing Ethics, and Salesforce Supervision," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30:78-90.

Hunt, S.D. & S. Vitell (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* 16:366-395.
- Kennedy, E.J. & L. Lawton (1996), "The Effects of Social and Moral Integration of Ethical Standards: A Comparison of American and Ukrainian Business Students," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(8):901-911.
- Kopp, R.J. (1993), "Ethical Issues in Personal Selling and Sales Force Management," in N. C. Smith & J. A. Quelch (eds.), *Ethics in Marketing*, 539-556, Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin.
- Laczniak, G.R. & J. Naor (1985), "Global Ethics: Wrestling with the Corporate Conscience," *Business*, July-Sept., 3-10.
- Maher, K.J. & J.J. Bailey (1999), "The Effects of Transgressor Sex on Judgments of Unethical Behavior," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 18(2):157-171.
- McCuddy, M.K. & B.L. Peery (1996), "Selected Individual Differences and Collegian's Ethical Beliefs," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(3):261-272.
- McNichols, C.W. & T.W. Zimmerer (1985), "Situational Ethics: An Empirical Study of Differentiators of Student Attitudes," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 4:175-180.
- Murphy, P.E. & G.R. Laczniak (1981), "Marketing Ethics: A Review with Implications for Managers, Educators and Researchers," *Review of Marketing 1981*, 251-266, Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Nieva, V. & B. Gutek (1980), "Sex Effects on Evaluation," *Academy of Management Review*, 5:267-276.

Reidenbach, E.R. & D.P. Robin (1988), "Some Initial Steps Toward Improving the Measurement of Ethics Evaluations of Marketing Activities," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 7:871-879.

Schminke, M. (1997), "Gender Differences in Ethical Frameworks and Evaluation of Others' Choices in Ethical Dilemmas," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16(1):55-65.

Shore, T. (1992), "Subtle Gender Bias in the Assessment of Managerial Potential," *Sex Roles*, 27:499-515.

Siebold, F.J. (1988), "The Customer Service Ethic: Foiling the Ghost of Willy Loman," *Proceedings of the Pi Sigma Epsilon National Conference in Sales Management*, 55-57 (Atlanta, Georgia).

Singhapakdi, A. & S.J. Vitell (1991), "Analyzing the Ethical Decision Making of Sales Professionals," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 11(4):1-12.

Singhapakdi, A. & S.J. Vitell (1992), "Marketing Ethics: Sales Professionals versus Other Marketing Professions," *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 12(2):27-31.

Sparks, J.R. & M. Johlke (1996), "Factors Influencing Student Perceptions of Unethical Behavior by Personal Salespeople: An Experimental Investigation," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(8): 871-887.

Swim, J. (1994), "Perceived Versus Meta-Analytic Effect Sizes: An Assessment of the Accuracy of Gender Stereotypes," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66:21-36.

Takala, T. & O. Uusitalo (1995), "Retailers' Professional and Professo-Ethical Dilemmas: The Case of Finnish Retailing Business," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 14(11):893-907.

Trevino, L.K. (1986), "Ethical Decision Making in Organizations: A Person-Situation Interactionist Model," *Academy of Management Review* 11:601-617.

Tsalikis, J., B. Seaton & P. L. Shepherd (2001), "Relativism in Ethical Research: A Proposed Model and Mode of Inquiry," *Journal of Business Ethics* 32(3):231-246.

Weber, J. (1993), "Assessing the Role of the Moral Issue and Its Intensity upon Managerial Decision Making," *International Association for Business and Society Proceedings*, 390-394.

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(2):29-42.

York, K.M. (1989), "Defining Sexual Harassment in Workplaces: A Policy-Capturing Approach," *Academy of Management Journal*, 32:830-850.

**Table 1: Relative Importances for the Two Samples**

		<b>Scenario 1 (Clothing Store)</b>											
FACTORS		Culturally acceptable		Provide for family		Obligated to act this way		Ethical		Do the same		Should be careful	
		GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB
SEX		15.8	18.5	20.1	23.7	20.3	23.8	14.2	16.4	19.1	16.9	17.6	18.4
STATUS		29.2	28.3	40.4	35.2	35.7	36.5	28.3	28.9	27.9	30.6	23.9	26.6
DOLLAR		54.9	53.0	39.4	40.9	43.9	39.6	57.4	54.5	52.9	52.4	58.4	54.8
Constant		7.73	6.98**	7.85	6.82**	7.88	7.28**	-2.65	2.07**	7.73	7.10**	2.71	3.14 NS

  

		<b>Scenario 2 (Health Club)</b>											
FACTORS		Culturally acceptable		Provide for family		Obligated to act this way		Ethical		Do the same		Should be careful	
		GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB
SEX		15.5	15.6	18.2	20.2	18.6	19.4	13.6	15.3	16.6	20.0	15.2	16.6
STATUS		28.1	27.0	36.5	37.0	36.1	38.5	25.9	28.6	29.4	29.5	21.8	24.8
DOLLAR		56.3	57.2	45.0	42.6	45.2	41.9	60.4	55.9	53.9	50.4	62.9	58.5
Constant		7.65	7.20**	7.35	6.73**	7.29	6.91 NS	-2.63	-2.34*	7.52	7.17 NS	3.28	3.23 NS

