Introduction

Bradley R. Agle, David W. Hart, Jeffery A. Thompson, and Hilary M. Hendricks

One of the most frequent questions that we hear as business ethics researchers is, "What is the best way to measure _____?" Measuring morality is implicitly challenging, for reasons that we will describe in this book. Adding to that complexity, however, is the fact that business ethics research and literature have proliferated at an astounding rate in recent decades. Business ethics studies appear not just in journals devoted solely to the field, but also frequently in general management journals. Often, scholars unknowingly work in parallel, developing similar measures without reference to one another. The field is marked by much reinventing-of-the-wheel when it comes to measurement. The result, one may argue, is a chaotic jumble of partially overlapping constructs and measures, diffused throughout multiple journals and communities, with no central reference point or repository where scholars can go to select measures appropriate for their research.

We see both need and value in compiling the various ways that researchers have attempted to define and measure "ethics." Daunting – indeed, often overwhelming – as that challenge has felt, this book is a first attempt to provide such a compilation and thus, we hope, to facilitate the advancement of business ethics research.

Research compilations have benefited other areas of study. Examples include topics such as attitudes (Albarracín, Johnson, and Zanna, 2005), religion (Hill and Hood, 1999), and organizational measures (Price and Mueller, 1986), and so on. Also, several compilations have charted the terrain of ethics-related concepts (e.g., *Character Strengths and Virtues* by Petersen and Seligman, 2004; *Moral Maturity* by Gibbs, Basinger, and Fuller, 1992; *Moral Development* by Rest and Barnett, 1986; *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Management, 2nd Edition: Business Ethics* by Werhane and Freeman, 2005; and others). We will not attempt to replicate or replace these excellent sources. However, no general compilation of ethics measures exists. There is no one place that scholars can go to see which instruments they might use to conduct their own ethics-related research.

The lack of such a compilation is likely the result of two factors: first, not only does ethics research appear in a vast array of journals, but also its measures have been developed in multiple disciplines. For example, we find research on moral development in developmental psychology (e.g., Kohlberg, 1981), moral stress in nursing (Lützén, Cronqvist, Magnusson, and Andersson, 2003), cheating behavior in behavioral psychology (Ariely, 2012), and so on. Second, the field is relatively young and many of the measures are new. Without an extended history of validation and frequent use, it is difficult to evaluate which measures ought to be the gold standard of the field.

THE HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

The lead editor of this volume, Brad Agle, has been thinking about this need in the field since the time he was a doctoral student in the late 1980s at the University of Washington. He kept hoping that someone in the field would provide such a volume. As the years continued without such a volume appearing, he began to think about how he might produce such a volume himself. The catalyst came in 2009 when Brad left the University of Pittsburgh and joined the faculty at the Marriott School of Management at Brigham Young University (BYU). There, his colleagues David Hart and Jeff Thompson joined the effort. At first, we set about to create the compilation ourselves. It did not take long to realize that this was an unmanageable project for three people. We began to think about other resources we could use. Since the Marriott School does not have a PhD program, producing the book as part of a PhD seminar was not an option. Then, in a stroke of insanity, brilliance, or something in between, Brad got the idea to have the three of us teach a pre-PhD seminar, in which we took undergraduate and graduate students interested in pursuing doctoral studies and taught them to do PhD-level research. We would then serve as editors for the book and have the students do the research for and write the chapters of the book. Given the experience level of the students, we also enlisted other professors throughout the school to work on these chapters with the students.

We were gratified that 11 students signed up for our seminar, and we were able to find faculty members to work with each team. As we currently write, ten of these students are now in doctoral programs: Lyndon Garrett at the University of Michigan; James Carlson at Texas Tech University; Zach Rodgers at Stanford; David Howe at the University of Utah; Christian Mealey at Rice; Sam Brown at BYU; Adrian Klemme at the University of Georgia; M.-C. Ingerson at BYU; Matt Walsman at Cornell; and Jared Miller at the University of Washington.

The lone student from our seminar who is not in a doctoral program was our amazing freshman, Camden Robinson, who is currently serving as a missionary for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Guatemala.

