CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter is organized consistent with the categories in Chapter 3: survey responses from respondents and non-respondents, preliminary and primary analyses for the research questions, and summary.

Survey Responses

During the time period between March 31 and April 21, 1997, 404 surveys were mailed to undergraduate students or their registrars in West Virginia state colleges and universities. Study participants returned 119 completed surveys representing five cultures. Four of the surveys were unusable as they were representative of cultures beyond the scope of the study. Three were unusable because the respondents were Japanese students who had lived their entire lives in the US. Thirty-two of the surveys were returned for lack of correct mailing addresses. The responses resulted in a total of 112 usable surveys and a response rate of 30.7% as shown in Table 9.

Among the 112 usable surveys, two were returned with missing responses. Missing data can be approached using a number of methods in research studies. One approach is for the researcher to eliminate cases that have even one missing data point. However, this approach is generally not desirable, since the strict criteria may eliminate many cases and the result
Table 9

**Total Surveys Distributed and Total Usable Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Surveys Distributed</td>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-deliverable</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned by other than US or Japanese students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-usable&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available Respondents</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-respondents</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Three Japanese students' responses were unusable because the subjects had lived in the US their entire lives.
could lead to biased estimates (Sande, 1982). In a second method for approaching missing data, the mean value of the sample responses for the missing data point can be substituted. Donner (1982) found this method to be suitably effective when compared with others for dealing with missing data, particularly when the correlations of the explanatory variables are relatively weak. Because of the acceptability of this method, the researcher used it when respondents did not answer an item. Of the 112 surveys returned in the study, two contained items with missing responses, thus, the mean was substituted on these items.

**Demographic Information for Respondents**

At 23.3 years, the mean age for US students was slightly higher than that of Japanese students at 21.9 years, as shown in Table 10. The minimum ages for Japanese and US students were the same, 18 years, while the maximum ages were 47 and 33 years, respectively. In terms of gender, 63.4% of the respondents were female. Overall, 55.4% of the students reported having deep beliefs in or practicing their own religions.

As may have been expected by their studying in the US, a higher percentage of the Japanese students had traveled more than 60 days or extensively to countries with different cultures. For the Japanese students, 48.5% (27.3% + 21.2%) were in those categories, against 21.4% (10.1 +11.3%) of US students having had the same travel experience.
### General Demographic Information for Respondents (n=112)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>US</th>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeply believe in and/or practice your own religion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 60 days (two months)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 60 days (two months)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extensively</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one to six months</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven to twelve months</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thirteen to twenty four months</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twenty five months or more</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A considerable difference appeared to exist between Japanese and US students' work experience. Only 13.9% of US respondents had no full-time work experience, but 48.5% of the Japanese students were in this category. The only category in which the two cultures were comparable was in the "one to six months" work category; in all others, US respondents had considerably more work experience.

Table 11 displays information about participants’ residential and family backgrounds. As expected, most US respondents had lived in the United States their entire lives. Five US and two Japanese respondents did not provide information about the amount of time they had lived in the US, therefore, mean scores were substituted.

Among US respondents, 69.6% were raised in rural areas, most likely reflecting West Virginia's geographic character, assuming that most students in higher education in West Virginia grew up in the state. The Japanese students reflected their own culture's densely populated living areas, with 87.9% of respondents growing up in semi-urban to urban environments.

The survey questions relating to parents' or guardians' work were offered as two items, in the likely event some participants would have more than one parent or guardian working. This appears to be the case, but the data were somewhat difficult to interpret. A simple count in the data revealed a total of 64
Table 11

Residential and Family Demographic Information for Respondents (n=112)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in US entire life?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If No to &quot;lived in US entire life,&quot; number of years lived in US</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 - 3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 - 6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 - 10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semi-rural to rural environment</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semi-urban to urban environment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/s work for a profit business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54^a</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25^b</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/s work for not-for profit business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19^a</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60^b</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Total number of responses is >100%. There are 73 combined US Yes responses, and 35 combined Japanese Yes responses, (on both questions--parents or guardians work for a profit business and parent/s work for not-for profit business) indicating that more than one parent worked for a profit business, in some instances.

^b Total number of responses is >100%. There are 85 combined US No responses, and 31 combined Japanese No responses (on both questions--parents or guardians work for a profit business and parent/s work for not-for profit business) indicating that more than one parent worked for a non-profit business, in some instances.
respondents who indicated their parents or guardians work exclusively for profit making organizations, while 15 work only for non-profit organizations. Nineteen students' parents work for neither type of organization, and 15 work for both types.

As shown in Table 12, the highest percentage of study participants from US and Japanese cultures were business majors, 26.6% and 33.3% respectively, followed by the "Other" category with 29.1% and 21.2% respectively. A slightly lower percentage of US respondents considered themselves to be excellent academic students before enrolling in college, with 72.1% (32.9% + 39.2%) of US students rating themselves as excellent or above average students before being enrolled in college, and 81.8% (27.3% + 54.5%) of the Japanese students placing themselves in those categories. The majority of students, 67.1% US and 63.6% Japanese, were at the junior or senior class levels.

**Procedures for Non-Responses**

Following data collection, the researcher tallied the number of responses from each institution and contacted the respective registrars for the last time, asking them to make available a list of the names and telephone numbers of non-respondents. At Institution 10, the researcher had gleaned the mailing list from the institution's telephone directory, so respondents and their telephone
Table 12

Academic Demographic Information for Respondents (n=112)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>US</th>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other majors</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages &amp; Literature</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman/sophomore</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior/senior</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
numbers were available for each subject. Two registrars sent the researcher the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of participants prior to data collection, therefore, the researcher handled the mailings to those subjects throughout the study and had their telephone numbers.

The names of the 285 non-responding subjects and their telephone numbers were collated and alphabetized, without regard to institution, and calls were made in an effort to contact five US and five Japanese students. Since there was a short time frame to contact non-respondents, the researcher called each number twice. The next number was used if there was no response. In several instances, the researcher left messages for non-respondents to return calls collect, but none did.

Twenty-four telephone calls were made between the dates of May 2 and 9, 1997, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., during which successful contact with two Japanese and four US students, willing to answer demographic questions from the survey, was made. Telephone calls were made to 24 additional subjects, but there were no answers. Of these calls, 7 US and 11 Japanese students had answering machines and messages were left requesting that the subjects call the researcher.

