

**ANALYZING COLLEGE STUDENTS' ETHICS PERCEPTIONS**  
**: A PILOT STUDY AT A FOUNDATION UNIVERSITY IN TURKEY.**

- **Asst.Prof.Dr. Eda YASA OZELTURKAY**  
Cag University, YasarBaybogan Campus  
Adana-Mersin KarayoluUzeri  
Mersin, Turkey  
edayasa@cag.edu.tr
  
- **Asst.Prof.Dr. Sezen BOZYIGIT**  
Mersin University,International Trade and Logistics Department,  
Tarsus School of Applied Technology and Management,  
Mersin University, Turkey  
sezenkilinc@yahoo.com
  
- **Asst.Prof.Dr. Murat GULMEZ**  
Cag University, YasarBaybogan Campus  
Adana-Mersin KarayoluUzeriMersin, Turkey  
mgulmez@cag.edu.tr

## **Abstract**

Ethics is an important concept for all areas of Business (production, marketing, human resource, finance, et al) and also for other disciplines (law, psychology, teaching etc). Even though it has been more visible in research and in business world recently, it is not a new concept. There are lots of ethical crises, scandals & problems happened in the past. Business ethics has also been an important issue for academicians and their environment. Previous studies show the link between university students and their behavior in the workforce in terms of ethical views. The purpose of this study is to analyze the perspectives of students towards business ethics. A survey focusing on business ethics and the ethical perceptions has been conducted at a foundation university in Turkey. Turkish students and their perceptions on 20 specific ethical behaviors and the relationships with demographic and basic variables were detailed. Ethical crisis usually occurs directly related to disciplines such as law, finance and management etc. Therefore this study is surveyed to summer school students across 6 departments in Mersin region (n=275 & N=796). The relationship between students' demographics and other related factors (such as age, gender, year in school, tobacco use, social media account usage, taking any business ethics course or lectures, time spent studying and being employed or trained before or current) were examined but no differences were found. After implementing a factor analysis on the retrieved data, 20 items were reduced to 13 items and classified under three factors entitled with business ethics, personal ethics and materiality ethics. The results show that students' departments with business ethics factor and the study period of students with personal and materiality ethics factor have significant differences.

**Keywords:** Business Ethics, Students, Ethical perceptions, Turkey.

## **Introduction**

Nowadays, the role of ethics has been better understood by many institutions, such as higher education institutions and big corporates. They focus on ethics more than ever before. The business programs in higher education institutions started to mention ethics in their curriculum

as a result of the dramatic crisis occurred due to unethical behaviours in the business area. All functions of business need ethically behaving personnel in order to comply with the necessities of today's business world today. In the communication age that we are living in, it is almost impossible for companies not to reveal any secrets or unethical business activities. For instance, marketing is the way that the companies represent themselves to the society (Ural, 2003). Henceby, the ethical scandals also create harmful impacts on the consumers end of the business. According to Laczniak and Murphy (1993), ethics in marketing identified as, Marketing ethics is the systematic study of how moral standards are applied to marketing decisions, behaviors, and institutions (Murphy, 2009).

After many corporate scandals, most of the members of the society believe that business people do not pay much attention to ethical considerations in their daily operations (Yazıcı and Kınıksaran, 2012). Several studies have shown a link between ethical views during college and behavior in the workforce (Ludlum, et al, 2013). Hence, these studies are important to investigate the moral climate of the future leaders (Freeman, 2009; Ludlum & Moskalionov, 2004). Current university students' perspectives regarding ethics will have an impact on their behavior during their business life in the future. Reiss and Mitra (1998) also claimed that, *in order to study the attitudes and behaviors of future organizational leaders one can look to current university students*. Therefore, the objective of this study was to determine college students' perspectives on ethical issues in a foundation university. A pilot study was designed and implemented. So this study's sample was covering only summer term of a foundation university in Turkey. The sample of this study includes all students who were present on campus during summer period at a foundation university. In this study, we examined gender, departments, study period, tobacco use, taking business ethics class; time spent studying, being employed, being trained, and major variables with the identified ethical factors.

