İ.Ü. Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi
No:46. (Mart 2012). ss.61-74.

WORKING LIFE MATTERS: ON THE COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS AND EMPLOYEES TOWARDS BUSINESS ETHICS[*]

Selim YAZICI[**]
Enis SINIKSARAN[***]

Abstract
The focus of this research is on the examination of changing attitudes of employees towards business ethics after a period of working experience. The primary aim of this study is to explore the differences in the attitudes of students (prospective managers) and employees towards business ethics issues. The secondary aim is to investigate whether working experience plays a role in the perception of business ethics issues.
The data was collected through drop-off surveys that included Attitudes toward Business Ethics Questionnaire (ATBEQ) and demographic questions, both from students and employees. Employees were chosen from three different industries in order to eliminate any industrial bias. The results were statistically analyzed through ANOVA and further multiple comparison tests. Data analysis results showed significant differences in terms of the attitude toward business ethics among students and employees. The results also show that, for some variables, the years spending in working life do really matter, that is, the higher the years spent in the working life, the higher the ethical awareness was found to be. Finally, managerial implications and further research alternatives are discussed.

Keywords: ATBEQ, Attitudes Towards Business Ethics, Business Ethics

Çalışma Yaşamı Fark Yaratır: Öğrencilerin ve Çalışanların İş Ahlakına Karşı Tutumlarının Karşılaştırılması

Özet
Bu çalışmanın odak noktası, çalışma yaşamının iş ahlakına karşı tutumlarda yaratacağı değişimi ölçmektir. Araştırmanın temel olarak iki amacı bulunmaktadır. Birincil amaç, geleceğin yönetici adayları olarak nitelendirilen öğrencilerin ve iş yaşamında belirli bir süreden beri çalışan kişilerin iş ahlakına karşı tutumlarındaki farklılıkları belirlemektir. İkincil amaç ise, çalışma yaşamında geçirilen sürenin, iş ahlakı algısında bir değişime neden olup olmadığının belirlenmesidir.
Bu amaçlardan yola çıkarak, öğrencilerden ve çalışanlardan oluşan iki farklı gruptan, literatürde iş ahlakına karşı tutumları ölçmek için kullanılan ATBEQ ölçeği kullanılarak veri toplanmıştır. İstatistiksel analizler sonunda, çalışanlar ve öğrenciler arasında iş ahlakına karşı geliştirdikleri tutumlarda anlamlı istatistiksel farklılıklar bulunmuştur. Ayrıca, belirli değişkenlerde ise, iş yaşamında geçirilen sürenin, çalışanın iş ahlakı algısını artırdığı gözlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: ATBEQ, İş Ahlakı, İş Ahlakına Karşı Tutum.

---

[*] This project has been supported by Istanbul University Scientific Research Projects Department, No: UDP-18168.
[**] Doç.Dr., İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, İşletme Bölümü Öğretim Üyesi, selim@istanbul.edu.tr
[***] Doç.Dr. İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, İşletme Bölümü Öğretim Üyesi, esiniksaran@istanbul.edu.tr

Introduction

There is a growing public concern for ethical problems in business. After many corporate scandals, most of the members of the society believe that business people do not attach much importance on ethical considerations in their daily operations.

Many studies dealing with the choices and attitudes of business practitioners and students towards ethical issues have been published since 1960's (e.g; Baumhart, 1961; Brenner and Molander, 1977; Purcell, 1977). Albaum and Peterson (2006) reported that, since the mid 1980's, many empirical studies on business ethics issues used student samples. It is widely acknowledged that the use of business professional samples may provide a more realistic representation of business ethics situations in the real world (Jewe, 2008).

The focus of this research is on the comparison of attitudes of students, and employees (business practitioners) from different business sectors towards business ethics, after a period of working experience. The *primary aim* of this paper is to explore the differences in the attitudes of students (prospective managers) and employees towards business ethics issues. The student respondent group was selected for the research due to their property of being the future leaders of businesses and governments, and from this perspective the results of this research may serve as an indicator of the way future leaders might be expected to behave. It is also possible that, not all of the students will reach managerial positions in organizations; but they will certainly affect the future ethical climate where they work as a decision maker. Employees were chosen from three different industries to eliminate any industrial bias. The *secondary aim of the study* is to investigate whether working experience plays a role in the perception of business ethic issues. The results showed some significant empirical evidence that working life and the duration of work experience are important in terms of the attitudes towards business ethics.