In approaching this task, we knew that it would be important to put parameters around our work. First, we chose to make the book a compilation of constructs and measures. We chose not to write about how constructs are related to one another, what we have learned from the research about ethical behavior, or to attempt to provide theoretical integration or mapping (although several of our authors chose to add some of this content). We also made the important decision (while floating on inner tubes in the "lazy river" of the J.W. Marriott in Orlando late one night during the Ethics and Compliance Officer Association conference in 2008) to keep our volume focused on measures at the individual level. This made the project more tractable.

METHODS

To begin mapping the terrain of individual ethics measures, we first consulted theoretical work on ethical decision making, which we felt was the most inclusive framework from which to view the various elements of individual ethics. We examined various theoretical models (specifically, Treviño, 1986; Jones, 1991; Bommer et al., 1987; Dubinsky and Loken, 1989; Ferrell and Gresham, 1985; Ferrell, Gresham, and Fraedrich, 1989; Hunt and Vitell, 1986; Zey-Ferrell and Ferrell, 1982; Sonenshein, 2007) to identify broad categories of individual-level ethics constructs. From this exercise, we made some initial attempts at creating chapter boundaries. We knew that these boundaries would evolve as we moved along, which turned out to be the case. Next, we selected a body of recent empirical work in ethics – a sample population, if you will. The three of us reviewed this literature to see if the constructs fit our emergent chapter boundaries. Through a series of meetings, and much discussion, chapters organically emerged that roughly match those seen in the current book.

One of the most difficult tasks we encountered during this phase of our project was deciding which articles and books to include, and which to exclude. For scholars like us, who think about ethics all the time, we had to resist the temptation to consider *every* construct ethically significant. Inclusion decisions were often a product of healthy and collegial debate, but we would be hard pressed to provide a concrete general rule for how we made these decisions. Ultimately, we tended to revert to thinking about our audience. Who would use this book, and for what purpose? We tried to draw boundaries that would include explicitly ethical constructs,

and exclude constructs whose domains were primarily in non-ethics conceptual space. For example, we spent a great deal of time debating whether to include the construct of incivility (e.g., Andersson and Pearson, 1999). Clearly, a lack of civility can have ethical consequences – it can make people feel undervalued, can foster a climate of opportunism and deception, and reflects a lack of human respect. However, we ultimately chose to exclude incivility from the book because incivility research has generally not focused on predicting ethics-related outcomes. Another example is the concept of justice, which has a long history of academic inquiry and measurement. Justice is clearly relevant to the ethics field. However, the justice literature was too massive for us to address, and other resources have already provided excellent overviews of the justice literature (Greenberg, 1990). Other notable omissions of this ilk include highly relevant but previously well-documented fields such as Positive Organizational Scholarship (Cameron and Spreitzer, 2011) and character strength and individual virtues (Peterson and Seligman, 2004)

These decisions to omit material were, we recognize, a judgment call, and others will no doubt question that judgment. Nevertheless, we were forced to draw boundaries, even at the risk of appearing arbitrary, in order to make the project feasible.

In addition, it was oftentimes difficult to determine to which chapter a particular construct or measure belonged. Many constructs seemed to span multiple areas, so again, we used our best collective judgment to provide structure. Furthermore, we have attempted to create a very thorough index to the book to help guide the reader. If you are looking for a particular construct, we invite you to refer to the index, rather than just peruse the chapter where you think it ought to appear.

Yet another challenge we faced during this phase of our project was collecting the actual measures used by the authors we cite. Our desire was to make ethics measures as accessible as possible to our readers. From the beginning, we envisioned cataloging measures in the book itself so that users could adopt them easily. Ultimately, we decided to provide measures on a related website rather than in the book itself (which would have made the book prohibitively lengthy). We have worked diligently to obtain the measures identified in this book and have cataloged them on the website, ethics.byu.edu/research_companion/.

Our website remains a work in progress, as many authors do not provide their measures in the published articles. We continue to reach out to authors to gain access to the exact measures they used. If you have a measure that would fit within the context of this book, we invite you to

share information about it through our website portal: ethics.byu.edu/research_companion/submission/.