## Literature Review

Ethics term can be basically defined as standards for how people live and act and the roots of the word ethics comes from the Greek "ethike" or "ethos," it means custom or norm. The term tends to be used for abstract or theoretical applications and is considered a branch of philosophy with the key question, "How should people live their lives?" (Roberts and Poper, 2015). Ethics is a requirement for human life, and "*it is our means of deciding a course of action, and it is accepted as without it, our actions would be random and aimless*" (Akram and Azad, 2011). The concepts of ethics and ethics studies are not new; Socrates was known as the first who vigorously approached to ethics 2,500 years ago when he questioned whether the *unexamined* life was worth living (Malloy, 2003). However, the fundamental ethical question, *What should I do?*, is still left unanswered in a definitive way. Business ethics has also been a concern in the academic environment. The study of business ethics began in the 1970s, heavily influenced by U.S. Catholic universities (Ludlum, et al, 2013).

Especially university education is accepted as the final stop for education and therefore, it has huge impacts on students' behavior when they join the work force. Averagely, an individual spends 20 years in the schools and so the schools have major roles to shape the personality and moral characteristics of individuals. Student's learnings and attitudes would shape their personality and working discipline. According to Hosmer (1991), Ethical problems are truly managerial dilemmas, because they represent a conflict between an organization's economic performance (measured by revenues, costs, and profits) and its social performance (stated in terms of obligations to persons both within and outside the

organization (Roberts and Poper, 2015). Similarly to this fact, management education is seen as an important part of the process toward improved business ethics, and accepted as a key opportunity to equip students with values and capabilities to promote ethical awareness (Ashforth et al., 2008). Corruption is responsible for making less money in almost every country and it involves a capital deviation around US\$ 1 trillion per year worldwide and the spread of corrupt acts affects the financial results negatively and verifies to retreat institutions image (Pardini et al., 2014). Likely, in historical development, ethics has been undertaken with different functions and in the present time, “values ethics” are ensuring the connection of ethics with the life space and therefore, ethics is eventually being given importance (Deniz et al., 2005). However the rules and regulations are standard in many countries, this doesn't help to avoid ongoing crisis in many countries. Although, many studies dealing with the choices and attitudes of business practitioners and students towards ethical issues have been published since 1960's, many empirical studies sampling with students have been examined since mid-1980s (Yazıcı and Kınıksaran, 2012).

As it is defined by Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the major role of management education is directly related to *prepare students to contribute to their organization and the larger society and to grow personally and professionally throughout their careers*, (Sigurjonsson et al, 2015). 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 (Yazıcı and Kınıksaran 2012).

In the world, some schools arrange ethics and ethics related lectures in their curricula are compulsory whereas some of them are taught as elective and others have chosen to integrate ethics discussions into many courses in the business core and major field of study (Cagle et al., 2008). The situation is similar in Turkey.

The popular ethical crisis is mostly happened with the financial departments, finance departments' sensitivity to this issue infinitely more. They are expected to deal with the topic in a professional manner, and yet few have formal training in how to teach such material. Dean and Beggs's (2006) interviews of faculty at a Catholic university in 1997 revealed that faculty did not feel that they had the proper training to teach ethics sufficiently (Cagle et al., 2008). Students are showing more interest in business ethics by signing up for elective courses and other related subjects (Wayne 2009). Generally the profile of business students among college students presents vulnerable to taking unethical actions (Lampe and Lampe, 2012). The previous studies show the ethical thoughts of the students differentiated based on the departments. In the study of Brown et al. (2010), business school students shows a correlation between increased narcissism and unethical decision making as well as lowered empathy levels in these students and the results show that, finance majors showed a marked and statistically significant tendency to be less empathetic and more narcissistic as compared to other business students. It has been well established that business students often cheat more and act in less cooperative ways than do students from other academic fields (Brown, and et al., 2010). Among fields of study, business students top the cheater's list at both undergraduate and graduate level and mainly on personality tests, finance students in particular, scored significantly higher on narcissism and lower on empathy, compared to other students, both traits which contribute to unethical decision making (Lampe and Lampe, 2012). Adding to these, also the same source (Lampe and Lampe, 2012) indicated that the most business students place high value on money and image, and follow these extrinsic values rather than the intrinsic ideals that would lead to greater ethical conduct. Scholars have not only conducted researches to determine ethical practices in the business communities, but also attempted to examine university students' perceptions based on their age, gender, classes, nationality, and culture (Lau, et al. 2012). Some previous studies indicated differences age