Literature Review

Business ethics, from a research perspective, has been a hot topic since the beginning of the twentieth century. Ethical behavior in business have extensively discussed in recent years. Ethical studies have been conducted by using two major dimensions: conceptual and empirical (Preble, Reichel, 1988: 941). *Conceptual studies* were about the meaning of business ethics, moral judgment and conduct, and social responsibility and try to introduce some rules and guidelines for business people to guide their decision-making process. *Empirical studies*, have focused on examining the application side of ethical behaviors, such like beliefs, perceptions, attitudes and behavior of general public, business people and prospective business managers (university students) (Preble, Reichel, 1988: 942).

Management researchers began to study business ethics during the 1960s by conducting surveys on managers' attitudes toward business ethics (Trevino and Nelson, 2011: 3). Many studies have also been carried out in different cultures examining business students' attitudes towards business ethics (Miesing and Preble, 1985; Preble and Reichel, 1988; Grant, Jr. and Broom, 1988; Jones, Jr. 1990; Small, 1992; and Glenn and Loo, 1993). Miesing and Preble (1985: 474) concluded that older and more experienced people were found to be more ethical than students. Preble and Reichel (1988: 947); in their investigation found that both American and Israeli business students placed considerable importance on ethics

in business. The results of Small's study (1992: 750) indicated "a high commonality of views towards business ethics by Western Australian, US and Israeli Students". He further argued that such commonality led him to believe that business ethics and business practices were very similar throughout the Western World.

ATBEQ was used by many researchers to compare different groups of students from different countries on their attitudes towards business ethics. The original study on attitude towards business ethics by Preble and Reichel (1988: 943) compared the means of samples of US and Israeli undergraduate business students (prospective managers). They have conducted ATBEQ survey to collect data from a sample of 279 students. In the study, scores obtained by American and Israeli business students were compared to see if they differed in their attitudes to a selection of ethical issues in business. They found that there were significant differences between these two groups of students. While significant differences were found between the two groups, there were also a large number of similarities. They also found that, both groups showed relatively high moral standards.

A subsequent study by Small (1992) compared the results published by Preble and Reichel (1988) with samples from Western Australian business students (272 students). Small conducted his study on a group of business students in Western Australia. The purpose of Small's study was to see if Australian students' results were statistically significant to the US and Israeli students' scores examined by Preble and Reichel (Small, 1992: 746). As the result of the comparison, US and Australian undergraduates tend to share similar or identical values in their attitudes towards business ethics. Although he found some statistically significant differences, he noted that they were not particularly meaningful (Small, 1992: 750).

Following that, Moore and Radloff (1996) conducted a study comparing the published results of the previous studies with those surveyed from final year South African undergraduate business students. They have assessed students over three consecutive years and compared their results with previous studies of Preble and Reichle (1988), and Small (1992). The total number of students surveyed over three year period was 379. Their first aim was to compare the results of the South African sample if there is a significant degree of change has taken place in the ethical attitudes of South African students over the consecutive years. The second aim of their research was to compare the results of the previous studies with South African business students. They have also suggested a revised version of the ATBEQ which excludes the poorly performing questions (Moore and Radloff, 1996: 868).

Lin (Lin 1999a and Lin 1999b) used ATBEQ, as a replication of Small's (1992) study, to collect data from Taiwanese undergraduate business and engineering students. She has compared Taiwanese university students' ethical perceptions with corresponding results from similar studies conducted in the US and Israel (Preble, Reichel, 1988), and Australia (Small, 1992). Although significant differences were found, she has also found some similarities.

Sims and Gegez (2004) have compared the results of the ATBEQ with earlier studies reported in the literature for samples from the US, Israel, Australia and South Africa to a new sample from Turkey. They have found that, while there were some shared views towards business ethics across countries, significant differences were exist between the Turkish and other samples. They further discuss similarities and differences in terms of countries' Corruption Perceptions Index ratings (reported by the Internet Center for Corruption Research) and Hofstede's Theory of International Cultures.

Sims (2006) further tried to investigate the cross-cultural differences. She compared the previously reported results of the ATBEQ in the literature for samples from Israel, USA, South Africa, Western Australia, and Turkey with new samples from Jamaica and West Indies. He utilized Hofstede's (1997) work on national cultures as a theoretical basis for comparing the countries within the sample.

Phau and Kea (2007) also presented a cross-national study of attitudes towards business ethics among Australia, Singapore, and Hong Kong by using culture and religion as the determinants. They found that respondents who practiced their religion tend to consider themselves more ethically minded than those who do not. They also undertake a more robust analysis approach to assess the reliability and validity concerns of the ATBEQ scale.

Cox, Friedman, and Edwards (2009) studied the use of a film as an intervention to engage student discussion about their attitudes towards business ethics. They also develop a revised, more efficient version of the ATBEQ like Moore and Radloff (1996) based on factor analysis results.