Three more Japanese and one US student were successfully contacted following 39 other telephone calls made during the week of May 5-9, 1997, between the hours of 3:00 and 8:00 p.m. There were no answers or answering
machines at the residences of 11 US and 24 Japanese students. The telephone calls were made to several West Virginia institutions during graduation week; therefore, respondents were somewhat difficult to contact.

Upon being reached by telephone, each non-respondent was presented a short synopsis of the research from a description of the study. The information was similar to that conveyed in the Informed Consent Letter. It guaranteed respondents' anonymity and emphasized the importance of the research. Uses of the data were explained, along with the need for comparing demographic data among respondents and non-respondents. Most of the non-respondents were cooperative and answered the questions. Seven of the calls reached non-respondents who did not agree to answer the questions.

Comparison of Respondents' and Non-Respondents' Answers

Comparing the general demographic characteristics of the respondents and non-respondents, the US cadre had a slightly higher age, 23.3 years, than did US non-respondents, 20.8 years, with a standard deviation of 6.8 for respondents and 1.8 for non-respondents respectively, as shown in Tables 10 and 13. Japanese respondents and non-respondents had similar mean and standard deviation scores relating to age. Travel experience for US respondents versus non-respondents was similar in both groups with percentages of 78.4% (39.2% + 39.2%) and 80% (40% + 40%), respectively, for those traveling less than 60 days or never. Japanese non-respondents appeared to have traveled more frequently than Japanese respondents.
Table 13

General Demographic Information for Non-Respondents (n=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>US</th>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeply believe in and/or practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your own religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 60 days (two months)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 60 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to six months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven to twelve months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteen to twenty four months</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty five months or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Religious beliefs and practices were similar among respondents and non-respondents in both populations.

There did appear to be a noticeable difference between respondents and non-respondents in the work experience measure. While 13.9% of US respondents had not worked, all US non-respondents had some degree of work experience, and 80% had 7 or more months work experience. Japanese students' work experience was low, with 48.5% of respondents and 60% of non-respondents reporting they had never worked.

Extensive similarity was found between respondents' and non-respondents' residential and family background demographic information, as shown in Tables 11 and 14. For the academic demographic information from respondents and non-respondents, results appeared to be similar as shown in Tables 12 and 15. Among the US respondents, 26.6% were business majors, as were 20% of the US non-respondents. Among the Japanese respondents, 33.3% were business majors, as were 20% of non-respondents. A considerable difference appeared in the "excellent academic background" category for Japanese, with 27.3% of respondents placing themselves in this category and 80% of Japanese non-respondents doing the same. US students' scores differed in that 32.9% of the respondents' scores were in the "excellent academic background" category, while 0% of the US non-respondents rated themselves in this category, as displayed in Tables 12 and 15.
Table 14

Residential and Family Demographic Information for **Non-Respondents** *(n=10)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lived in US entire life?</strong>&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **If No to "lived in US entire life,"
number of years lived in US**                     |       |      |       |      |
| 1.0 - 3.0                                         | --    | --   | 2     | 40.0  |
| 3.1 - 6.0                                         | --    | --   | 1     | 20.0  |
| 6.1 - 10.0                                        | --    | --   | --    | --    |
| 10.1 or more                                      | --    | --   | 1     | 20.0  |
| Missing data                                       | --    | --   | 1     | 20.0  |
| **Grew up in:**                                    |       |      |       |      |
| semi-rural to rural environment                   | 4     | 80.0 | 1     | 20.0  |
| semi-urban to urban environment                   | 1     | 20.0 | 4     | 80.0  |
| **Parent/s work for a profit business**           |       |      |       |      |
| Yes                                               | 5<sup>a</sup> | 100.0 | 4<sup>a</sup> | 80.0 |
| No                                                 | --<sup>b</sup> | --   | 1<sup>b</sup> | 20.0 |
| **Parent/s work for not-for profit business**     |       |      |       |      |
| Yes                                               | 1<sup>a</sup> | 20.0 | 2<sup>a</sup> | 40.0 |
| No                                                 | 4<sup>b</sup> | 80.0 | 3<sup>b</sup> | 60.0 |

<sup>a</sup> Total number of responses is >100%, 6 combined US Yes responses; and 6 combined Japanese Yes responses (on both questions--Parents or guardians work for a profit business and Parent/s work for not-for Profit business) indicating that more than one parent worked for a profit business in some instances.

<sup>b</sup> Total number of responses is >100%; 4 combined US No responses and 4 combined Japanese No responses (on both questions--Parents or guardians work for a profit business and Parent/s work for not-for Profit business) indicating that more than one parent worked for a non-profit business, in some instances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other majors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages &amp; Literature</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman/sophomore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior/senior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An overall comparison of the mean scores of respondents’ and non-respondents’ demographic characteristics, displayed in Table 16, showed a few differences. The mean of respondents indicated that those not living in the US their entire lives tended to be in the US longer, 4.3 years, than those who did not respond, 1.9 years. There was also a difference in the travel experience, with respondents traveling less, a mean of 2.1 on a 4 point scale; than non-respondents, a mean of 2.7. Non-respondents also had less work experience, a mean of 2.3 on a 5 point scale, than respondents, with a mean of 2.9. On the other measures, the variables were similar.

**Analyses for the Research Questions**

Since the researcher was uncertain if the selected demographic variables would influence how subjects would respond to the vignettes, the data analysis was divided into two parts: preliminary analysis and primary analysis.

**Preliminary Analysis**

A chi square test was performed to determine if the subjects who differed in gender, major, and family background responded to the vignettes in a significantly different way. The results of the chi square test revealed a significant difference between responses of Japanese and US students in each of the demographic characteristics included in the analysis, i.e., the actual frequencies were not the expected frequencies. This analysis did not reveal what the differences were, therefore, each of these variables was included in the
Table 16

Comparison of Demographic Response Means between Respondents and Non-Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Respondent s (n=112)</th>
<th>Non-Respondents (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Male=1, Female=2)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeply believe in or practice your own religion? (Yes=1, No=2)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in US entire life? (Yes=1, No=2)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (1=Freshman/Sophomore, 2=Junior/Senior)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does one of your parents or guardians work for a profit-making business? (1=Yes, N=no)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does one of your parents or guardians work for non-profit making business? (1=Yes, N=no)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grew up in (1=Rural, 2=Urban) Environment</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (1=Never, 2=&lt;60 days, 3=&gt;60 days, 4=Extensively)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience (1=None, 2=1-6 Months, 3=7-12 Months, 4=13-24 Months, 5= 25 Months)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
primary analysis as an independent variable, used to test the specific hypotheses.