based ethical behavior. Ruegger and King (1992) stated that older students (40 plus years age group were the most ethical, followed in order by the 31-40 group, the 22-30 group and those of 21 years of age and under) are more ethical comparing to students enrolled with under 40 ages, however, the results of Sikula and Costa's study (1994), shows that younger students (under 21 age) are more ethical than older students.

Education at the university also influences ethics perception of the students. Some studies also supported these results. Nagpal and Das (2013) stated in their study, students' ethics perceptions are related to the faculty members' behaviors to shape their ethical behaviors. Additionally, college students believe that they are living in an ethical campus environment where their faculty members are mostly ethical in nature and that it is never too late to learn about ethics. Adding to this study also Shurdenet. al. (2010) claimed that students' perception of ethics has been changing over time and is also positively influenced by ethics education.

### **Methodology and Hypothesis**

The data was gathered from students who were attending the summer school lectures in a foundation university in Mersin region, Turkey. Through the date of 20-31 July 2015 questionnaires were collected. This study's questionnaire was structured based on the previous studies' questionnaires including Ludlum, et al, (2013) Deshpande et, al. (2006), and Alayoğlu et al, (2012). The university which was chosen to be the research ground has approximately 5000 students and established 1997, have three different faculties (Fine & Art, Law, Economics and Administrative Sciences) and one higher vocational school. For academic year 2014-2015 796 students registered for summer school. Convenience sampling method was used to conduct the surveys. 330 questionnaires were spread out and 300 of them turned back and 275 of them were found sufficient to be analyzed. Students were asked to complete the questionnaire during class time voluntarily. The questionnaire form have totally 6 questions related to their demographics (gender, age, department, school years, business ethics lessons and internship) and 20 ethical behavior items based on 4 point scale (1 = Very Unethical 2 Unethical 3 = Ethical 4 Very Ethical). To analyze the data, factor analysis, descriptive analysis (means, frequencies, percentages) and reliability analysis Anova and-tests were implemented with SPSS programs. Hypotheses are structured based on the previous studies and shown below:

**H1:** Students' perceptions of business ethic about business life show differences according to the students' departments.

**H2:** Students' perceptions of personal ethic about business life show differences according to the students' departments.

**H3:** Students' perceptions of materiality ethic about business life show differences according to the students' departments.

**H4:** Students' perceptions of business ethic about business life show differences according to the students' years at the school.

**H5:** Students' perceptions of personal ethic about business life show differences according to the students' years at the school.

**H6:** Students' perceptions of materiality ethic about business life show differences according to the students' years at the school.

**H7:** Students' perceptions of business ethic about business life show differences according to the students' internship situation.

**H8:** Students' perceptions of personal ethic about business life shows differences according to the students' internship situation.

**H9:** Students' perceptions of materiality ethic about business life shows differences according to the students' internship situation.

**H10:** Students' perceptions of business ethic about business life shows differences according to take business ethic lesson.

**H11:** Students' perceptions of personal ethic about business life shows differences according to take business ethic lesson.

**H12:** Students' perceptions of materiality ethic about business life shows differences according to take business ethic lesson.

## Findings

The results of the study are shown on the following tables below. Table 1 figured out the results of the demographic characteristics and profile of the participants, and Table 2 indicates the reliability scores. 20 variables were classified by factor analysis and shown in table 3. The following tables (from Table 4 to 7) indicated the results of the relations through the factors with departments and school years, internship and business ethics lectures.