Lau (2009) examined ethics education and its relationship with students' ethical awareness and moral reasoning. He also used ATBEQ and 10 vignettes as the major measurement instrument. It was hypothesized that students with ethics education will have both a greater ethical awareness and ability to make more ethical decisions.

Kum-Lung and Teck-Chai (2010) aimed to explore the influence of religiosity, gender, and education levels on attitude towards business ethics. They both administer ATBEQ, and Religious Commitment Inventory (RCI-10) to measure attitudes and interpersonal and intrapersonal religiosity.

More recently, Bageac, Furrer and Reynaud (2010) focused on the difference in the perception of business ethics across French and Romanian management students. All these studies made use of students as their subject of study. While previous studies using ATBEQ were exploratory and descriptive in nature looking at cross-cultural differences; their research took a more theory testing and confirmatory approach.

Methodology

As noted previously, this study holds two aims. Concerning these aims, the hypotheses can be stated as follows:

H_1: There is a statistically significant difference in the perceptions of the students and managers towards business ethics issues.

H_2: There is a positive correlation between the experience in worklife and ethical awareness.

In order to test the hypotheses One-Way ANOVA statistics and multiple comparison tests were conducted. For some of the variables, statistical evidence was found to accept the hypothesis.

Subjects and Procedures

The present study compares two different groups, students and employees, on their attitudes toward business ethics. Full-time employees from three different business sectors, which are real estate (n=113), banking (n=128), and insurance (n=218) were chosen. The reason to choose three different sectors is to eliminate any industrial bias towards business ethics and to explore the differences between business sectors. On the other hand senior undergraduate business administration students (n=156) from major universities in Turkey were chosen with suitable sampling techniques to test the hypotheses. None of the students were attended to a business ethics course before.

Subjects were participated in this research through a self-administered survey. The questionnaires were distributed to the students during their classes by research associates and collected once completed. Drop-off method was used for business professionals. Once questionnaires were delivered, they were collected the other day following a phone call to ensure that it was completed. A cover-letter was included explaining that the intent of the study was to gather their attitudes towards business ethics and that their participation was voluntary and without compensation. All questionnaires were anonymous. The demographic composition of the sample is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: The Demographic Composition of the Sample

	Real Estate (n=113)	**Banking** (n=128)	**Insurance** (n=218)	**Student** (n=156)
Gender				
Male	77	95	122	93
Female	36	33	96	63
Average Age	33.6	34.0	32.9	20.7
Average Experience	11.6	12.6	10.4	0

Research Instrument and Measures

The survey used in the study included the Attitudes towards Business Ethics Questionnaire (ATBEQ) scale and demographic variables. ATBEQ was originally developed by Neumann and Reichel (1987), was cited in Preble and Reichel (1988: 943), and was based on the Stevens (1979) "Values Clarification Exercises", to measure the differences in ethical attitudes. In the ATBEQ scale, respondents were asked to express their opinions regarding attitudes towards business ethics. Thirty variables were listed and the respondents were asked to score the level of agreement to each of these questions on a five-point Likert scale where 1 corresponds to "strongly disagree" and 5 to "strongly agree" (see Appendix).

The thirty item ATBEQ scale was used after "back translation method" to ensure an accurate rendering of the original questionnaire. A colleague with perfect command of English translated the original scale to Turkish and another colleague translated it back to English to resolve any disagreement. After minor revisions, it is decided that translated version was matched with the original version.

Results

In the present study, reliability analysis gave a value for Cronbach's alpha of 0.71 which is regarded as acceptable for the purpose of the present research. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for normality was used to see whether the responses had a normal curve regarding the mean value. All of the items were considered to have normal distributions.To test our first hypothesis H1, One-Way ANOVA was used to examine and identify significant differences among the three working groups and the students. The examination of One-Way ANOVA results given in Table 2 indicates that there are significant differences between the group means for the variables 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 20, 25, 28 and 29 at 0.05 levels.