With a roadmap of core constructs in hand for each of the chapters, we passed the baton to our chapter author teams. Each of them did a deeper dive into the literature, and searched for additional constructs that related to their area of focus. Simultaneously, we, along with a few other dedicated research assistants, began systematically reviewing more than 50 journals. For the most prestigious journals, we reviewed article abstracts for ethics constructs from the journal's inception. For other journals, we reviewed research over the past several years. Our research assistants also did general searches for ethics-related terms to pick up other important articles we might have missed. As we encountered new constructs and articles, we sent these to the relevant team for consideration in their chapters.

During the drafting process, we invited several ethics scholars to come to BYU and meet with our student teams to assess their work and provide guidance on any constructs or measures that we might be missing. We express particular thanks to Jared Harris from the Darden School at the University of Virginia, Scott Reynolds from the University of Washington, and Gary Weaver from the University of Delaware, all of whom visited campus to work with our students.

Although we have made what feels like a herculean effort to cover the terrain of individual ethics measures, we are keenly aware that we have overlooked or omitted some important concepts. We apologize in advance to colleagues whose work we may have failed to include, or to which we have not given fair due, or which we may have mischaracterized in some way. Given such a large and complex task, we are confident that the work is far from perfect, and we accept responsibility for all the remaining errors. We hope that future editions of this book will fill in holes where necessary.

WHAT WE HOPE TO CONTRIBUTE

The motivation for this book largely comes out of a scientific tradition of cumulative knowledge, and the belief that such knowledge can help us to improve our world. We are all deeply committed to helping ourselves, our students, and members of our society to become more ethical. We believe that scientific understanding of ethical behavior can help us in that quest. In order for this to happen in an efficient and effective manner, current knowledge must be available in an easily accessible fashion. We

fear that, because ethics research spans many disciplines, is oftentimes conducted by those without formal training in ethics, and is not always easily accessible, the research in our field is not as effective or cumulative as it should be. Instruments tend to proliferate in such an environment, relevant research goes unused, and parallel projects duplicate effort inefficiently. For example, we have noticed that many scholars develop a new instrument when a good instrument for the construct already exists. The effort they expended in instrument development and validation might have been better used in developing or testing new theory.

Our primary goal is thus to benefit the field by providing a central reference for ethics measures. We hope this minimizes duplication and provides a valuable entry point into the field for young scholars (or those new to the field) who are trying to understand what measures are available. For those seeking an overview of the state of business ethics theory, however, other books may be more appropriate. Several excellent reviews of the literature have appeared during the past few years that provide valuable interpretations of the knowledge that our field has generated regarding ethical decision making and behavior. We invite the reader to consult these works, including Treviño and Weaver (2003); Tenbrunsel and Smith-Crowe (2008); Treviño, Weaver, and Reynolds (2006), and Bazerman and Tenbrunsel (2011). In contrast to these excellent reviews of theory and knowledge, our goal here is three-fold: (1) to identify and catalog the various constructs that are used in the field; (2) to identify and catalog any measures of those constructs; and (3) to assess the quality and applicability of these measures.

Finally, our motivation is also driven by an intense desire to understand and develop useful ways of helping our students to become effective ethical agents and leaders in the business world. In other words, we want to know how we can help students develop themselves ethically. To do so, we will need to conduct multiple studies over multiple years, investigating multiple educational interventions and using multiple individual measures. This book, with its objective to document the validated measures we have as resources, stands as the first step in that project. We will soon initiate research on this effort with a dedicated research team. But we could not begin that project before we had identified the various ways that researchers have devised to quantify and measure ethical concepts at an individual level. As we look back on our work for this project, we feel deep appreciation for the extensive work that our colleagues have provided over the years.

Our acknowledgments section identifies many people who have contributed in significant ways to this project. As a final note to our

introduction, however, we wish to give special recognition to two people: Hilary Hendricks and Rachel Mahrt. As we were struggling to move this project along this past year, we were incredibly fortunate to be joined by our fourth editor, Hilary Hendricks. Hilary is an MBA student at BYU with an impressive and extensive background in editorial services targeted at academic publications. She came to Dr Agle's office looking to gain research experience with the goal of entering a PhD program in the future. That was our lucky day. Hilary has turned out to be an amazing colleague, writer, researcher, motivator, organizer, and editor. She recruited another gifted student and writer, Rachel Mahrt, and together they provided the structure and attention to detail that undergirds this work. This project would not have developed to where it has without their dedicated service. One of you out there will be really lucky to get Hilary as a doctoral student someday.