**Table 1 The Demographic Characteristics and profile of the Participants**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
Female	135	49,1	International Finance	66	24,0
Male	140	50,9	Law	50	18,2
Total	275	100	Int. Management	57	20,7
<b>Age</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>	Int. Trade And Logistics	41	14,9
18-20	65	23,6	Tourism	11	4,0
21-23	164	59,6	International Relationship	23	8,4
24-26	37	13,5	Higher Vocational School	14	5,1
27 and More	9	3,3	Total	262	95,3
Total	275	100	Missing Value	13	4,7
<b>School Years</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>	Total	275	100
1	80	29,1	<b>Business Ethics Lectures</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
2	60	21,8	Yes	67	24,4
3	60	21,8	No	208	75,6
4	41	14,9			

5	14	5,1	Total	275	100
6	4	1,5	<b>Internship</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
7	5	1,8	Yes	77	28
Total	264	96,0	No	198	72
Missing Value	11	4,0	Total	275	100
Total	275	100,0			

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the sample, approximately 50,9 % of the students are male; more than the half of them ( 59,6 %) are at the age interval of 21 and 23. The sampling students are in Preparatory school , 29,1%; in both sophomore and freshmen classes have the same percentage as 21,8% and in the junior classes 14,9% and the remaining part represents the students in the sample who have in senior classes and also repeat classes. As it seen on the Table 1, 24 % of the students were enrolled in the Department of international finance, and secondly, international management (20, 2 %) and thirdly law department (18, 2%) students were enrolled for the summer term. Students (75,6 %) claimed that they have not gotten any lectures related to ethics and 72 % of them have not been trained at any companies before.

**Table 2 Reliability of the Items on the Scale**

Statements	Alfa
For The First Half of The Scale	,781
For The Second Half of The Scale	,780
For All Scale	,865

Analyzing the reliability of the scale in the study, reliability analysis was done for both full of the items first. Then the scale was divided into two parts and each part's reliabilities were calculated. Results showed that in Table 2. The scale was used in this study is highly reliable.

**Table 3 the Results of Factor Analysis**

	Communalities	Component	Eigenvalues	E. Variance	Mean	C. Alpha
<b>1. Business Ethics About Business Life (4 statements)</b>			<b>2,712</b>	<b>20,862</b>	<b>1,40</b>	<b>,815</b>
5. Divulging confidential information	,643	,774				
10. Falsifying time/quality/quantity reports	,685	,763				
8. Passing blame for your errors to an innocent co-worker	,579	,707				
9. Claiming credit for someone else's work	,655	,703				
<b>2. Personal Ethics About Business Life (6 statements)</b>			<b>2,584</b>	<b>19,877</b>	<b>1,91</b>	<b>,749</b>
13. Falling asleep at work	,576	,728				
15. Pilfering (taking) organization materials and	,472	,654				

supplies						
12. Call in sick to take a day off work	,463	,636				
14. Authorizing a subordinate to violate organization rules	,408	,612				
6. Doing personal business on organization time	,484	,540				
20. Not reporting others' violations of organization policies and rules	,484	,523				
<b>3.Materiality Ethics About Business Life (3 statements)</b>			<b>1,868</b>	<b>14,367</b>	<b>1,95</b>	<b>,649</b>
3. Giving gifts/favors in exchange for preferential treatment.	,682	,789				
17. Accepting gifts/favors in exchange for preferential treatment	,569	,699				
2. Padding (increasing) an expense account up more than 10%	,464	,508				