Table 2: ANOVA Results for Four Groups

Var. No	Real Estate Employees (n=113)		Banking Employees (n=128)		Insurance Employees (n=218)		Students (n=156)		p-values for ANOVA
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	
1	2.1327	1.33299	2.4141	1.29522	2.2151	1.39482	2.3397	1.34643	.330
2	2.6875	1.50693	2.5703	1.24029	2.6680	1.56447	2.0769	1.28283	**.000***
3	2.7778	1.24805	2.7734	1.19852	3.3494	1.33894	2.5769	1.19158	**.000***
4	3.2743	1.35783	3.1250	1.26117	3.3255	1.38891	2.5962	1.19558	**.000***
5	3.6250	1.16344	3.4688	.91305	3.7680	1.21659	3.4872	1.04411	**.030***
6	2.8053	1.23099	2.8504	1.11326	2.7642	1.30981	2.6667	1.20394	.633
7	2.3009	1.19437	2.5859	1.22009	2.4263	1.36145	2.4359	1.23487	.385
8	2.8981	1.24510	3.1024	.99869	2.8171	1.18282	2.9679	1.04985	.129
9	1.9375	1.23960	1.9922	1.06110	2.2032	1.36622	1.6346	.97773	**.000***
10	1.9196	1.17893	2.1875	1.19546	2.1102	1.31713	1.6603	1.07461	**.001***
11	2.7207	1.44078	2.5000	1.17050	3.1741	1.43634	2.2821	1.23286	**.000***
12	2.8929	1.29000	3.2598	1.12131	3.2619	1.38391	3.0064	1.26744	**.029***
13	2.6460	1.51139	2.5234	1.36298	2.3889	1.46933	3.1603	1.50910	**.000***
14	1.3628	.91673	1.6641	1.11028	1.6008	1.24830	1.5192	1.04401	.165
15	1.4018	.88491	1.7422	1.05924	1.5315	1.10201	1.5833	1.02836	.081
16	1.3805	.83792	1.8281	1.18461	1.6575	1.24348	1.9744	1.20723	**.000***
17	2.9464	1.51770	2.8984	1.20915	3.1280	1.43662	2.9487	1.28412	.357
18	4.3125	1.05720	4.1496	1.02414	4.0354	1.29560	4.2949	1.01738	.068
19	3.0625	1.30337	2.7812	1.12898	3.0667	1.38591	3.1731	1.21370	.073
20	3.3214	1.33703	2.9766	1.19358	3.0472	1.35342	2.8333	1.41801	**.031***
21	1.4425	.94433	1.7578	1.12765	1.7148	1.24960	1.6410	1.07132	.127
22	3.5179	1.44560	3.4094	1.35900	3.2753	1.49155	3.4551	1.40663	.424
23	3.5982	1.45478	3.6094	1.22464	3.5628	1.47165	3.5000	1.43009	.915
24	4.1964	1.08087	4.0394	1.07202	4.0964	1.17378	4.2051	.88513	.505
25	3.3423	1.33141	3.4844	1.17711	3.2500	1.40632	3.0705	1.17562	**.056***
26	3.7636	1.12460	3.6406	.99395	3.6920	1.24714	3.7564	1.16603	.801
27	4.2973	1.10037	4.2578	.99008	4.2298	1.15919	4.1474	1.02740	.704
28	1.7768	1.01084	2.1250	1.23594	2.0323	1.32821	1.7372	.91660	**.009***
29	2.9018	1.37520	2.8346	1.20029	3.0361	1.35996	3.3718	1.15963	**.002***
30	3.9196	1.35659	3.6142	1.42008	3.7080	1.53890	3.5449	1.35047	.187

Note: *p£0.05

Schaeffe's post-hoc test was carried out for these variables to determine which of the means for these groups are significantly different from the others, and the results were presented in Table 3. According to the table, for the variables 2, 4, 9, 10, 13, and 29, the means of Students are significantly different from the three working groups. For the variables 3 and 11, Insurance group; for the variables 16 and 20 Real Estate group seems to be different from the others. For the variables 5, 12, 25, and 28, there is no unique group which is different from the others.

Table 3: Post-Hoc Test Results for variables 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 20, 25, 28 and 29

Var.	Group	p-value	Var.	Group	p-value	Var.	Group	p-value	Var.	Group	p-value
V2	Real E.	.527	**V9**	Real E.	.725	**V13**	Real E.	.517	**V28**	Real E.	.022
		.905			.052			.122			.055
		.001			.042			.005			.784
	Bank	.527		Bank	.725		Bank	.517		Bank	.022
		.530			.106			.398			.466
		.004			.013			.000			.006
	Ins.	.905		Ins.	.052		Ins.	.122		Ins.	.055
		.530			.106			.398			.466
		.000			.000			.000			.014
	Stud.	**.001**		**Stud.**	**.042**		**Stud.**	**.005**		Stud.	.784
		.004			**.013**			**.000**			.006
		.000			**.000**			**.000**			.014
V3	Real E.	.979	**V10**	Real E.	.089	**V16**	**Real E.**	**.003**	**V29**	Real E.	.687
		.000			.167			**.035**			.359
		.204			.045			**.000**			.003
	Bank	.979		Bank	.089		Bank	.003		Bank	.687
		.000			.558			.176			.151
		.192			.000			.292			.001
	Ins.	**.000**		Ins.	.167		Ins.	.035		Ins.	.359
		.000			.558			.176			.151
		.000			.000			.008			.011
	Stud.	.204		**Stud.**	**.045**		Stud.	.000		**Stud.**	**.003**
		.192			**.000**			.292			**.001**
		.000			**.000**			.008			**.011**
V4	Real E.	.379	**V11**	Real E.	.205	**V20**	**Real E.**	**.047**			
		.731			.003			**.049**			
		.000			.009			**.003**			
	Bank	.379		Bank	.205		Bank	.047			
		.160			.000			.626			
		.001			.173			.369			
	Ins.	.731		**Ins.**	**.003**		Ins.	.049			
		.160			**.000**			.626			
		.000			**.000**			.116			
	Stud.	**.000**		Stud.	.009		Stud.	.003			
		.001			.173			.369			
		.000			.000			.116			

