THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN BRIBERY AND UNETHICAL ACTIONS: AN ASIAN PERSPECTIVE

Richard A. Bernardi
(Corresponding Author)
Professor of Accounting, Gabelli School of Business, Roger Williams University

Ikki Hayashi
Gabelli School of Business, Roger Williams University

Abstract*: This study examines the association between a willingness to bribe a police officer to avoid being issued a speeding ticket with their views on inappropriate behavior of corporate executives. Our sample of 401 participants comes from Hong Kong (90), Japan (51), Nepal (23), and United States (237). We controlled for social desirability response bias in the responses of our participants. Our analyses indicate that, in all four dilemmas, the most significant variable was the belief about how ethical it was to pay a bribe to avoid a traffic ticket. Our data indicate significant differences between the views of the participants from Japan and Nepal compared to the views of the participants from the United States. Finally, social desirability response bias was a factor for two of the four questions.*

Keywords: *Bribery, Unethical Actions, Asian Perspective*

INTRODUCTION

Ethical decisions in business are strongly influenced by culture and environment (i.e., what may be culturally acceptable can be unethical in the other countries). For example, in the United States, people exchange gifts during Christmas. On the other hand, people in Asian countries tend to exchange gifts as a way of building their relationships and traditions. However, Asian gift giving traditions could be viewed as bribery during business transactions because "*the boundary between bribery and gift-giving is sometimes unclear*" in China (Fathom, 2002, p. 1). Bribery has been a central issue in many of the scandals in Japan and is "*deeply rooted in the Japanese way of doing business*" (Taka 1997, p. 1502). However, Steidlmeier (1999, p. 126) believes that bribery and gift giving are complex issues in Japan:

> *Bribery itself emerges as an extremely complex. . . . it is clearly wrong. However, . . . to say that bribery is wrong is to utter a tautology. That is, bribery (huilu) defines a wrongful type of action.*

Lambsdorff (2002) indicates that Japan, China and India have higher bribe payers indices than the United States.[1] It may be that the unclear boundaries between gift giving and bribery may influence the higher corruption rate compared to the US. Roberts (2004, p.1) suggests that, "[s]*ome multi-national companies and some governments have very strict policies regarding their employees accepting gifts.*" Even though gift giving seems to be inescapable part of business in Asian countries, many global companies have limited the acceptance of gifts from

people in other countries during business transactions. Gordon and Miyake (2001) indicate that bribery and corruption are recognized as major impediments to development in developing countries. Our research furthers the study of Baack et al.'s (2000) suggestion that accepting small ethical deviations affects attitudes towards larger ethical problems. Specifically, we examine whether a person's propensity to offer a police officer a bribe to avoid a speeding ticket associates with their attitudes concerning the ethical dilemmas in Bernardi and Vassill's (2004) study. Unlike Bernardi and Vassill's sample, only two of the four countries in our sample are members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD 2004) – Japan and the United States.[1]

LITRATURE REVIEW
Defining Bribery
A bribe can be defined as "something (as money or a favor) given or promised to a person to influence conduct" (Webster, 1995, p. 63). In the case of bribing a public official (i.e., bribing a police officer to avoid a speeding ticket), the acceptance of a bribe suggests a contract between the person offering the bribe and the public official for a favorable outcome (i.e., no speeding ticket) (Turow, 1985). This favorable outcome results in *"an unfair advantage to those paying the bribe"* (Pacini, et al., 2002, p. 3) as it suggests that individuals who are financially well off can avoid being penalized for their improper actions.

Additionally, avoiding penalties for improper action(s) (i.e., accepting small ethical deviations) can lead to accepting larger ethical deviations (Baack et al., 2000). For example, Bernardi and Vassill (2004) found that, for a sample from Canada, Ireland, Spain, and the United States, a person's propensity to offer a police officer a bribe to avoid a speeding ticket associates with their attitudes concerning the ethical dilemmas in the corporate environment. Similarly, Lawson (2004) and Sims (1993) maintain that cheating in a college setting results in dishonest behavior in a corporate environment.