This data's sampling adequacy was efficient for factor analysis based on the results of Kaiser- Meyer Olkin (KMO) sampling adequacy and Barlett Sphericity tests. KMO value was equal to 0,864 which provided an efficient sampling adequacy and the efficient results of Barlett Sphericity tests indicated the calculated Chi-square value ( $\chi^2=1077,962$ ;  $p=0,000$ ) and it suggests that the variables are appropriate for factor analysis. Variables are analyzed and classified in terms of the reliability scores (If the item deleted or not how the alpha score changes), relevant correlations with the scale, being overlapped, number of variables which are expressing under the same factor (s), under equal root values. The statement of first, fourth, eleven and nineteen were overlapped; seventh, sixth and eighteenth of the variables were expressing under the same factors. For that reasons, these items were omitted from the scale. Finally 13 of the statements were accepted under three factors. These factors explained 55,1% of the total variances. According to Scherer (1988), variance explanations between 40 and 60 % are accepted as an ideal proportion for social science factor analysis.

**Table 4 Factors and Their Relations to Students' Departments**

Factors	Symbol	Depts.	n	Mean	Std. Dev.	F Val.	P Val.	Diff.
<b>Business Ethics About Business Life</b>	A	Int. Finance	65	1,38	,526 69	3,734	<b>0,006</b>	D>E E>A A>B B>C
	B	Law	50	1,34	,465 36			
	C	Int. Management	57	1,25	,337 28			
	D	Int. Trade And Logistics	40	1,67	,716 56			



	E	Others (Psychology, et al)	48	1,42	,642 38			
<b>Personal Ethics About Business Life</b>	A	Int. Finance	66	1,81	,561 22	1,412	,230	None
	B	Law	50	2,02	,576 72			
	C	Int. Management	57	1,83	,499 97			
	D	Int. Trade And Logistics	41	1,96	,669 28			
	E	Psychology and others	66	1,81	,561 22			
<b>Materiality Ethics About Business Life</b>	A	Int. Finance	65	1,81	,6921 4	2,091	,082	None
	B	Law	49	2,01	,7483 3			
	C	Int. Management	56	1,87	,6148 4			
	D	Int. Trade And Logistics	41	2,10	,7973 5			
	E	Others	48	2,13	,7429 4			

According to the results are shown in Table 4, the first factor has only a significant difference based on the departments of the students. The students enrolled in international management have more ethical perceptions on business related ethical values. The lowest ethical perceptions are belonging to international trade and logistics department's students. Thereby, H1 hypothesis is accepted however H2 and H3 hypothesis are rejected.

**Table 5 Factors and their relations to Students' school years.**

Factors	Symbol	School Years	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	P Value	Difference
<b>Business Ethics About Business Life</b>	A	1	79	1,32	,41245	2,108	,100	None
	B	2	60	1,55	,72311			
	C	3	60	1,39	,50708			
	D	4 and above	63	1,36	,53290			
<b>Personal Ethics About Business Life</b>	A	1	80	1,77	,49808	3,060	<b>,029</b>	D>C C>B B>A
	B	2	59	1,91	,63830			
	C	3	60	1,92	,54924			
	D	4 and above	64	2,06	,58465			
<b>Materiality Ethics About Business Life</b>	A	1	79	1,78	,71390	2,013	<b>,035</b>	B>C C>D D>A
	B	2	59	2,11	,70197			
	C	3	59	2,04	,71507			
	D	4 and	64	2,00	,72373			

		above					
--	--	-------	--	--	--	--	--

Table 5 shows the results of the years students spent in the university and their business ethics perceptions through identified factors. As it seen in the table, there is a significant difference between their school years and personal ethics and school years and materiality ethics. Therefore it is seen that there is a significant difference between years spend in school with students' perceptions about ethical personality and financial issues. For both subjects the students that are in the first year at the school have more ethical perceptions comparing to the remaining years. In terms of personal ethics about business life the students who spend four and more years in the campus, have significant differences and adversely with the respect to materiality ethics about business life factor and students who spend two years at the campus have less ethical perceptions. Therefore, H5 and H6 accepted and H4 is rejected.