Table 3 (Cont.)								
V5	Real E.	.278	**V12**	Real E.	.029	**V25**	Real E.	.399
		.258			.012			.533
		.317			.478			.092
	Bank	.278		Bank	.029		Bank	.399
		.014			.988			.097
		.890			.101			.008
	Ins.	.258		Ins.	.012		Ins.	.533
		.014			.988			.097
		.527			.053			.176
	Stud.	.317		Stud.	.478		Stud.	.092
		.890			.101			.008
		.527			.053			.176

In summary, the students are found to be the most different group for six variables; however, for the majority of the variables, there seems no clear cut distinction between the students and the employees.

Results of the previous ANOVA and post-hoc tests indicate that the differences of the groups may stem from the working experience since the most different group is students who have no experience. To test our second hypothesis H_2, we tried another ANOVA design, hoping to obtain a clearer picture regarding the work experience. In this design, we constructed four groups based on the working experience presented as in Table 4. Since, in our sample, there is no worker with less than one year of experience, Group 1 totally comprised of the students.

Table 4: Working Experience of Groups

Group Number	Working Experience (Years)	Sample Size
1	Less than 1	156
2	[1-2]	94
3	[3-10]	210
4	More than 10	155

Table 5 shows the ANOVA results. At this design, much more significant differences were found comparing with the previous one.

Table 5: ANOVA Results for the Four Groups Formed Based on Working Experience

Var.	Group 1 (n=156)		Group 2 (n=94)		Group 3 (n=210)		Group 4 (n=155)		p-values for ANOVA
No	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	
1	2.3397	1.34643	2.2368	1.21424	2.3612	1.39908	2.0455	1.35445	.149
2	2.0769	1.28283	3.0435	1.39794	2.5378	1.46679	2.5909	1.57851	**.000***
3	2.5769	1.19158	3.0531	1.32180	2.9467	1.31162	3.0662	1.39842	**.007***
4	2.5962	1.19558	3.2783	1.32153	3.1886	1.35193	3.3822	1.33270	**.000***
5	3.4872	1.04411	3.6903	.99175	3.7018	1.06964	3.6000	1.28225	.554
6	2.6667	1.20394	2.9204	1.24026	2.7723	1.21166	2.6859	1.31397	.393
7	2.4359	1.23487	2.5614	1.28321	2.5066	1.30136	2.2013	1.30048	**.049***
8	2.9679	1.04985	3.0089	1.08632	3.0224	1.14861	2.7697	1.19862	.159
9	1.6346	.97773	2.1043	1.21665	2.1372	1.31782	1.9286	1.21056	**.015***
10	1.6603	1.07461	2.1947	1.28075	1.9251	1.15928	2.1656	1.38141	**.002***
11	2.2821	1.23286	2.8174	1.46049	2.8571	1.40056	3.0795	1.45842	**.002***
12	3.0064	1.26744	3.1043	1.28673	3.2876	1.20795	3.0584	1.41068	.131
13	3.1603	1.50910	2.6435	1.45814	2.6432	1.47561	2.1935	1.44643	**.000***
14	1.5192	1.04401	1.7130	1.26882	1.5859	1.19193	1.3526	.96255	**.044***
15	1.5833	1.02836	1.6609	1.05869	1.5639	1.03868	1.3484	.93693	**.044***
16	1.9744	1.20723	1.7130	1.24791	1.6623	1.13610	1.3935	.98361	**.001***
17	2.9487	1.28412	3.1491	1.22100	3.0402	1.42784	2.8590	1.48736	.273
18	4.2949	1.01738	4.0696	1.19738	4.1416	1.11449	4.1410	1.25697	.586
19	3.1731	1.21370	2.9304	1.24056	2.8904	1.35090	3.2129	1.25350	**.043***
20	2.8333	1.41801	3.1217	1.19317	3.1013	1.35129	3.0903	1.35497	.397
21	1.6410	1.07132	1.8000	1.17129	1.6272	1.11717	1.3949	.93889	**.020***
22	3.4551	1.40663	3.2054	1.54884	3.4646	1.38919	3.3503	1.51854	.498
23	3.5000	1.43009	3.9292	1.32770	3.6622	1.32005	3.3057	1.52190	**.004***
24	4.2051	.88513	4.2478	1.08998	4.0789	1.13141	3.9744	1.21787	.189
25	3.0705	1.17562	3.2212	1.39984	3.3991	1.30516	3.1948	1.39128	.242
26	3.7564	1.16603	3.7168	1.06460	3.7301	1.12059	3.7707	1.24485	.982
27	4.1474	1.02740	4.2566	1.02451	4.3216	1.01215	4.2258	1.23556	.783
28	1.7372	.91660	2.0439	1.20757	2.0044	1.22383	1.7756	1.22645	**.024***
29	3.3718	1.15963	2.9561	1.35927	2.8772	1.30833	3.0321	1.35561	**.001***
30	3.5449	1.35047	3.4123	1.56177	3.7807	1.44050	3.9231	1.44820	**.015***