**Demographic Variables Related to Vignette Responses**

Two research questions guided this study. The first question focused on the relationships that existed among students' ratings on issues of ethicality in business situations and selected demographic variables. The second question examined whether students' ratings supported selected aspects of Hofstede's theory (1984, 1991).

**Research Question 1**

*Does a relationship exist among students' ratings of ethically-based business vignettes involving business communication and selected demographic variables?* The demographic variables included (a) major, (b) gender, and (c) family employment background.

To answer Research Question 1, correlations were computed to determine the nature and degree of relationships between the variables. The correlation coefficients were then interpreted using the criteria of Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1979). The criteria follow:

- .90 to 1.00 ( -.90 to -1.00) Very high positive (negative) correlation
- .70 to .90 ( -.70 to -.90) High positive (negative) correlation
- .50 to .70 ( -.50 to -.70) Moderate positive (negative) correlation
- .30 to .50 ( -.30 to -.50) Low positive (negative) correlation
.00 to .30 (0.00 to -.30) Little, if any, correlation

For Research Question 1, the Belief scores, correlations of responses provided by both Japanese and US students were computed. The outcomes indicated the extent of intercorrelations among responses to the Belief questions related to the six vignettes, representing Vitell et al.'s ethical decision-making classifications (1993). Few strong relationships among the variables were found, using the correlation interpretation scales of Hinkle et al. (1979), as shown in Table 17. According to Hinkle et al.'s scales, eight cells in the matrix showed low positive correlation scores (.30 to .50, or -.30 to -.50), all others ranged between .00 and .30 and .00 and -.30, indicating little, if any, correlation.

The eight low positive correlations for the Belief questions ranged from .326 to 453. For example, responses to Vignette A compared to responses for Vignette D were .326. These vignettes addressed PIO codes of ethics and Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder. Responses to Vignette E compared to responses for Vignette F were .453. These two vignettes addressed the first Belief question relating to Perception of Ethical Problems versus the second Belief question that related to the same classification. Each of the correlations among demographic variables and vignette responses was in the little, if any, range of correlation, 0.00 to .30.

For analysis of the Behavior scores, correlations were computed for responses provided by both Japanese and US subjects. The intercorrelations
Table 17

Correlations for the Belief Questions by Japanese and US Subjects Combined (n=112)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vignette A, PIO Codes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vignette B, PIO Codes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vignette C, Self versus Org&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vignette D, Self versus Org&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vignette E, PEP&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vignette F, PEP&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Q14 Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Q15 Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Q22 Profit Business</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Q23 Non-Profit Business</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>PIO Codes--Professional, Industry, and Organizational Codes of Ethics and Norms

<sup>b</sup>Self Versus Org.--Self Versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder

<sup>c</sup>PEP--Perceives Ethical Problems

Shaded cells show significant scores.

- Moderate positive correlation (.50 to .70)
- Low positive correlation (.30 to .50)
- Little, if any, correlation (0.00 to .30)

(Table 17 continues)
Table 17

Correlations for the Belief Questions by Japanese and US Subjects Combined (n=112)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vignette A, PIO Codes</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vignette B, PIO Codes</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vignette C, Self versus Org</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vignette D, Self versus Org</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vignette E, PEP</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vignette F, PEP</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Q14 Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Q15 Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Q22 Profit Business</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Q23 Non-Profit Business</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

Correlations for the Behavior Questions by Japanese and US Subjects Combined (n=112)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vignette A, PIO Codes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette B, PIO Codes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette C, Self versus Org&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette D, Self versus Org&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette E, PEP&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette F, PEP&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Profit Business</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23 Non-Profit Business</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>PIO Codes--Professional, Industry, and Organizational Codes of Ethics and Norms
<sup>b</sup>Self Versus Org.--Self Versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder
<sup>c</sup>PEP--Perceives Ethical Problems
<sup>d</sup>Shaded cells show significant scores.

Moderate positive correlation (.50 to .70)  
Low positive correlation (.30 to .50)  
Little, if any, correlation (0.00 to .30)  

(Table 18 continues)
Table 18

Correlations for the **Behavior Questions by Japanese and US Subjects**
Combined (n=112)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vignette A, PIO Codes(^a)</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette B, PIO Codes(^a)</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.239</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette C, Self versus Org(^b)</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>-.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette D, Self versus Org(^b)</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette E, PEP(^c)</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette F, PEP(^c)</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Profit Business</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23 Non-Profit Business</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
among the six vignettes, relating to Behavior and representing Vitell et al.'s ethical decision making classifications (1993), are shown in Table 18. According to Hinkle et al.'s (1979) scales, two cells in the matrix showed moderate positive correlation scores (.50 to .70, or -.50 to -.70), seven cells showed low positive correlation scores (.30 to .50, or -.30 to -.50), all others ranged between .00 and .30 and -.30, indicating little, if any, correlation.

The nine moderate or low correlations for the Behavior questions ranged from .392 to .526. For example, responses to Vignette C compared to responses for Vignette E were .392. These vignettes addressed Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder and Perceives Ethical Problems. Responses to Vignette A compared to responses for Vignette C were .526. These two vignettes addressed PIO codes of ethics and Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder. Each of the correlations among demographic variables and vignette responses was in the lowest range of correlation, 0.00 to .30.

In summary, the correlations indicated that:

1. Gender and ethical belief and behavior were weakly correlated. In other words, gender appeared not to relate to ethical belief or behavior.

2. Major and ethical belief and behavior were also weakly correlated. Therefore, major did not appear to relate to ethical belief or behavior.
3. Parents or guardians work for a Profit or for a Non-Profit-Making Business showed a weak correlation. Therefore, parents’ or guardians’ employment did not appear to relate to respondents’ ethical belief or behavior. 