**Table 6 Relations of Students' Internship and Three Ethical Factors**

Factors	Internship	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t Value	p Value
<b>Business Ethic About Business Life</b>	Yes	76	1,38	,54387	-,427	,670
	No	196	1,41	,56114		
<b>Personal Ethic About Business Life</b>	Yes	75	1,89	,56794	-,357	,722
	No	198	1,92	,57089		
<b>Materiality Ethic About Business Life</b>	Yes	76	1,91	,66472	-,587	,560
	No	195	1,97	,74363		

In Table 6, as the results indicates that, No differences were found between the relations of students' Internship and three ethical factors. Hence, H7, H8 and H9 hypothesis are rejected.

**Table 7 Relations of Students' Business Ethics Lectures and Three Ethical Factors**

Factors	Business Ethics Lesson	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t Value	p Value
<b>Business Ethic About Business Life</b>	Yes	64	1,4766	,70107	1,150	,252
	No	207	1,3853	,50224		
<b>Personal Ethic About Business Life</b>	Yes	65	1,8795	,64785	-,553	,581
	No	207	1,9243	,54334		
<b>Materiality Ethic About Business Life</b>	Yes	64	1,9115	,76346	-,496	,621
	No	206	1,9628	,71090		

Table 7 shows that, three factors have no significant relations with students' enrolling into the business ethics lectures. Therefore, H10, H11 and H12 hypothesis are rejected.

## Conclusion

Briefly, 275 students responded to the survey. Approximately 51% of the students are male, and 60% of them are between the age interval of 21 and 23, 29% of them in their first year students. Students Enrolled in six different departments for summer term as stated before,

24% of them from International Finance; 21% International Management, 18% Law department and 15% International Trade and Logistics department. Nearly, 25% of them have business ethics lecture and 28% of them have the experience of Internship. In the sampling university there are three faculties and ethics issues are discussed. As mentioned earlier, it is difficult to find academicians who study ethics or ethics related issues in general. At the university where this study carried out, the ethics lectures has been added to the curriculum last two years after hiring a full time professor who does research regarding ethics. Business Ethics course is a compulsory course for fourth year Business students. For Law School and School of Psychology the courses related to ethics taught first year and fourth year of the studies. Factor analysis was implemented to 20 items in the list. However, the number of items in factor analysis decreased to 13 from 20. The reason for this is, certain items were affecting the reliability level negatively and some items were overlapping on others. The remaining 13 items were classified under three factors entitled with business ethics, personal ethics and materiality ethics. The results showed that students' departments have significant differences with business ethics factor also study period of the students have significant differences with personal and materiality ethics. Although ethical crisis influence all disciplines, given that many scandals have involved financial impropriety, finance faculty have been at the center of the debate about whether ethics should be integrated into the curriculum (Cagle, et al., 2010). This study indicates that finance students show lower sensitivity level to ethical issues. The results are shown similarities except gender differences through the literature. No differences were found in terms of ethical sensitivity levels between genders for this study.

Business schools and other higher education institutions have been under that they don't play an active role in shaping the leaders of the future therefore it is imperative for educators to incorporate ethical decision-making into their curricula to broaden their perspectives with tools or strategies (Robert and Roper, 2015). Developing ethical perspectives of students will influence their both social and workplace relations. Through this fact, ethics education lectures and methods have impulsive action for shaping attitudes and perspectives of the individuals. When in doubt, each member of the society is expected to behave in the way in which she or he would hope that all others would behave as stated in the Golden Rule (Pittela and Rotstein, 2015). Professors of ethics considering introducing ethical discussions into their course material, it should be encouraging to know that discussing ethics cases in class can improve students' impressions of the ethical standards of the typical businessperson (Cagle, et al., 2010) At the same time, business scandals from Enron and WorldCom to Martha Stewart focused the media spotlight on business schools, demanding that graduates be sent to the workplace with knowledge of and sensitivity for the impact their business decisions have on their stakeholders and a more socially oriented approach to managing ethically (Robert and Roper, 2015).

This study highlights the importance of having ethics related topics and courses in the curriculum. Today's working environment and universities preferably focus on shaping the perspectives and attitudes of their workers and students.