Note: *p£0.05

These differences seem to occur for the variables 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 23, 28, 29, and 30 at 0.05 levels.

Schaeffe's Post-hoc test was carried out for these variables to determine which of the means for the four groups are significantly different from the others and the results were presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Post-Hoc Test (LSD) Results for the Variables 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 23, 28, 29, and 30

Var.	Group	p-value	Var.	Group	p-value	Var.	Group	p-value	Var.	Group	p-value	Var.	Group	p-value
V2	**1**	**.000**	**V9**	**1**	**.023**	**V14**	1	.070	**V21**	1	.219	**V30**	1	.414
		.022			**.003**			.306			.896			.117
		.016			**.042**			.321			.037			.020
	2	**.000**		2	.023		2	.070		2	.219		2	.414
		.003			.815			.318			.164			.028
		.012			.245			.009			.002			.005
	3	.022		3	.003		3	.306		3	.896		3	.117
		.003			.815			.318			.164			.028
		.727			.104			.044			.039			.047
	4	.016		4	.042		4	.321		**4**	**.037**		**4**	**.020**
		.012			.245			.009			**.002**			**.005**
		.727			.104			.044			**.039**			**.047**
V3	**1**	**.007**	**V10**	1	.002	**V15**	1	.402	**V23**	1	.052			
		.014			.128			.968			.672			
		.002			.002			.056			.051			
	2	.007		2	.002		2	.402		2	.052			
		.484			.058			.404			.099			
		.936			.848			.013			.000			
	3	.014		3	.128		3	.968		3	.672			
		.484			.058			.404			.099			
		.389			.060			.042			.015			
	4	.002		4	.002		**4**	**.056**		**4**	**.051**			
		.936			.848			**.013**			**.000**			
		.389			.060			**.042**			**.015**			
V4	**1**	**.001**	**V11**	**1**	**.048**	**V16**	1	.164	**V28**	1	.021			
		.002			**.008**			.035			.015			
		.000			**.000**			.000			.677			
	2	.001		2	.048		2	.164		2	.021			
		.555			.807			.698			.768			
		.524			.136			.023			.062			
	3	.002		3	.008		3	.035		3	.015			
		.555			.807			.698			.768			
		.160			.137			.024			.059			
	4	.000		4	.000		**4**	**.000**		4	.677			
		.524			.136			**.023**			.062			
		.160			.137			**.024**			.059			
V7	1	.199	**V13**	**1**	**.047**	**V19**	1	.146	**V29**	**1**	**.006**			
		.265			**.018**			.039			**.000**			
		.047			**.000**			.664			**.014**			
	2	.199		2	.047		2	.146		2	.006			
		.711			.999			.784			.598			
		.024			.014			.073			.637			
	3	.265		3	.018		3	.039		3	.000			
		.711			.999			.784			.598			
		.023			.004			.016			.253			
	4	**.047**		**4**	**.000**		4	.664		4	.014			
		.024			**.014**			.073			.637			
		.023			**.004**			.016			.253			

The vast majority of the differences stem from the two groups: Group 1 who has the least experience, and Group 4, who are the most experienced. For the variables 2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 13 and 29, Group 1 seems different from the others, while for the variables 7, 13, 15, 16, 21, 23 and 30, Group 4 seems so. When we look at the means of these fourteen variables (see Table 5) we can observe that the business ethics perception of Group 1 is lower than those of the others, while that of Group 4 is higher than the others. Since Group 1 comprises of the people who have no work experience and Group 4 comprises of the people who are the most experienced, we can claim that, business ethics perception increases with the working experience. As can be seen from the analysis, working life changes the attitude of people towards business ethics. Shortly, working life matters.