Transparency International's (TI) Bribe Payers Index (BPI, 2011) provides a useful measure of the propensity for bribery in a country; however, TI's BPI does not include Nepal. Consequently, we used TI's Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI, 2011) to estimate Nepal's BPI with a regression model of the 28 countries in both TI's BPI and CPI. The results of this regression indicates that these indices are positively associated (adjusted R^2 of 0.681, p < 0.0000). Using the model from this regression, Nepal's projected BPI would be 3.1.[2] The BPIs for the four countries in this study are: Japan at 1.4, United States at 1.9, Hong Kong at 2.4, and Nepal at 3.1. This literature suggests our first research hypothesis (alternate form):

H1: *When compared to the attitudes of students from the United States about bribing a police officer to avoid a speeding ticket, students from Hong Kong and Nepal (Japan) will be more likely to indicate that bribery is acceptable (unacceptable).*

Gift Giving
Wong and Beckman (1992) note that bribery is an accepted and sometimes expected business practice in many developing countries. Pacini et al. (2002, p. 2) note that *"in some cultures,*

bribes are an ordinary and necessary cost of doing business". Millet (2004) suggests that countries (or cultures) could be classified countries by the extent gifts enter into business relationships. For instance, Asians seem to expect more than in European countries (Worldroom, 2004). While offering presents is offensive in Germany, exchanging gifts is not part of the custom in Belgium and the UK (Worldroom). This indicates that Asian countries have high expectations of gift giving and it may be related to their relationships with others. Many Asian countries give gifts to show the respect for others, to trace traditions, and to have harmony.

Steidlmeier (1999) maintains that reciprocity governs social interactions in China. Considering their society's view on morality of reciprocity, Chinese are expected to exchange gifts during business transactions. Roberts (2004, p.2) indicates that individuals from Indonesia, Japan and Korea also expect the exchange of gifts in the normal course of business negotiations. She suggests that gift is essentially expected in all Asian countries. In a study on gift giving in Asia, Japan ranked first, China seventh, and Hong Kong ninth (James, 2004, p.1), which indicates their belief in gift giving in promoting personal relationships in business.

Because Asian countries consider gift giving as a way of building personal relationships, one needs to be aware of the gift giving customs in Asia (Black, 2004, p. 2). Indeed, there is a ritual played out during the exchange of gifts in Asian countries. For instance, in Japan and China, people use both hands when they are accepting gifts and never open the gifts in front of person who gave them the gift. Following the proper formalities is important when accepting gifts as gift giving is a way of showing respect in Asian societies such as China and Japan (Fathom, 2002).

In Japan, it is common to give gifts the business during the two gift giving seasons each year (Roberts, 2004, p. 4) - Ochugen (Oseibo) in mid-summer (at the end of the year). At these times, gifts are often given by workers and managers throughout the company. In Asian countries, people admire the virtue of modesty; so that, receivers routinely refuse gifts. In Chinese culture, refusing gifts three times is a tacit understanding:

> *In order not appear greedy, a gift will not be immediately taken, but refused three times before finally being accepted. Each time it's refused, you as the giver must graciously continue to offer the gift. And once it's taken, tell the person you're happy it's been accepted.* (Roberts, 2004, p. 3)

By refusing gifts, a giver must understand a receiver is just trying not to be rude. Also, a giver has to act as if he or she forces a receiver to accept a gift by offering a gift continuously; otherwise, a receiver does not look like greedy. Giving gifts cements the necessary relationships on which business dealings exist. Roberts (2004, p. 6) indicates that people are also offended by certain gifts because of their religious reasons in the Hindu and Indian cultures. A gift is not always to be an article; in Asian countries entertainment is a form of gift giving. For instance, Settai involves taking a customer or supervisor for a drink, dinner and golf is "*in fact, the oil of life in Japan . . .* [to an extent] *more so in the world of business than anywhere else*" (De Mente,

2004, p. 2). A crucial point is that Japanese view these entertainment outings as a gift because this type of gift is not a concrete object and thus not considered a bribe.