Correlations between Japanese and US Subjects’ Scores

Further correlations were run separately on scores of Japanese and US respondents in an effort to determine if other relationships among variables existed. Few strong relationships among the variables were found, using the correlation interpretation scales of Hinkle et al. (1979). Correlations on US students’ responses to Belief questions, found in Appendix F, Table F1, Correlations of Japanese Students’ Responses on the Belief Questions, were similar to the combined responses shown in Table 17.

The Japanese students’ responses on Belief questions differed somewhat from the combined responses and from US responses. According to Hinkle et al.’s scales (1979), one cell in the Japanese Belief matrix, found in Appendix F, Table F1, Correlations of Japanese Students’ Responses on the Belief Questions, showed moderate positive correlation scores (.50 to .70), and seven cells showed low positive correlation scores (.30 to .50, or -.30 to -.50). The vignettes involved addressed (a) Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder and Perceives Ethical Problems, (b) Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder and Parents or Guardians Work for a Profit Business, and (c) Gender and Parents or Guardians Work for a Non-Profit
Business. There were low negative correlations on Vignettes that addressed (a) Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder and Perceives Ethical Problems, and (b) Gender and Parents Work for a Non-Profit Business.

Correlations on Japanese students’ responses to Behavior questions, found in Appendix F, Table F-3, Correlations of Japanese Students’ Responses on the Behavior Questions, included several that differed from the correlations of combined responses displayed in Table 18 and from US students’ responses displayed in Appendix F, Table F-4, Correlations of US Students’ Responses on the Behavior Questions. Japanese students’ responses revealed moderate positive correlations between Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder and Parents or Guardians Work for a Profit-Making Business, and low positive correlations between (a) Gender and Parents or Guardians Work for a Profit-Making Business, and (b) Gender and Parents or Guardians Work for a Non-Profit Business.

Correlations on US students’ responses to the Behavior questions, found in Appendix F, Table F4, were closely aligned with the combined responses in Table 18, with one exception. A low positive correlation of .345 was found between Self versus Organization as the Most Important Stakeholder and the Perceives Ethical Problems classification.

In summary, the correlations computed for responses of US and Japanese students separately indicated that:
1. Gender and ethical belief and behavior were weakly correlated. In other words, gender did not appear to relate to ethical belief or behavior.

2. Major and ethical belief and behavior were also weakly correlated. In other words, major did not appear to relate to ethical belief or behavior.

3. Parents or Guardians Work for a Profit or for a Non-Profit Making Business showed a weak correlation. Therefore, parents' or guardians' employment did not appear to relate to respondents' ethical belief or behavior.

**Means and Standard Deviations**

Table 19 displays a comparison of Japanese and US students' mean scores and standard deviations on vignette items for the Belief questions. Table 20 displays a similar comparison for the Behavior Questions.

In each of the tables, the mean of US respondents' scores is lower than the mean of Japanese respondents' scores. Japanese students' mean scores ranged from 2.22 to 3.27, while US students' scores ranged from 1.56 to 2.59 on the Belief responses. Overall, these responses indicated that Japanese students found the vignette situations to be more ethical than did US students. The same is true for the Behavior questions with mean scores for Japanese students’ responses for the vignettes ranging from 1.94 to 3.66, while US students' responses ranged between 1.32 and 2.65.
Table 19

A comparison of Japanese and US Respondents' Mean and Standard Deviation Scores for Vignette Belief\(^a\) Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette</th>
<th>US (n=79)</th>
<th>Japanese (n=33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Belief Scale: 1=Unethical, 2=Generally Unethical, 3=Somewhat Unethical, 4=Somewhat Ethical, 5=Generally Ethical, 6=Ethical
Table 20

A comparison of Japanese and US Respondents' Mean and Standard Deviation Scores for Vignette Behaviora Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette</th>
<th>US (n=79)</th>
<th>Japanese (n=33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Behavior Scale: 1=No, 2=Very Unlikely, 3=Probably Would Not, 4=Probably Would, 5=Very Likely, 6=Yes.
Primary Analysis--Analyses of Variance, Research Question 2

The primary analysis included twelve ANOVAs, one for each of the study’s dependent variables or vignette scores for the 6 Belief questions and the 6 Behavior questions. As previously discussed, this research examined the implications of Hofstede's cultural typologies (1984) on the ethical decision classifications developed by Vitell et al. (1993). The typologies selected were Individualism versus Collectivism, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Masculinity/Femininity, as shown in Table 5.

Individualism versus Collectivism as related to Professional, Industry, and Organizational Codes of Ethics

According to Vitell et al. (1993), the Individualism versus Collectivism typology has implications for subjects' adherence to Professional, Industry, and Organizational (PIO) Codes of Ethics and Norms, as well as their motivations toward Self versus Organization as the Most Important Stakeholder. Vignettes A and B asked for responses that revealed the extent to which the subjects' ethical norms are subjected to PIO Codes of Ethics. Therefore, the ANOVAs for students' responses to these two vignettes were used to examine the PIO code implications for Hofstede's Individualism versus Collectivism dimension (1984).

The theory examined whether cultures high on Individualism, such as the United States, are less affected by PIO codes of ethics regarding ethical norms; whereas, the opposite should be true for cultures low on Individualism
and high on Collectivism, such as Japan. This proposition was tested in two ways, (a) the subjects’ ethical beliefs and norms, and (b) the subjects’ perceived behavior.

As described in Chapter 3, the specific propositions tested were as follows. On the **Belief** question, the null hypothesis was that Japanese and US students were expected to respond equally regarding ethical norms. The alternative hypothesis was that the Japanese students would indicate that they find violations of PIO codes by business people to be more unethical than US students would report. Since, in Hofstede’s typology (1984, 1991), US and Japanese cultures are posited to be high and low on Individualism, respectively, rejection of the alternative hypothesis will be in the direction of supporting Hofstede’s implied ethical norms pertaining to PIO codes, indicating the theory is not supported.

On the **Behavior** question, the null hypothesis was that Japanese and US students are expected to respond equally regarding ethical norms. The alternative hypothesis is that the Japanese would indicate that they would be less likely to engage in behavior that violates PIO codes than would US students. Since, in Hofstede’s typology (1984, 1991), US and Japanese cultures are posited to be high and low on Individualism, respectively, rejection of the alternative hypothesis will be in the direction of supporting Hofstede’s implied ethical norms pertaining to PIO codes, indicating the theory is supported.
Tables 21 and 22 summarize the ANOVA results on responses to the Vignette A and B Belief questions, respectively. As can be seen from the tables, the null hypothesis of the equality of the reported scores was retained for Vignette A, whereas, it was rejected for Vignette B.