OUTLINE OF THE CHAPTERS

This book is meant primarily to be a reference work. While some may choose to read a chapter as a way of familiarizing themselves with research in a particular subject, we anticipate that most people will use the book primarily as a resource that helps them find constructs, construct definitions, and measures as they contemplate new research projects. One of the features of this book that we hope users will find helpful is the tables included in each chapter. These tables document the major measures that we have identified in each area, along with the working definition scholars have provided, and a reference to the measure itself. Our hope is that users of the book will find these tables a useful quick reference to find measures that suit their research needs.

In that spirit, we provide a brief overview of each of the chapters. The chronology of the initial chapters reflects our sense of which topics are currently receiving the most attention among researchers of individual, behavioral ethics.

Chapter 1 focuses on measures related to moral awareness. Rooted in James Rest and Robert Barnett's (1986) concept of moral sensitivity (the starting point of his ethical-decision-making model), research in this area has become highly active in recent years. The chapter addresses key challenges that face this area of research, including a lack of definitional precision and a proliferation of similar measures with slightly different foci. The chapter not only documents what the measures are, but also attempts to categorize them in terms of the various definitional elements present in the literature. Although many of the measures described in this chapter fall under the larger rubric of moral awareness, other related

constructs that appear in the chapter include moral attentiveness, ethical predisposition, moral construal, and moral imagination, along with awareness's dark twin, moral disengagement.

The emphasis of Chapter 2 is ethical behavior. While behavioral research on morality is expansive, the focus of this chapter is on the dispositional factors that are related specifically to the context of the organizational world. Interestingly, the major constructs and measures in this area of business ethics focus less on ethical behavior (such as whistleblowing and ethical intentions) and more on unethical actions. These include general measures of unethical behavior, bullying, work-place deviance, and broader issues of deception (such as lying, cheating, and dishonesty).

Chapter 3 focuses on one of the most researched areas of business ethics: ethical decision making. The causal connection between cognition and behavior is fundamental to understanding the ethical actions of individuals. The empirical research in this area tends to congregate around three basic steps of the ethical-decision-making process: aware-ness of the ethical content of a decision; the decision itself; and the consequent behavior. Specific types of measures include the well-known Defining Issues Test; the Moral Judgment Test; moral intensity; moral disengagement; and moral stress, among many others.

Chapter 4 covers the topics of values and attitudes. Values have been a critical element in most ethics research since ethics was subjected to empirical research. Fortunately, a great deal of work has been done in this area. This work is reflected in the chapter, where highly developed definitions and measures are discussed. There are several highly used values measures, such as the Rokeach (1973) values measure. This chapter also covers attitudes relevant to ethics. The primary attitudes discussed here deal with those surrounding a company's social respons-ibility, ethical behavior at work, materialism, deception in negotiations, and so on. Several measures have attempted to discover an individual's attitude toward the responsibilities of business and business people.

Chapter 5 describes measures related to individual ethical traits. As a general boundary condition, the authors focus on individual traits that reflect two key characteristics: first, the traits are normative in nature (i.e., include some conception of the "good"); and, second, they are stable (i.e., scholars generally treat the traits as enduring over time). Using these defining features as the litmus test for inclusion, four important traits emerged as most foundational. They include Belief in a Just World, Machiavellianism, Moral Courage, and Moral Identity. In addition, this chapter includes measures of Ethical Leadership. The latter construct may stretch the limits of the chapter's boundary conditions

since, arguably, leadership has as much to do with behavior as with traits and thus may not be as stable as the other key constructs in the chapter. Ethical Leadership, however, is typically used as a descriptor of an individual, and incorporates traits as well. The chapter also addresses other less-established trait measures.

Unlike the preceding chapters, Chapters 6 and 7 do not discuss constructs that are explicitly ethics related. Rather, they discuss constructs and measures that have been proposed to play a key role in ethical decision making and behavior. While some of these constructs come from theoretical models of ethical decision making, most originate with the theoretical and empirical work of scholars in management's parent disciplines, psychology and sociology. Examples of constructs discussed in these chapters include moral emotions, personality dimensions, religiosity, and so on.