Gift Giving and Bribery
According to Legal Definitions (2007), bribery can be defined as "the improper acceptance by a public official, juror, or someone bound by a duty to act impartially." Bribery leads to slow economic growth, unfair competitions and destroying trust (OECD, 2004). The Indian Prime Minister described bribes as a 'convenience tax' indicating that this description is a commonly held belief (Haviland, 2003, p. 2). In many Asian countries, they consider bribery as a part of their expected expense. Also, they seem to see bribery is one of their cultures. People in Asian countries have deferent mind set compared to the US or Asian people do not considerer the certain things as bribery because of culture differences. Taka (1997) indicates that Japanese do not consider business ethics as an important subject because of differences in cultural or social business background and also he believes that business ethics published in Japan is translated wrongly and confusing. The definition of bribery might confuse Asian people because of their cultural and language differences, and that might not confuse Asian gift giving is not bribery.

Steidlmeier (1999) believes that Asian customs tend to make it difficult to distinguish between gift giving and bribery; moreover (p. 6):

> To label it "bribery" is already to make a moral judgment. For in ordinary English (or Chinese) the word bribery itself (huilu) connotes a wrongful transfer of resources between parties.

Many believe that bribery is unethically acceptable, which is universal idea. By using gift giving instead of bribery, "Gift Giving" sounds acceptable for many Asian people because the word, "Gift giving", has only positive connotations among Asian people. For Asian people, gift giving only brings respect, caring, and harmony for others. However, Pedigo and Marshall (2009) report that their sample believed that gift giving while negotiating business or trade transactions was a substantial ethical dilemma. The dilemma arose in determining whether the gift or exchange of gifts was aimed at influencing business transactions or part of a cultural setting not associated with business. Overall, their sample believed that gift giving was a violation of personal ethics in a business setting resulting from trying to gain an advantage.

Transparency International's (TI) Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI, 2011) provides a useful measure of corrupt business practices within a country. The CPIs for the four countries in this study are: Hong Kong at 1.6, Japan at 2.0, United States at 2.9, and Nepal at 7.8. This literature suggests our next two research hypotheses (alternate form):

H2: *When compared to the attitudes of students from the United States, attitudes on corporate dilemmas will be more permissive (i.e., not a problem) for students from Nepal and less permissive for students from Hong Kong and Japan.*

H3: *Attitudes on bribery a police officer to avoid a speeding ticket will associate with attitudes towards other corporate ethical dilemmas.*

METHODOLOGY
Subjects
Our sample included the responses 401 business students (84 men and 80 women) from Hong Kong (90), Japan (51), Nepal (23) and the United States (237), which are shown in Table 1. Our research instrument consisted of five questions, the Impression Management questionnaire (Paulus 1988), and a short background data questionnaire. The instrument was intentionally kept short so that the probability of students randomly responding to the questionnaire was minimized. We also included a background questionnaire that asked the participants to provide their home country, gender, and major. The surveys were given to the contact person who was usually a professor teaching at a university in the country. The contact person distributed the surveys to business students and returned the completed surveys

TABLE 1
Attitudes On Bribery, SDRB and Sample Size

Country	Attitude	IMS	(N)
Hong Kong	1.3	5.8	90
Japan	1.5	6.0	51
Nepal	2.3	6.4	23
United States	2.7	4.6	237

Attitude	Attitude about bribing a police officer.
SDRB	The Impression Management Subscale score (Paulhus, 1991)

Variables
We used four questions from Duizend and McCann's (1998) research on corruption (see Appendix A) as our dependent variables. Our short questionnaire also included a question dealing with an individual's beliefs about offering a police officer a bribe to avoid a speeding ticket; this question was taken from Stevens et al. (1993). The dollar amounts in the question concerning bribing the board of directors from Duizend and McCann and bribing a police officer from Stevens et al. were converted into the local currencies of the countries in our study. While the students for the sample from Hong Kong spoke English, the surveys for the samples from Japan and Nepal had to be translated into their languages. We initially had an exchange student at our university from each country translate the survey into that country's language. Once this was complete, the surveys were then back-translated by a second exchange student back into English to ensure the first translation was correct. Students were used as their version of the language's intricacies would be more current for our targeted samples of students.