In Table 21, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in an F-ratio of .936, not significant at the .05 level. In Table 22, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in an F-ratio of 6.522, which was significant at the .05 level. The main effect, citizenship, contributed to the result. Therefore, students' Belief responses do not give a clear indication regarding the validity of Hofstede’s cultural typology (1984, 1991) and ethical norms with respect to the influence of PIO Codes of Ethics. An F-test of significance on the interaction effect between Citizenship and Parents or Guardians Work for a Profit-Making Business, on Japanese and US students' responses, resulted in an F-ratio of 7.629, which was significant at the .05 level.

Tables 23 and 24 summarize the ANOVA results on the Behavior responses to the Vignette A and B questions, respectively. As can be seen in the tables, on the Behavior question, the null hypothesis of the equality of the reported scores is not rejected for Vignettes A and B. Therefore, the analyses do not support culture-based differences in the responses as posited by Hofstede.
Table 21

Summary Table for Analysis of Variance--Belief Question Vignette A, Addressing Individualism versus Collectivism and Professional, Industry and Organizational Codes of Ethics; and Addressing Uncertainty Avoidance and Professional, Industry and Organizational Codes of Ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.930</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions with Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.753</td>
<td>3.384</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

Summary Table for Analysis of Variance--Belief Question Vignette B, Addressing Individualism versus Collectivism and Professional, Industry and Organizational Codes of Ethics; and Addressing Uncertainty Avoidance and Professional, Industry and Organizational Codes of Ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.935</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.089</td>
<td>2.147</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.639</td>
<td>3.225</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.383</td>
<td>6.522</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions with Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.036</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.083</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.976</td>
<td>7.629</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23

**Summary Table for Analysis of Variance--Behavior Question Vignette A, Addressing Individualism versus Collectivism and Professional, Industry and Organizational Codes of Ethics; and Addressing Uncertainty Avoidance and Professional, Industry and Organizational Codes of Ethics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.245</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions with Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.341</td>
<td>1.931</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.329</td>
<td>10.014</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24

Summary Table for Analysis of Variance--Behavior Question Vignette B, Addressing Individualism versus Collectivism and Professional, Industry and Organizational Codes of Ethics; and Addressing Uncertainty Avoidance and Professional, Industry and Organizational Codes of Ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.591</td>
<td>1.662</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.289</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.281</td>
<td>2.104</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions with Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.374</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.528</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.520</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individualism versus Collectivism Dimension as related to Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder

According to Vitell et al. (1993), the Individualism versus Collectivism typology also has implications for the subjects' motivations toward Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder. Vignettes C and D asked for responses that show the extent to which business people would be willing to be unethical for personal or for organization gain. Therefore, the ANOVAs for students' responses to these two vignettes were used to test Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder implications of Hofstede's Individualism versus Collectivism dimension (1984, 1991).

The theory examined whether cultures high on Individualism, such as the United States, are more likely to see Self as the Most Important Stakeholder and to be unethical for self or for organizational gain; whereas, the opposite is true for cultures low on Individualism, such as Japan. This proposition was tested in two ways, (a) the subjects' ethical beliefs and norms, and (b) the subjects' perceived behavior.

As described in Chapter 3, the specific propositions tested were as follows. On the Belief question, the null hypothesis was that Japanese and US students were expected to respond equally regarding willingness to be unethical for self rather than organizational gain. The alternative hypothesis was that Japanese students would indicate they find the behavior of business people that
is motivated by personal gain to be more unethical than would US students. Rejection of the alternative hypothesis will be in the direction of supporting the classification proposition developed by Vitell et al. (1993) pertaining to Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder, indicating the theory is not supported.

On the Behavior question, the null hypothesis was that US and Japanese students were expected to respond equally regarding their willingness to be unethical for Self or for Organizational gain. The alternative hypothesis was that the Japanese students were expected to indicate that they would be less likely to engage in behavior that is motivated by personal gain than would US students. Rejection of the alternative hypothesis will be in the direction of supporting the classification proposition developed by Vitell et al. (1993) pertaining to Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder, indicating the theory is not supported.

Tables 25 and 26 summarize the results of the ANOVAs on the responses to the Belief parts of Vignettes C and D, respectively. As can be seen from the tables, the null hypothesis of the equality of the reported scores was retained for Vignette C; whereas, it was rejected for Vignette D. In Table 25, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in an F-ratio of .276, not significant at the .05 level. In Table 26, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in
Table 25

Summary Table for Analysis of Variance--Belief Question Vignette C, Addressing Individualism versus Collectivism and Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder; and Addressing Uncertainty Avoidance and Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.210</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.762</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions with Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.213</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.839</td>
<td>5.842</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.219</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26

Summary Table for Analysis of Variance--Belief Question Vignette D, Addressing Individualism versus Collectivism and Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder; and Addressing Uncertainty Avoidance and Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.275</td>
<td>6.221</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions with Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.816</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.448</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.627</td>
<td>3.657</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.738</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
an F-ratio of 6.221, which was significant at the .05 level. The main effect, citizenship, contributed to the result. Therefore, the students' responses do not give a clear indication regarding the validity of Hofstede's cultural typology (1984, 1991) and ethical norms with respect to Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder. Table 26 also shows that the interaction of major, gender, profit or non-profit status of parents or guardians with citizenship did not offer any additional clarification. As the F-ratio shows, none of the interaction effects were significant at the .05 level.

For the Behavior questions, Tables 27 and 28 summarize the ANOVA results on the responses to the Vignette C and D questions, respectively. As can be seen in the tables, the null hypothesis of the equality of the reported scores was retained for Vignette C, whereas, it was rejected for Vignette D.