\* = significant difference at .05 level

\*\* = significant difference at .01 level

NS = Not Significant

**Table 2: Means of Individual Variables for the Two Samples**

CARD	Scenario 1 (Clothing store)															
	Culturally acceptable		Provide for family				Obligated to act this way				Ethical		Do the same		Should be careful	
	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB
1 (F,S,\$a)	7.29	6.55**	8.05	6.67**	7.86	6.94**	-1.84	-1.57	7.64	7.07**	2.87	2.83	7.64	7.07**	2.87	2.83
2 (F,Ma,\$b)	8.27	7.60**	8.38	7.10**	8.41	7.69**	-2.99	-2.41**	8.47	7.69**	2.25	2.47	8.47	7.69**	2.25	2.47
3 (F,O,\$c)	8.69	8.22**	8.52	7.32**	8.63	7.97**	-3.54	-2.92**	8.66	8.00**	1.98	2.31	8.66	8.00**	1.98	2.31
4 (M,S,\$b)	8.06	7.63**	8.30	7.19**	8.30	7.45**	-2.85	-2.58*	8.40	7.88**	2.24	2.49	8.40	7.88**	2.24	2.49
5 (M,Ma,\$c)	8.63	8.19**	8.55	7.69**	8.62	8.02**	-3.43	-2.99**	8.69	8.10**	2.08	2.34	8.69	8.10**	2.08	2.34
6 (M,O,\$a)	7.44	6.76**	8.26	7.05**	8.13	7.23**	-2.32	-1.81**	7.96	7.29**	2.93	2.82	7.96	7.29**	2.93	2.82
7 (M,S,\$c)	8.50	7.88**	8.27	7.17**	8.42	7.65**	-3.17	-2.64**	8.52	7.95**	2.01	2.30	8.52	7.95**	2.01	2.30
8 (M,Ma,\$a)	7.67	6.96**	8.26	7.28**	8.18	7.48**	-2.34	-1.91**	8.03	7.40**	2.87	3.07	8.03	7.40**	2.87	3.07
9 (M,O,\$b)	8.43	7.97**	8.31	7.53**	8.43	7.90**	-3.23	-2.71**	8.56	7.85**	2.17	2.52	8.56	7.85**	2.17	2.52
10 (F,S,\$c)	8.52	8.02**	8.25	7.27**	8.41	7.69**	-3.23	-2.67**	8.57	7.93**	1.94	2.29	8.57	7.93**	1.94	2.29
11 (M,O,\$c)	8.67	8.23**	8.46	7.45**	8.59	7.96**	-3.51	-2.98**	8.71	7.98**	1.99	2.30	8.71	7.98**	1.99	2.30
12 (F,O,\$a)	7.61	7.20*	8.23	7.07**	8.16	7.55**	-2.28	-1.91*	8.00	7.26**	2.82	2.87	8.00	7.26**	2.82	2.87
13 (M,S,\$a)	7.46	6.98*	8.15	6.79**	7.98	7.01**	-1.98	-1.74	7.75	7.24**	2.80	2.90	7.75	7.24**	2.80	2.90

\* = significant difference at .05 level      \*\* = significant difference at .01 level

F=female, M=male, S=salesperson, Ma=general manager, O=owner

\$a=15000dr, \$b=120000dr, \$c=240000dr, \$d=75000dr, \$e=600000dr, \$f=2100000dr

**Scenario 2 (Health club)**

CARD	Culturally acceptable		Provide for family		Obligated to act this way		Ethical		Do the same		Should be careful	
	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB	GR	ALB
1 (F,S,\$d)	7.02	6.77	7.32	6.49**	6.53	6.45	-1.76	-1.72	7.24	6.90	4.00	3.80
2 (F,Ma,\$e)	8.17	7.88	8.03	7.11**	7.79	7.35*	-2.97	-2.60*	8.14	7.64**	3.32	3.02
3 (F,O,\$f)	8.59	8.28*	8.20	7.18**	8.28	7.64**	-3.55	-3.03**	8.51	7.85**	2.77	2.55
4 (M,S,\$e)	7.97	7.67	7.90	6.96**	7.42	6.98	-2.77	-2.47	8.04	7.52**	3.21	2.91
5 (M,Ma,\$f)	8.52	8.24	8.28	7.36**	8.10	7.57*	-3.44	-2.99**	8.44	7.95**	2.86	2.57
6 (M,O,\$d)	7.41	7.18	7.76	6.88**	7.47	6.95*	-2.28	-2.14	7.67	7.22	3.92	3.66
7 (M,S,\$f)	8.41	8.06*	8.00	7.04**	7.85	7.19**	-3.32	-2.78**	8.33	7.78**	2.71	2.49
8 (M,Ma,\$d)	7.34	7.21	7.86	6.94**	7.33	7.06	-2.36	-1.97*	7.70	7.22*	3.74	3.29
9 (M,O,\$e)	8.26	7.87*	7.96	7.02**	7.97	7.26**	-3.06	-2.71*	8.28	7.73**	3.16	2.78
10 (F,S,\$f)	8.41	8.04*	8.04	7.07**	7.79	7.27*	-3.25	-2.75**	8.31	7.83**	2.76	2.46
11 (M,O,\$f)	8.54	8.19*	8.20	7.17**	8.21	7.59**	-3.50	-3.02**	8.51	7.83**	2.80	2.48
12 (F,O,\$d)	7.43	7.28	7.82	6.87**	7.37	7.03	-2.32	-2.02	7.68	7.17*	3.80	3.45
13 (M,S,\$d)	7.19	7.12	7.58	6.71**	6.96	6.71	-1.96	-1.76	7.43	6.98	3.91	3.40

\* = significant difference at .05 level      \*\* = significant difference at .01 level  
 F=female, M=males, S=salesperson, Ma=general manager, O=owner  
 \$a=15000dr, \$b=12000dr, \$c=24000dr, \$d=7500dr, \$e=60000dr, \$f=210000dr