As we are extending the work of Bernardi and Vassill (2004), we used the sample from the United States as the control group and the three other countries as treatment variables (i.e., three indicator variables for Hong Kong, Japan and Nepal). We also controlled for gender (an indicator variable) and social desirability response bias. We used the Impression Management Subscale (IMS) of Paulhus' (1991) Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Appendix B). IMS has 20 statements; individuals are asked to respond to each statement using a seven-point Likert scale. Even number questions are reverse coded from the odd numbered questions on the IMS; for example, the first two statements are:

1. *Sometimes I tell lies if I have to.*
2. *I never cover up our mistakes.*

An individual responding in a highly socially desirable manner to the first second statement would likely choose either a one or a two on the Likert scale (i.e., the 'Not True' area) because telling a lie is not socially desirable. Similarly, an individual responding in a highly socially desirable manner to the second statement would likely choose either a six or a seven on the Likert scale (i.e., the 'Very True' area) because covering up mistakes is not socially desirable. Table 1 indicates that the average scores on the IMS are very similar, which leads one to anticipate that this variable may not be significant in the analyses.

DATA ANALYSIS

The Table 2 data indicate that the average responses to the four questions were higher for the students from the United States than for the students from Hong Kong, Japan, and Nepal. In fact, the U.S. students' average responses are higher than the average responses of the students from the other three countries.

TABLE 2
Mean Responses by Country

Country	Defective Product	Over Charge	BOD Bribe	Spouse's Vacation
Hong Kong	1.3	1.8	1.3	2.7
Japan	1.3	1.5	1.6	1.5
Nepal	1.2	1.8	2.3	2.5
United States	1.8	2.2	2.4	3.4

Defective Product	A manufacturer knowingly sells a product with a material defect that could cause injury to consumers.
Over Charge	A repair shop overstates the extent of repairs that must be done on customers' automobiles and charges them for work that was not done.

BOD Bribe	A president of a company gives each of its board members $10,000 to keep them quiet about the company performing illegal actions. (The amount in this question was denominated in the country's currency)
Spouse's Vacation	A business executive takes his/her spouse on an international trip and charges the cost of both their trips as a business expense.
Shading	Highest values, where higher (lower) values indicate that the action was more (less) acceptable.

Bribing a Police Officer

Stepwise regression was used in our modeling process so that we could determine the order that the variables went into the model and their individual contribution to that model's explanatory power (i.e., each variable's partial adjusted R^2). The data for the stepwise regression model for bribing a police officer to avoid a speeding ticket is shown in Table 3. If an individual responds to this question in a socially desirable manner, they would respond by indicating that bribing a police officer to avoid a speeding ticket was less acceptable (i.e., the coefficient should be negative). While social desirability response bias (SDRB) was a factor in the model and its sign was negative, SDRB's partial adjusted R^2 was only .007. The signs for the country variables representing Hong Kong and Nepal were negative indicating that the respondents from these two countries perceived the action as being less acceptable even after controlling for SDRB than for the students from the United States. Consequently, while our first hypothesis was supported for Japan, it was not supported for either Hong Kong or Nepal.