In Table 27, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in an F-ratio of 3.120, not significant at the .05 level. In Table 28, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in an F-ratio of 5.162, which was significant at the .05 level. Therefore, students' responses do not give a clear indication regarding the validity of Hofstede’s cultural typology (1984, 1991) and ethical norms with respect to Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder. We also cannot conclude that responses by Japanese and US students on the variables
Table 27

Summary Table for Analysis of Variance--Behavior Question Vignette C, Addressing Individualism versus Collectivism and Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder; and Addressing Uncertainty Avoidance and Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.385</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.647</td>
<td>3.120</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions with Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.567</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.411</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.006</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.614</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28

Summary Table for Analysis of Variance--Behavior Question Vignette D, Addressing Individualism versus Collectivism and Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder; and Addressing Uncertainty Avoidance and Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.124</td>
<td>2.730</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.864</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.689</td>
<td>5.162</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions with Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>\textbf{9.689}</td>
<td>\textbf{5.162}</td>
<td>\textbf{.025}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.104</td>
<td>1.653</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.168</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.352</td>
<td>2.851</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.879</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
major, gender, profit or non-profit status of parents or guardians, with respect to citizenship were significant.

_Uncertainty Avoidance Dimension as related to Professional, Industry, and Organizational Codes of Ethics_

According to Vitell et al. (1993), the Uncertainty Avoidance typology has implications for subjects' adherence to PIO Codes of Ethics, their motivations toward Self versus Organization as the Most Important Stakeholder, as well as their Perception of Ethical Problems. Vignettes A and B asked for responses that show the extent to which the subjects' ethical norms were subjected to PIO Codes of Ethics. Therefore, the ANOVAs for students' responses to these two vignettes were used to test PIO implications of Hofstede's Uncertainty Avoidance dimension (1984, 1991).

The theory examined whether cultures high on Uncertainty Avoidance, such as the Japanese culture, are posited to be more affected by PIO Codes of Ethics regarding ethical norms; whereas, the opposite is true for cultures low on Uncertainty Avoidance, such as the US. This proposition was tested in two ways, (a) the subjects' ethical beliefs and norms, and (b) the subjects' perceived behavior.

As described in Chapter 3, the specific propositions tested were as follows. On the Belief question, the null hypothesis is that Japanese and US students were expected to respond equally regarding ethical norms. The
alternative hypothesis was that the Japanese students would indicate that they found the use of PIO codes by business people when forming ethical norms to be more ethical than would US students. Since, in Hofstede’s typology (1984, 1991), Japanese and US cultures are posited to be high and low on Uncertainty Avoidance, respectively, rejection of the alternative hypothesis will be in the direction of supporting Hofstede’s implied ethical norms pertaining to PIO codes, indicating the theory is not supported.

On the Behavior question, the null hypothesis was that Japanese and US students are expected to respond equally regarding ethical norms. The alternative hypothesis was that Japanese students would report they would be more likely to engage in behavior that considers PIO codes when forming their own ethical norms than US students. Since, in Hofstede’s typology (1984, 1991), Japanese and US cultures are posited to be high and low on Uncertainty Avoidance, respectively, rejection of the alternative hypothesis will be in the direction of supporting Hofstede’s implied ethical norms pertaining to PIO codes, indicating the theory is not supported.

Tables 21 and 22 summarize the results of the ANOVAs on the responses to the Belief parts of Vignettes A and B, respectively. As can be seen from the tables, the null hypothesis of the equality of the reported scores was retained for Vignette A, whereas, it was rejected for Vignette B.
As reported earlier, in Table 21, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students’ responses resulted in an F-ratio of .936, not significant at the .05 level. In Table 22, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students’ responses resulted in an F-ratio of 6.522, which was significant at the .05 level. Therefore, students’ responses do not give a clear indication regarding the validity of Hofstede’s cultural typology (1984, 1991) and ethical norms with respect to PIO Codes of Ethics. An F-test of significance on the interaction effect between Citizenship and Parents Work for a Profit-making business, on Japanese and US students’ responses, resulted in an F-ratio of 7.629, which was significant at the .05 level.

Tables 23 and 24 summarize the ANOVA results on the Behavior responses to the Vignette A and B Behavior questions, respectively. As can be seen in the tables, on the Behavior question, the null hypothesis of the equality of reported scores is rejected at the .05 level for Vignettes A and B. Therefore, the analyses do not support culture-based differences in the responses posited by Hofstede.

**Uncertainty Avoidance Dimension as related to Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder**

According to Vitell et al. (1993), the Uncertainty Avoidance typology also has implications for motivations toward Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder and Perceptions of Ethical Problems. Vignettes C and D
asked for responses that show the extent to which business people would be willing to be unethical for personal or for organization gain. Therefore, the ANOVAs for students' responses for these two vignettes were used to examine the Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder implications of Hofstede's Uncertainty Avoidance dimension (1984, 1991).

The theory examined whether cultures high on Uncertainty Avoidance, such as Japan, are more likely to consider the Organization as the Most Important Stakeholder and to be unethical for organizational rather than personal gain; whereas, the opposite should be true for cultures low on Uncertainty Avoidance, such as the US. This proposition was tested in two ways, (a) the subjects' ethical beliefs and norms, and (b) the subjects' perceived behavior.

As described in Chapter 3, the specific propositions tested were as follows. On the Belief question, the null hypothesis is that Japanese and US students are expected to respond equally regarding their willingness to be unethical for personal as for organizational gain. The alternative hypothesis was that Japanese students would indicate they find the behavior of business people that is motivated by group interest to be more ethical than US students will indicate. Since, in Hofstede's typology (1984, 1991), Japanese and US cultures are posited to be high and low on Uncertainty Avoidance, respectively, rejection of the alternative hypothesis will be in the direction of supporting the classification propositions developed by Vitell et al. (1993), regarding Self
versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder, indicating the theory is not supported.

On the **Behavior** question, the null hypothesis is that Japanese and US students are expected to respond equally regarding business people's willingness to be unethical for personal as for organizational gain. The alternative hypothesis is that Japanese students would indicate that they would be more likely to engage in behavior motivated by group interest than would US students. Rejection of the alternative hypothesis will be in the direction of supporting the classification propositions developed by Vitell et al. (1993), pertaining to Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder, indicating the theory is not supported.

Tables 25 and 26 summarize the results of the ANOVAs on the responses to the Belief parts of Vignettes C and D, respectively. As mentioned earlier, the null hypothesis of the equality of the reported scores was retained for Vignette C, whereas, it was rejected for Vignette D. In Table 25, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in an F-ratio of .276, not significant at the .05 level. In Table 26, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in an F-ratio of 6.221, which was significant at the .05 level. The main effect, citizenship, contributed to the result. Therefore, the students' responses do not
give a clear indication regarding the validity of Hofstede's cultural typology (1984, 1991) and ethical norms with respect to Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder.