## **Limitations**

In every study has, this study has similar limitations. Firstly the data was gathered from the perceptions of one university students in Turkey therefore it would not be possible to generalize the results for Turkey and the rest of the world. By reason of limited time, the sampling was occurred from a foundation university's enrolled students of summer term. For

the reason the sampling covering just the students enrolled to summer term, the students that have business ethics lectures could not be specified, well. If the further research is enlarged with the formal terms (fall and spring) and after teaching these courses, results will be verified.

### **Further Research**

In the further research, the sampling size would be larger to increase the reliability and validity of the studies. Data would be gathered from different universities' different departments and compare cultural differences based on Hofstede's or other related perspectives with other countries. In the literacy some studies related to this issue accomplished with two perspectives as also the employers and current employees' perspectives can be searched.

### **Managerial Implications**

Based on this and related results, managers and companies can benefit a lot and develop their strategies on providing ethical climate at their teams more effectively. Y generations attitudes and preferences varies compare to the previous generations. Therefore establishing ethical climate at the workplace becomes a bit difficult. Since the beginning of the century, companies are carrying out lots of solutions to increase Y generation workers commitment to their companies. Dependently, their ethical dilemmas are changed. Understanding their perspectives would help them to write up manager's leading strategies in a positive way.

### **Bibliography**

2. Akram, M., & Azad, M. K. K. (2011). Attitude towards business ethics: Comparison of public and private organizations in Pakistan. *International Journal of Economics and Management Sciences*, 13, 73-77.
3. Alayoğlu, N., Öztürk, A. O., Babacan, M. (2012). Perceptions of college students and attitudes of private and public employees towards business ethics. *Turkish Journal of Business Ethics*, 5(9), (2012, May). 27-35.
4. Ashforth, B. E., Gioia, D. A., Robinson, S. L., & Trevino, L. K. I. (2008). Re-viewing organizational corruption. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 670–684ç
5. Brown T.A., Sautter, J.A., Littvay, L., Sautter A.C., Bearnes, B. (2010). Ethics and Personality: Empathy and Narcissism as Moderators of Ethical Decision Making in Business Students, *Journal of Education for Business*, 85:4, 203-208, DOI: 10.1080/08832320903449501
6. Cagle J.A.B., Glasgo, P.W., Holmes, V.M. (2008). Using Ethics Vignettes in Introductory Finance Classes: Impact on Ethical Perceptions of Undergraduate Business Students, *Journal of Education for Business*, 84:2, 76-83, DOI: 10.3200/JOEB.84.2.76-83
7. Deniz, R., İpbüker, C., Göksel, Ç. (2005). Mühendislik Etiği Dersleri Neden Zorunlu Olarak Okutulmalıdır?, TMMOB Haritave Kadastro Mühendisleri Odası 10. Türkiye Harita Bilimsel ve Teknik Kurultayı 28 Mart - 1 Nisan 2005, Ankara.
8. Deshpande, S.P., Joseph, J., Prasad, R., (2006). Factors Impacting Ethical Behavior in Hospitals *Journal of Business Ethics* 69:207–216 Springer 2006 DOI 10.1007/s10551-006-9086-5