TABLE 3
Stepwise Regression Model for Bribing a Police Officer to Avoid a Speeding Ticket

Model	Adjusted R^2	F Factor	Significance	
Regression	0.154	25.21	0.000	
Term	Coefficient	T Stat	P-value	Partial R^2
Intercept	1.65	8.28	0.000	--
Hong Kong	-0.68	7.21	0.000	.091
Japan	-0.58	4.91	0.000	.056
SDRB	-0.05	-2.03	0.043	.007

Bribery	Participant's view on bribing a police officer.
Country	A series of indicator variables with the US set to zero.
SDRB	The Impression Management Subscale score (Paulhus, 1991)

Consumer-Issue Questions

Table 4 shows the stepwise regression models for the two consumer issues questions. The overall model has an adjusted R^2 of .315 (i.e., explained 31.5 percent of the variation). The most

powerful variable in model for selling a defective product was an individual's attitude about bribery; the partial R^2 for bribery in the defective product model was .309. Hypothesis two was partially supported; if the individual was from Nepal, they would be less likely to sell a defective product than if the individual was from the United States. The model also indicates support for hypothesis three; the more likely an individual is to bribe a police officer to avoid a speeding ticket, the less likely the individual was to indicate that selling a defective product was unacceptable. Social desirability response bias (SDRB) was not significant.

The model for overstating the costs of repairs has an adjusted R^2 of .177. Hypothesis three on bribery was supported; bribery's partial R^2 was only .177 in the model. The more likely an individual is to bribe a police officer, the less likely the individual was to indicate that overstating the costs of repairs was unacceptable. SDRB was not significant.

TABLE 4
Stepwise Regression Models for Consumer- Issue Questions

Question 1: Selling a product with a defect.

Model	Adjusted R^2	F Factor	Significance	
Regression	0.315	93.03	0.000	

Term	Coefficient	T Stat	P-value	Partial R^2
Intercept	0.48	3.74	0.000	--
Bribery	0.41	13.49	0.000	.309
Nepal	-0.24	-2.21	0.028	.006

Question 2: Overstating cost of repairs.

Model	Adjusted R^2	F Factor	Significance	
Regression	0.177	86.73	0.000	

Term	Coefficient	T Stat	P-value	Partial R^2
Intercept	1.17	10.65	0.000	--
Bribery	0.37	9.31	0.000	.177

Bribery	Participant's view on bribing a police officer.
Country	A series of indicator variables with the US set to zero.
SDRB	The Impression Management Subscale score (Paulhus, 1991)

Corporate-Issue Questions

Table 5 shows the results of the analyses for the questions involving bribing board members and the expenses of a spouse's vacation. The model for bribing a board member has an adjusted R^2 of .357. Not surprisingly, an individual's attitude about bribing a police officer (hypothesis three) was again the most powerful variable and had a partial R^2 of .347. Individuals who were more likely to bribe a police officer were also less likely the individual was to indicate that bribing a board member was unacceptable. SDRB was also significant in the model; the higher the

individual's propensity to respond in a socially desirable manner, the more likely the individual was to indicate that bribing a board member was unacceptable. There were no significant country differences in the model.

The model concerning using company funds to pay for a spouse's vacation has an adjusted R^2 of .237. The most powerful variable in the model was an individual's propensity to bribe a police officer (hypothesis three); the more likely an individual was to bribe a police officer, the less likely the individual was to indicate that paying for a spouse's vacation with company funds was unacceptable. Students from both Japan (anticipated) and Nepal (not anticipated) were more likely to indicate that the action was unacceptable than students from the United States. SDRB was also significant. The responses for the students from Japan and Nepal were lower than those of the US students (H1) in the model for the spouse's vacation.

TABLE 5
Stepwise Regression Models for Corporate-Issue Questions

Question 3: President bribes board members to keep silent**.**

Model	Adjusted R^2	F Factor	Significance	
Regression	0.357	111.94	0.000	

Term	Coefficient	T Stat	P-value	Partial R^2
Intercept	1.15	7.52	0.000	--
Bribery	0.52	14.08	0.000	.347
SDRB	-0.05	-2.69	0.007	.010

Question 4: Using company money for spouse's vacation**.**

Model	Adjusted R^2	F Factor	Significance	
Regression	0.252	98.51	0.000	

Term	Coefficient	T Stat	P-value	Partial R^2
Intercept	1.48	5.73	0.000	--
Bribery	0.46	10.13	0.000	.237
Japan	-0.66	-5.88	0.000	.059
SDRB	-0.06	-2.30	0.022	.009
Nepal	-0.32	-1.99	0.047	.005