On the Behavior question, Tables 27 and 28 summarize the ANOVA results on the responses to the Vignette C and D questions, respectively. As can be seen in the tables, the null hypothesis of the equality of reported scores was retained for Vignette C, whereas, it was rejected for Vignette D.

In Table 27, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in an F-ratio of 3.120, not significant at the .05 level. In Table 28, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in an F-ratio of 5.162, which was significant at the .05 level. Therefore, students' responses do not give a clear indication regarding the validity of Hofstede's cultural typology (1984, 1991) and ethical norms, with respect to Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder. It can also not be concluded that major, gender, profit, or non-profit work status of parents or guardians employment, in responses by Japanese and US students, with respect to citizenship, was significant.

**Uncertainty Avoidance Dimension as related to Perceives Ethical Problems**

According to Vitell et al. (1993) the Uncertainty Avoidance typology also has implications for the subjects' perceptions of business people's ability, or tendency, to perceive business situations as having ethical components. Vignettes E and F asked for responses that reveal the extent to which students...
report that business people would be likely to perceive situations as having ethical components. Therefore, the ANOVAs for students’ responses to these two vignettes were used to examine Perceives Ethical Problems implications of Hofstede’s Uncertainty Avoidance dimension (1984, 1991), as developed by Vitell et al. (1993).

The theory examined whether cultures high on Uncertainty Avoidance, such as Japan, are posited to be less likely to perceive business situations as having ethical components; the opposite is true for cultures low on Uncertainty Avoidance, such as the US. This proposition was tested in two ways, (a) the subjects’ ethical beliefs and norms, and (b) the subjects’ perceived behavior.

The specific propositions tested, as described in Chapter 3, are as follows. On the Belief question, the null hypothesis is that US and Japanese students were expected to report business people to be equally likely to perceive problems as having an ethical component. The alternative hypothesis was that Japanese students were expected to indicate that they find situations in business to have fewer ethical components than US students will report. Since, in Hofstede’s typology (1984, 1991), Japanese and US cultures are posited to be high and low on Uncertainty Avoidance, respectively, rejection of the alternative hypothesis will be in the direction of supporting the classification proposition pertaining to Uncertainty Avoidance, indicating the theory is not supported.
On the **Behavior** question, the null hypothesis is that US and Japanese students are expected to respond equally regarding the perception of ethicality in business situations. The alternative hypothesis is that Japanese students would indicate that they would be more likely to engage in behavior that is questionably ethical than would US students. Since, in Hofstede’s typology (1984, 1991), Japanese and US cultures are posited to be high and low on Uncertainty Avoidance, respectively, rejection of the alternative hypothesis will be in the direction of supporting the classification proposition developed by Vitell et al. (1993) pertaining to Uncertainty Avoidance, indicating the theory is not supported.

Tables 29 and 30 summarize the results of the ANOVAs on the responses to the Belief parts of Vignettes E and F, respectively. As can be seen from the tables, the null hypothesis of the equality of the reported scores was rejected for either Vignette E or F. In Table 29, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students’ responses resulted in an F-ratio of 3.531, not significant at the .05 level. In Table 30, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students’ responses resulted in an F-ratio of 2.857, not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the outcomes of the analyses of students’ responses do not align with Hofstede’s cultural typology-implied Belief and Behavior (1984, 1991) with respect to Perceives Ethical Problems.
Table 29

Summary Table for Analysis of Variance--Belief Question Vignette E, Addressing Uncertainty Avoidance and Perceives Ethical Problems; and Addressing Masculinity/Femininity and Perceives Ethical Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.323</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.395</td>
<td>3.287</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.573</td>
<td>3.531</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions with Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.186</td>
<td>4.373</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>1.618</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30

Summary Table for Analysis of Variance--Belief Question Vignette F, Addressing Uncertainty Avoidance and Perceives Ethical Problems; and Addressing Masculinity/Femininity and Perceives Ethical Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.702</td>
<td>2.526</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.081</td>
<td>1.945</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.057</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions with Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.720</td>
<td>2.543</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the Behavior question, Tables 31 and 32 summarize the ANOVA results on the responses to the Vignettes E and F questions, respectively. As can be seen in the tables, the null hypothesis of the equality of the reported scores was retained for either Vignette C or D.

In Table 31, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in an F-ratio of .428, not significant at the .05 level. In Table 32, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in an F-ratio of 1.800, not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the analyses do not support culture-based differences in the responses as posited by Hofstede.

Masculinity/Femininity Dimension as related to Perceives Ethical Problems

According to Vitell et al. (1993), the Masculinity/Femininity typology has implications for subjects' perceptions of business people's ability to perceive situations as having ethical components. Vignettes E and F asked for responses that show the extent to which students would report that business people are likely to perceive situations as having ethical components. Therefore, the ANOVAs for students' responses to these two vignettes were used to test the Perceives Ethical Problems implications of Hofstede's Masculinity/Femininity dimension (1984, 1991).
Table 31

Summary Table for Analysis of Variance--Behavior Question Vignette E, Addressing Uncertainty Avoidance and Perceives Ethical Problems; and Addressing Masculinity/Femininity and Perceives Ethical Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.064</td>
<td>1.603</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.155</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.099</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions with Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 32

Summary Table for Analysis of Variance--Behavior Question Vignette F, Addressing Uncertainty Avoidance and Perceives Ethical Problems; and Addressing Masculinity/Femininity and Perceives Ethical Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.773</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.334</td>
<td>1.730</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.067</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.602</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.467</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions with Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The theory examined whether cultures high on Masculinity, such as the Japanese culture, are posited to be more affected by PIO Codes of Ethics regarding ethical norms; whereas, the opposite should be true for cultures low on Masculinity, such as the US. This proposition was tested in two ways, (a) the subjects' ethical beliefs and norms, and (b) the subjects' perceived behavior.

As described in Chapter 3, the specific propositions tested were as follows. On the Belief question, the null hypothesis was that Japanese and US students were expected to report business people to be equally likely to perceive problems or dilemmas as having an ethical component. The alternative hypothesis is that the Japanese students are expected to report business people to be less likely to perceive issues to be ethical or not ethical and more likely to see issues as accepted business practice. Since, in Hofstede’s typology (1984, 1991), Japanese and US cultures are posited to be high and low on Masculinity/Femininity, respectively, rejection of the alternative hypothesis will be in the direction of supporting the classification proposition developed by Vitell et al. (1993) regarding Perceives Ethical Problems, indicating the theory is not supported.