Chapter 8 departs from the pattern of our book. Instead of following the basic structure of the other chapters, with a table listing constructs and measures, followed by a discussion of these, Chapter 8 discusses the unique challenges one faces when attempting to do empirical ethics research. Such challenges include data sensitivity, social desirability bias, the need for deception, and the complexity of obtaining Institutional Review Board approval for research. Suggestions for overcoming these challenges are also provided.

We hope this compilation will serve as a springboard for cross-disciplinary collaboration. Thank you for your commitment to the study of ethical behavior in organizations.

REFERENCES

Albarracín, D.E., Johnson, B.T., and Zanna, M.P. (2005). *The Handbook of Attitudes*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Andersson, L.M. and Pearson, C.M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, **24**(3), 452–71.

Ariely, D. (2012). *The (Honest) Truth about Dishonesty*. New York: HarperCollins.

Bazerman, M.H. and Tenbrunsel, A.E. (2011). *Blind Spots: Why we fail to do what's right and what to do about it*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bommer, M., Gratto, C., Gravander, J., and Tuttle, M. (1987). A behavioral model of ethical and unethical decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **6**(4), 265–80.

Cameron, K.S. and Spreitzer, G.M. (eds) (2011). *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dubinsky, A.J. and Loken, B. (1989). Analyzing ethical decision making in marketing. *Journal of Business Research*, **19**(2), 83–107.

Ferrell, O.C. and Gresham, L.G. (1985). A contingency framework for understanding ethical decision making in marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, **49**(3), 87–96.

Ferrell, O.C., Gresham, L.G., and Fraedrich, J. (1989). A synthesis of ethical decision models for marketing. *Journal of Macromarketing*, **9**(2), 55–64.

Gibbs, J.C., Basinger, K.S., and Fuller, D. (1992). *Moral Maturity: Measuring the development of sociomoral reflection*. New York: Routledge.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, **16**(2), 399–432.

Hill, P.C. and Hood, R.W. (1999). *Measures of Religiosity*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.

Hunt, S.D. and Vitell, S. (1986). A general theory of marketing ethics. *Journal of Macromarketing*, **6**(1), 5–16.

Jones, T.M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An Issue-Contingent Model. *The Academy of Management Review*, **16**(2), 366–95.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The Philosophy of Moral Development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

Lützén, K., Cronqvist, A., Magnusson, A. and Andersson, L. (2003). Moral stress: Synthesis of a concept. *Nursing Ethics*, **10**(3), 312–22.

Peterson, C. and Seligman, M.E.P. (2004). *Character Strengths and Virtues: A handbook and classification*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Price, J.L. and Mueller, C.W. (1986). *Handbook of Organizational Measurement*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing.

Rest, J.R. and Barnett, R. (1986). *Moral Development: Advances in research and theory* (pp. 89–119). New York: Praeger.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: Free Press.

Tenbrunsel, A.E. and Smith-Crowe, K. (2008). Ethical decision making: Where we've been and where we're going. *The Academy of Management Annals*, **2**(1), 545–607.

Treviño, L.K. (1986). Ethical decision making in organizations: A person–situation interactionist model. *The Academy of Management Review*, **11**(3), 601–17.

Treviño, L.K. and Weaver, G.G.R. (2003). *Managing Ethics in Business Organizations: A social scientific perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Treviño, L.K., Weaver, G.R., and Reynolds, S.J. (2006). Behavioral ethics in organizations: A review. *Journal of Management*, **32**(6), 951–90.

Sonenshein, S. (2007). The role of construction, intuition, and justification in responding to ethical issues at work: The sensemaking-intuition model. *The Academy of Management Review*, **32**(4), 1022–40.

Werhane, P.H. and Freeman, R.E. (2005). *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Management, Volume II*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Zay-Ferrell, M. and Ferrell, O.C. (1982). Role-set configuration and opportunities as predictors of unethical behavior in organizations. *Human Relations*, **35**(7), 587–604.