Bribery	Participant's view on bribing a police officer.
Country	A series of indicator variables with the US set to zero.
SDRB	Social desirability response bias as measured on Paulhus' (1991) Impression Management Subscale

Additional Analyses
One should also consider the potential influence of the sample from the United States as it represents 59.1 percent of the participants in this study. To examine the potential influence, we removed the sample from the United States from our data set and reexamined our four questions concerning ethical dilemmas. The models for all four dilemmas remained essentially unchanged; however, the R^2s for the first two questions changed significantly. For the selling a defective product (overstating the cost of repairs) question, the adjusted the R^2 decreased (increased) from .315 (.177) to .192 (.362). Additionally, SDRB was not a factor in any of the four models.

RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS
Given a growing dilemma of academic dishonesty in college (Sims, 1993) and the association between cheating in college and workplace dishonesty (Lawson, 2004; Sims, 1993), we believe our research helps to highlight the problem experienced managers confront when communicating their corporate codes of ethics to newly-hired college graduates. Additionally, research by Bernardi et al. (2011, 2012, 2013) indicate that students who had cheated were less likely to whistle-blow in a classroom setting; consequently, Lawson (2004 and Sims (1993) findings suggest these students would also be less likely to whistle-blow in a corporate setting.

The results of our research dealing with students' attitudes concerning corporate dishonesty along with those of Delaney and Sockell (1992) and Weeks and Nantel (1992) relating training on ethics codes positively affecting behavior, and those of Gordon and Miyake (2001) on the current status of implementation strategies for codes of ethics suggest several potential areas for improving corporate ethics training. Gordon and Miyake note that only about 20 percent of corporate codes of ethics reference punitive actions or require reporting findings the board of directors. These seem to be relatively simple implementation measures especially in light of the increased responsibility of boards as a result of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (U.S. Congress, 2002). While about 12 percent of the firms mention training on the unethical nature of bribery, only nine percent require employees to sign that they understand the company's ethics code – again a relatively easy measures to implement. Prior research shows that these issues improve employee compliance with ethics codes. They are also part of the best business practices recommended Transparency International (2003): board of directors' overview, signing to acknowledge code requirements, training on code and the penalties for not following the code.

CONCLUSIONS
The purpose of our research was to extend the work of Duizend and McCann's (1998) and Bernardi and Vassill (2004) to three countries in a different area of the world. Our results are similar to those of Bernardi and Vassill that provide strong evidence of the explanatory power of the bribery variable, which was the most powerful variable in all four models. The data in our research also suggest that firms (societies) need to educate their employees (citizens) about the also indicates that firms and societies should continue their struggle to lower the incidence of bribery. While attempting to bribe a police officer to avoid a speeding ticket might be perceived as a relative minor ethical deviation, our findings provide evidence of the potential consequences of accepting minor ethical deviations.

Our analysis did not support our second hypothesis that, given the data from Transparency International's Bribe Payers Index (2011), the students from the United States would be more (less) sensitive to these issues than the students from Hong Kong and Japan (Nepal). While the students from the United States were more open to the idea of bribing a police officer to avoid a ticket (Table 3), this difference was only significant for the students from Hong Kong and Japan. For the four ethical dilemmas used in the research, the differences in attitudes among countries were inconsistent.

Our research also included a Paulhus' Image Management Subscale to control for socially desirable responding. Social desirability response bias was only significant in three of the five models (e.g., bribing a police officer, bribing a board member, and the spouse's vacation dilemmas) and explained only about one percent of the variation. However, this may have been the caused by the extremely close the average scores on Paulhus' measure for the students from Hong Kong, Japan and Nepal. Future research should include a more diverse group of countries perhaps using Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimensions as a guide.

Our research has three limitations which are similar to those listed by Bernardi and Vassill (2004). The first limitation is that the sample comes from only three countries if one does not include the United States. The second limitation is that we used students as surrogates for newly-hired college graduates' attitudes. Finally, we only examined the four dilemmas; future studies should examine other ethical issues.