9. Freeman, R.E.(2009). Teaching business ethics in the age of Madoff“, *Change* 41.6, 37-42.
10. Laczniak, G. R., & Murphy, P. E. (1993). *Ethical marketing decisions: The higher road*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Inc.
11. Lampe, M., Engleman-Lampe, C. (2012). Mindfulness-Based Business Ethics Education *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, Volume 16, Number 3, 2012
12. Lau, L. K., Caracciolo, B., Roddenberry, S., & Scroggins, A. (2012). College students' perception of ethics. *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics*, 5, 1-13.
13. Ludlum, M.P. and S. Moskaloinov (2004). Right and Wrong and Cultural Diversity: Replication of the 2002 NAS/Zogby Poll on Business Ethics“, *Journal of Education for Business*, 79(5), 294-298.
14. Ludlum ,L., Moskalionov,S., Ramachandran, V. (2013). Examining Ethical Behaviors by Business Students, *American International Journal of Contemporary Research* Vol. 3 No. 3; March 2013
15. Malloy, D.C., (2003). Understanding the Nature of Ethics, Values, and Purposes of Business, Health Care and Law: Implications and Applications for Community Sport, the Sport We Want, 59-79 <http://www.cces.ca/files/pdfs/CCES-PAPER-Malloy-E.pdf>, Accessed date: 01,09,2015.
16. Murphy P.E., (2009). Ethical Marketing in American and European Companies Patrick E. Murphy, *International Marketing Trends Congress*, URL: <http://www.marketing-trends congress.com/archives/2009/Materiali/Paper/Fr/Murphy.Pdf>. Accessed date: 01 September, 2015.
17. Nagpal, S. &Das, S.G. (2013). Understanding Ethics: A Study on Perception of Management Students. *Biz & Bytes - A Quarterly Journal of Management & Technology*. 4(2),1-8.
18. Pardini, D.J., Silva Costa,Y.,R. Ferri, I.V.M., (2014). Corrupt Behaviors in the Finance Sector: Theory, Typology and Control Mechanisms at Brazilian Banks,38. *Enanpad* 13-17 September, 2014, Rio De Janeiro, [http://www.anpad.org.br/admin/pdf/2014\\_EnANPAD\\_FIN1512.pdf](http://www.anpad.org.br/admin/pdf/2014_EnANPAD_FIN1512.pdf). Accessed date: 03,09,2015
19. Pittela,R., Totstein,P., (2015). Creating an ethical classroom, [www.teaching.monster.com/benefits/articles/3522-creating-an-ethical-classroom](http://www.teaching.monster.com/benefits/articles/3522-creating-an-ethical-classroom), Accessed date: 3,09,2015.
20. Reiss, M.C., and K. Mitra(1998). The effects of individual difference factors on the acceptability of ethical and unethical workplace behaviors“, *Journal of Business Ethics* 17, 1581-1593.
21. Roberts, C., & Roper, C. D. (2015). Ethics for Students Means Knowing and Experiencing: Multiple Theories, Multiple Frameworks, Multiple Methods in Multiple Courses. In D. Palmer (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Business Ethics and Corporate Responsibilities* (pp. 153-178). Hershey, PA: Business Science Reference. doi:10.4018/978-1-4666-7476-9.ch008.
22. Ruegger,D., King, E.W., (1992). A Study of the Effect of Age and Gender upon Student Business Ethics, *Journal of Business Ethics* ,Vol. 11, No. 3 (Mar., 1992), pp. 179-186
23. Scherer, R. F. (1988). Dimensionality of Coping: Factor Stability Using the Ways Of Coping Questionnaire”, *Psychological Report*, 62, 76-77
24. Shurden, S., Santandreu, J.&Shurden, M. (2010). How Student Perceptions of Ethics Can Lead to Future Business Behavior. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, 13(1), 117-127

25. Sigurjonsson,T.,O., Arnardottir, A.A, Vaiman, V., Rikhardsson,A., (2015). Managers' Views on Ethics Education in Business Schools: An Empirical Study, J Bus Ethics (2015). 130:1–13. DOI 10.1007/s10551-014-2202-z
26. Sikula A Sr, Costa AD., (1994), Are age and ethics related?, Journal of Psychologyi November 128 (6) 659-665.
27. Ural,T. (2003). İşletmevePazarlamaEtigi, DetayYayincılık, Şubat 2003.
28. Yazıcı, S.,Sınıksaran.,E., (2012).Working Life Matters: on the Comparison of The Attitudes of Students and Employees Towards Business Ethics, İ.Ü. SiyasalBilgilerFakültesiDergisi No:46. (Mart 2012). ss.61-74.
29. Wayne, L. (2009). A promise to be ethical in an era of immorality. New York Times. Link: [http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/30/business/30oath.html?\\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/30/business/30oath.html?_r=1), Accessed date: 03,09,2015.