Limitations

This study is not without limitations. The analysis relied on the data from surveys. Convenience sampling was used. The sample size from different industries may not be sufficient to reflect those industry employees' ethical attitudes. Also, the survey was conducted only in Istanbul.

Discussion and Conclusions

In this study, we compare business students with full-time employees from three different industries on a number of ethical dimensions to test if working life increase ethical awareness. The goal is not only compare two groups (students as the non-workers and employees from different industries), but to examine two different cultures, one which is not interested in revenue in terms of living, versus the one with specific goals of making money. The results of this study are consistent with previous studies that find students to be less ethical than corporate employees for some variables. The evidence shows that, students make less ethical choices than employees. Why this is the case is not clear. It could mean that students have lower ethical standards, but other implications are also possible.

Additionally, we found significant empirical evidence that working life and the duration of working are important for changing the attitudes of people towards business ethics. On the other hand, replication of the exploratory factor analysis procedure failed to support factorial structure proposed by previous studies for ATBEQ scale (for example Moore and Radloff, 1996; Etheredge, 1999; Cox, 2009; Lau, 2009)

A major function of this research on the ethical perceptions of future managers is to provide a guideline for educators, managers, government officials, and other parties to contemplate. As a conclusion, it is also important to add Business Ethics courses to business administration curriculums. Business ethics courses might reduce the time to develop ethical perception. There are many evidence to prove that (see for example Crane, 2004; Lin, 1999a and Lin, 1999b) found that ethics education improved students' ethical awareness and moral reasoning. In a previous study, Yazici et al., (2010) also found that, only adding business ethics related films to the content of the course could make positive contribution to students' ethical awareness.

References

- Albaum, G. and R. A. Peterson: 2006, 'Ethical Attitudes of Future Business Leaders: Do they Vary by Gender and Religiosity?', *Business & Society* 45(3), 300–321.
- Bageac, D., Furrer, O. and Reynaud L.: 2010, 'Management Students' Attitudes Toward Business Ethics: A Comparison Between France and Romania', *Journal of Business Ethics* 98(3), 391-406.
- Baumhart, R.C.: 1961, 'How Ethical are Businessmen?', *Harvard Business Review* 39(4), (July-Aug. 1961), 6-9.
- Brenner, S. N. and Molander, E. A.: 1977, 'Is the Ethics of Business Changing?', *Harvard Business Review* 55(1), (Jan.-Feb. 1977), 57-71.
- Cox, P.L., Friedman, B.A. and Edwards, A.L.: 2009, 'Enron: The Smartest Guys in the Room—Using the Enron Film to Examine Student Attitudes towards Business Ethics', *Journal of Behavioral & Applied Management* 10(2), 263-290.
- Crane, F.G.: 2004, 'The Teaching of Business Ethics: An Imperative at Business Schools', *Journal of Education for Business* 79(3), 149-151.
- Etheredge, J.M.: 1999, 'The Perceived Role of Ethics and Social Responsibility: An Alternative Scale', *Journal of Business Ethics* 18(1), 51-64.
- Glenn, J.R. and Loo, M.F.V.: 1993, 'Business Students' and Practitioners' Ethical Decisions Over Time', *Journal of Business Ethics* 12(11), 835-847.
- Grant, E. W. Jr. and L. Broom: 1988, 'Attitudes Towards Ethics: A View of the College Student', *Journal of Business Ethics* 7(8), 617-619.
- Jewe, R. D.: 2008, 'Do Business Ethics Courses Work? The Effectiveness of Business Ethics Education: An Empirical Study', *The Journal of Global Business Issues* 2(1), 1–6.
- Jones, Jr., W.A.: 1990, 'Student View of Ethical Issues: A Situational Analysis', *Journal of Business Ethics* 9(3), 201-205.
- Kum-Lung, C. and Teck-Chai, L.: 2010, 'Attitude towards Business Ethics: Examining the Influence of Religiosity, Gender and Education Levels', *International Journal of Marketing Studies* 2(1), 225-232.
- Lau, C.L.L.: 2009, 'A Step Forward: Ethics Education Matters', *Journal of Business Ethics* 92(4), 565-584.
- Lin, C.Y.Y.: 1999a, 'A Comparison of Perceptions About Business Ethics in Four

Countries', *The Journal of Psychology* 133(6), 641-655.