Endnotes
1. While Hong Kong and Nepal are not members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, they have endorsed the Asian Development Bank/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia and the Pacific (2001). The second pillar of this initiative advocates strengthening anti-bribery actions and promoting integrity in business operations.
2. We are grateful for the use of Bernardi and Vassill's (2004) data for the United States, which we use for comparison purposes.
3. TI's BPI has a range from zero to ten where zero (ten) reflects the country most (least) likely to engage in bribery, which we believe is counter intuitive. We transformed TI's values by subtracting them from ten; consequently, the country most (least) likely to engage in bribery has an index of ten (zero).

References
Asian Development Bank/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia and the Pacific: (2001). Anti-Corruption Plan for Asia and the Pacific.

Baack, D., Fogliasso, C. and Harris, J. (2000). "The personal impact of ethical decisions: A social penetration theory", *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 39-49.

Bernardi, R.A., Banzhoff, C. A., Martino, A. M., and Savasta, K. J. (2011). "Cheating and Whistle Blowing in the Classroom", *Research on Professional Responsibility and Ethics in Accounting*, Vol. 15, pp. 165-191.

Bernardi, R.A., Goetjen, E. S., and Brax, J. M. (2013). "Whistle-Blowing in the Classroom: The Influence of Students' Perceptions of Whistleblowers", *Accounting for the Public Interest: An International Perspective on Accounting to Society*, forthcoming.

Bernardi, R.A., Larkin, M. B., LaBontee, L. A., Lapierre, R. A., and Morse, N. C. (2012). "Classroom Cheating: Reasons Not to Whistle-Blow and the Probability of Whistle-Blowing", *Research on Professional Responsibility and Ethics in Accountin*g, Vol. 16, pp. 203-233.

Bernardi, R.A. and Vassill, K.M. (2004). "The Association between Bribery and Unethical Corporate Actions: An International Study", *Business Ethics: A European Review* Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 342-353.

Black, R. (1997). "Asian Etiquette", Nov. 11, http://www.worldroom.com/pages/execlifestyle/gift giving.phtml.

Delaney, J. T. and Sockell, D. (1992). "Do Company Ethics Training Programs Make a Difference? An Empirical Analysis", *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 11, No. 9, pp. 719-727.

De Mente, B.L. (2001). "Japan"s Cultural Asian Business Code Words - Partying with an Ulterior Motive", November, http://www.ampforum.com/columns/boye47.htm.

Duizend, J., and McCann, G.K. (1998). Do Collegiate Business Students Show a Propensity to Engage in Illegal Business Practices? *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 229-238.

Fathom. (2002). "Exchange, Bribery, and Gift-giving: Interview with Charles Stafford", October", http://www.globalpolicy.org/nations/corrupt/2002/0624chin.htm.

Gordon, K. and Miyake, M. (2001). "Business approaches to combating bribery: A study of codes of conduct", *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 34, No. 3/4, pp. 161-173.

Haviland, C. (2003). "Diwali Highlights Indian Bribery", October 25, http://www.news.bbc.co.uk/2hi/south_/ 3211981.stm.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, CA.

James, D. (2004). "Gift Giving Customs in Asia", November 11, http://www.bsicorplnet/960924/ giftgive.html.

Legal Definitions. (2007). *Bribery Law and Legal Definition,* http://definitions.uslegal.Com/b/ bribery.

Lambsdorff, J.G. (2002). "Making Corrupt Deals--Contracting in the Shadow of the Law", *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* Vol. 48, No. 3, pp. 221-247.

Lawson, R. A. (2004). "Is classroom cheating related to business students' propensity to cheat in the 'real world?" *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 189–199.