On the Behavior question, the null hypothesis was that Japanese and US students were expected to report business people to be equally likely to perceive business situations as having ethical components. The alternative
hypothesis is that the Japanese students will report they would be more likely to engage in a broader range of business practices they consider to be ethical than will US students. Since, in Hofstede's typology (1984, 1991), Japanese and US cultures are posited to be high and low on Masculinity and Femininity, respectively, rejection of the alternative hypothesis will be in the direction of supporting the Hofstede implied ethical norms pertaining to PIO codes, indicating the theory is not supported.

Tables 29 and 30 summarize the results of the ANOVAs on the responses to the Belief parts of Vignettes E and F, respectively. As can be seen from the tables, the null hypothesis of the equality of the reported scores was not rejected for either Vignettes E or F. In Table 29, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in an F-ratio of 3.531, not significant at the .05 level. In Table 30, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in an F-ratio of 2.857, not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the outcomes of the analyses of students' responses align with Hofstede's cultural typology implied Belief and Behavior (1984, 1991), with respect to both Uncertainty Avoidance and Masculinity/Femininity dimensions.

On the Behavior question, Tables 31 and 32 summarize the ANOVA results on the responses to the Vignette E and F questions, respectively. As
can be seen in the tables, the null hypothesis of equality of the reported scores was retained for either Vignette C or D.

In Table 31, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students' responses resulted in and F-ratio of .428, not significant at the .05 level. In Table 32, an F-test of significance between Japanese and US students responses resulted in an F-ratio of 1.800, not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the analyses do not support culture-based differences in the responses as posited by Hofstede. Further, among the demographic variables, major, gender, and parent or guardian owns or works for a profit- or non-profit-making business, none were significant in the analyses as a main effect.

Summary

The findings of the surveys of Japanese and US students in West Virginia colleges and universities and the data analysis techniques employed have been presented in this chapter. More female students responded to the survey than males, and more than half of all respondents reported having deep religious beliefs. The highest percentage of respondents from both cultures were business majors.

Correlations among the responses to Belief and Behavior questions indicated little, low, or moderate relationships among the variables, providing little, if any, evidence of relationships among students' ratings of ethically based business vignettes and the students' majors, genders, or family employment
backgrounds. Further, little relationship was found between US and Japanese students' responses to the vignettes in the correlation analyses. The results of chi square tests indicated a significant difference between Japanese and US students in gender, major, and family background characteristics. Therefore, each of these variables was used in testing the study hypotheses. This primary analysis compared the Belief and Behavior scores of Japanese and US students to the vignettes. A summary of the twelve ANOVAs, described below, is shown in Tables 33 and 34.

On the Belief question, Vignettes B and D supported a statistically significant difference between Individualism versus Collectivism for Japanese and US students, whereas, Vignettes A and C did not. On the Behavior question, only Vignette D supported a significant difference between Japanese and US students. However, the validity of Hofstede's cultural typology (1984, 1991) requires not only a difference between Japanese and US scores, but also that the Japanese scores, with respect to both PIO codes and Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder, be less than US scores. For this study, the US scores are consistently lower, but not statistically, than Japanese scores on both the Belief and Behavior responses. Thus, the results did not confirm the Belief and Behavior implications of Hofstede's Individualism versus Collectivism typology or his Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder typologies (1984, 1991).
On the Belief questions, Vignettes B and D supported a statistically significant difference for Uncertainty Avoidance between Japanese and US students, whereas, Vignettes A and C did not. On the Behavior question, only Vignette D supported a significant difference between Japanese and US students. On Vignettes E and F, no significant difference was found with respect to either Belief or Behavior questions.

The Hofstede Masculinity/Femininity typology-implied behavior was not supported by the results of the research (1984, 1991). No statistically significant difference existed between US and Japanese students with respect to Belief and Behavior questions, but as expected, the Japanese mean responses were greater than mean US responses. To summarize, the results of the research did not support the Individualism versus Collectivism or Uncertainty Avoidance implied Belief and Behavior questions, nor did they support the Masculinity/Femininity implied Belief and Behavior questions.
Table 33

Summary of Analysis of Variance Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifications</th>
<th>Belief Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions of Hofstede &amp; Vitell et al. (1993)</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind vs Coll A</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAI B</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vitell et al. (1993) Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifications</th>
<th>Belief Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind vs Coll C</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAI D</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vitell et al. (1993) Perceives Ethical Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifications</th>
<th>Belief Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAI E</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F F</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a significantly different at .05 level

(Table 33 continues)
Table 33

Summary of Analysis of Variance Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifications</th>
<th>Behavior Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimensio ns of Hofstede &amp; Vitell et al. (1993) Vignette</td>
<td>Major Gender Profit Non-Profit Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind vs Coll UAI</td>
<td>A .174 .392 .364 .475 .643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B .200 .365 .495 .262 .150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitell et al. (1993) Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind vs Coll UAI</td>
<td>C .834 .434 .469 .492 .080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D .641 .102 .321 .493 .025a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F .340 .192 .303 .248 .183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a significantly different at .05 level*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Hofstede's Classification</th>
<th>Vitell's Propositions</th>
<th>Vignettes Testing the Theory</th>
<th>Theory's Projection of Scores</th>
<th>Actual Scores</th>
<th>Supports Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individualism versus Collectivism</td>
<td>Professional, Industry, and Organizational Codes of Ethics</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
<td>J &lt; US</td>
<td>J &gt; US</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individualism versus Collectivism</td>
<td>Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder</td>
<td>C &amp; D</td>
<td>J &lt; US</td>
<td>J &gt; US</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>Professional, Industry, and Organizational Codes of Ethics</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
<td>J &lt; US</td>
<td>J &gt; US</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>Self versus Organization as Most Important Stakeholder</td>
<td>C &amp; D</td>
<td>J &lt; US</td>
<td>J &gt; US</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>Perceives Ethical Problems</td>
<td>E &amp; F</td>
<td>J &gt; US</td>
<td>J &gt; US</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Masculinity/Femininity</td>
<td>Perceives Ethical Problems</td>
<td>E &amp; F</td>
<td>J &gt; US</td>
<td>J &gt; US</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>