- Lin, C.Y.Y.: 1999b, 'Business Ethics in Taiwan: A Comparison of Company Employees and University Students', *Business and Professional Ethics Journal* 18(2), 69-90.
- Miesing, P. and Preble, J.F.: 1985, 'A Comparison of Five Business Philosophies', *Journal of Business Ethics* 4(6), 465-476.
- Moore, R.S. and Radloff, S.E.: 1996, 'Attitudes Towards Business Ethics Held by South African Students', *Journal of Business Ethics* 15(8), 863-869.
- Neumann, Y. and Reichel, A.: 1987, 'The Development of Attitudes toward Business Ethics Questionnaire (ATBEQ): Concepts, Dimensions, and Relations to Work Values', *Working Paper, Department of Industrial Engineering and Management*, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Israel.
- Phau, I. and Kea, G.: 2007, 'Attitudes of University Students Toward Business Ethics: A Cross-National Investigation of Australia, Singapore and Hong Kong', *Journal of Business Ethics* 72(1), 61–75.
- Preble, J.F and Reichel, A.: 1988, 'Attitudes Towards Business Ethics of Future Managers in the US and Israel', *Journal of Business Ethics* 7(12), 941-949.
- Purcell, T.V.: 1977, 'Do Courses in Business Ethics Pay Off?', *California Management Review* 19(4), 50-58.
- Sims, R.L. and Gegez, A.E.: 2004, 'Attitudes Towards Business Ethics: A Five Nation Comparative Study', *Journal of Business Ethics* 59(3), 253–265.
- Sims, R.L.: 2006, 'Comparing Ethical Attitudes Across Cultures', *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal* 13(2), 101-113.
- Small, M.W.: 1992, 'Attitudes Toward Business Ethics Held by Western Australian Students: A Comparative Study', *Journal of Business Ethics* 11(10), 745-752.
- Stevens, E.: 1979, *Business Ethics*, New York: Paulist Press.
- Trevino, L.K. and Nelson, K.A.: 2011, *Managing Business Ethics: Straight Talk About How To Do It Right*, 5th. Ed., New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Yazici, S., Ozbebek, A. and Kilicarslan Toplu, E.,: 2010, 'Exploring Companies' Behavioral Paradox by Using "The Corporation" Documentary', *6th. International Strategic Management Conference Proceedings*, St. Petersburg, Russia, (July 8-10), 1277-1282.

Appendix: The Attitudes towards Business Ethics Questionnaire (ATBEQ) Items

1. The only moral of business is making money.
2. A person who is doing well in business does not have to worry about moral problems.
3. Every business person acts according to moral principles, whether he/she is aware of it or not.
4. Act according to the law, and you can not go wrong morally.
5. Ethics in business is basically an adjustment between expectations and the way people behave.
6. Business decisions involve a realistic economic attitude and not a moral philosophy.
7. Moral values are irrelevant to the business world.
8. The lack of public confidence in the ethics of business people is not justified.
9. ‘‘Business Ethics’’ is a concept for public relations only.
10. The business world today is not different from what it used to be in the past. There is nothing new under the sun.
11. Competitiveness and profitability are independent values (existing on their own).
12. Conditions of free economy will serve best the needs of society. Limiting competition can only hurt society and actually violates basic natural laws.
13. As a consumer, when making a car insurance claim, I try to get as much as possible regardless of the damage.
14. While shopping at the supermarket, it is appropriate to switch price tags or packages.
15. As an employee, I take office supplies home; it does not hurt anyone.
16. I view sick days as vacation days that I deserve.
17. Employee wages should be determined according to the laws of supply and demand.
18. The main interest of shareholders is maximum return on their investment.
19. George, X., says of himself, ‘‘I work long, hard hours and do a good job, but it seems to me that other people are progressing faster. But I know my efforts will pay off in the end’’, Yes, George works hard, but he is not realistic.
20. For every decision in business the only question I ask is, ‘‘Will it be profitable?’’ If yes – I will act accordingly; if not it is irrelevant and a waste of time.
21. In my grocery store every week I raise the price of a certain product and mark it ‘‘on sale’’, There is nothing wrong with doing this.
22. A business person can not afford to get hung up on details.
23. If you want a specific goal, you have got to take the necessary means to achieve it.
24. The business world has its own rules.
25. A good business person is a successful business person.
26. I would rather have truth and personal responsibility than unconditional love and belongingness.
27. True morality is first and foremost self-interested.
28. Self-sacrifice is immoral.
29. You can judge a person according to his/her work and decisions.
30. You should not consume more than you produce.