Millet, J. (2004). "Gift Giving Savvy: How to Avoid Blunders and Faux Pas," July 24, http://www.cultural savvy.com.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2004). "Fighting Bribery and Corruption", July 1, http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/33/1827022.pdf.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2001). ADB/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia and the Pacific: Combating Corruption in the New Millennium, http://www.oecd.org/site /adboecdanti-corruptioninitiative/anti-corruptionactionplanforasiaandthepacific.htm.

Pacini, C., Swingen, J.A and Rogers, H. (2002). "The role of the OECD and EU conventions in combating bribery of foreign public officials", *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 385-407.

Paulhus, D.L. (1991). "Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR)", Vol. 1, pp. 37-41, in J. P. Robinson, P.R. Shaver, and L.S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of Personality and Psychological Attitudes*, Academic Press, New York.

Pedigo, K.L. and Marshall, V. (2009). "Bribery: Australian Managers" Experiences and Responses when Operating in International Markets", *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 87, No. 1, pp. 59-74.

Roberts, K. (2004). "International Gift Giving for Business Worldwide", http://www.cyborlink.com/besite/ international_gift_giving.htm

US Congress. (2002). "Sarbanes-Oxley Act (HR 3763)", http://fl1.findlaw.com/news.findlaw.com/hdocs/docs/ gwbush/sarbanesoxley072302.pdf (accessed 5 March 2010).

Sims, R. (1993). "The Relationship between Academic Dishonesty and Unethical Business Practices", *Journal of Education for Business* Vol. 68, No. 4, pp. 207-211.

Steidlmeier, P. (1999). "Gift Giving, Bribery, and Corruption: Ethical Management of Business Relationships in China", *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 121-132.

Taka, I. (1997). "Business Ethics in Latin America," *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 16, No. 14, pp. 1597-1603.

Transparency International. (2012). Transparency International: "Who Are We?" http://www.trasparency. org/whoarewe.

Transparency International. (2011). "2011 Bribe Payers Index," http://bpi.transparency.org/ bpi2011/results/.

Transparency International. (2011). "2011 Corruption Perceptions Index", http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2011/ results/.

Weeks, W. A. and Nantel, J. (1992). "Corporate Codes of Ethics and Sales Force Behavior: A Case Study," *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 11, No. 10, pp. 753-360.

Wong, A., and Beckman, E. (1992). "An Applied Ethical Analysis System in Business", *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 173-178.

Worldroom. (2004). Executive Lifestyle – Tips, November 23, http://www.worldroom.com/pages/execlifestyle/ giftgiving.html.

APPENDIX A
Ethics Questionnaire

Using the scale below as a guide, write a number beside each statement to indicate how much you agree with it.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Totally Unacceptable			**No Opinion**			**Totally Acceptable**

_____ 1. A manufacturer knowingly sells a product with a material defect that could cause injury to consumers.

_____ 2. A repair shop overstates the extent of repairs that must be done on customers' automobiles and charges them for work that was not done.

_____ 3. A president of a company gives each of its board members $10,000 to keep them quiet about the company performing illegal actions.

      4.   A business executive takes his/her spouse on an international trip and charges the cost of both their trips as a business expense.

Note: Dollar amount in case three were converted into the local currency.

APPENDIX B
Paulhus' Impression Management Subscale

Using the scale below as a guide, write a number beside each statement to indicate how much you agree with it.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not True			**Somewhat true**			**Very true**

    1.   Sometimes I tell lies if I have to.
    2.   I never cover up my mistakes.
    3.   There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
    4.   I never swear.
    5.   I sometimes try to get even rather that forgive and forget.
    6.   I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
    7.   I have said something bad about a friend behind his/her back.
    8.   When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
    9.   I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.
   10.   I always declare everything at customs.
   11.   When I was young, I sometimes stole things.
   12.   I have never dropped litter on the street.
   13.   I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.
   14.   I never read sexy books or magazines.
   15.   I have done things that I don't tell other people about.
   16.   I never take things that don't belong to me.
   17.   I have taken sick leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.
   18.   I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
   19.   I have some pretty awful habits.
   20.   I don't gossip about other people's business.

E-mail: rbernardi@rwu.edu