Journal of Business Ethics (2008) 78:141–151
DOI 10.1007/s10551-006-9323-y

Do the Numbers Add Up to Different Views? Perceptions of Ethical Faculty Behavior Among Faculty in Quantitative Versus Qualitative Disciplines

Linda A. Kidwell
Roland E. Kidwell

ABSTRACT. Faculty across a wide range of academic disciplines at 89 AASCB-accredited U.S. business schools were surveyed regarding their perceptions of the ethical nature of faculty behaviors related to undergraduate course content, student evaluation, educational environment, research issues, financial and material transactions, and social and sexual relationships. We analyzed responses based on whether instruction in the academic discipline focused mainly on quantitative topics or largely on qualitative issues. Faculty who represented quantitative disciplines such as accounting and finance (n = 383) were more likely to view behaviors such as selling complimentary textbooks and grading on a strict curve as more ethical than faculty representing more qualitative disciplines such as management and marketing (n = 447). In contrast, faculty in quantitative disciplines were more likely to view behaviors such as showing controversial media and bringing up sexual or racial charged matters as less ethical than their counterparts. Whereas these differences may be attributed to the respondents' academic backgrounds, the large level of agreement on ethical behaviors raises questions about the growing influence of business disciplines that operate within more unified research and teaching paradigms.

KEY WORDS: ethics, faculty–student relationships, academic misconduct, academic discipline, AACSB

Linda Kidwell (PhD, Louisiana State University) is an associate professor in the Accounting Department at the University of Wyoming where she teaches auditing as well as accounting ethics. Her research interests include academic ethics, auditing ethics, and governmental auditing. Her research has been published in the Journal of Business Ethics, Teaching Business Ethics, CPA Journal, Journal of Accounting and Public Policy *and elsewhere. She has taught in the United States, Australia, and Canada. She has also been a frequent faculty mentor in the National Conference on Ethics in America held annually at the United States Military Academy (West Point).*

Roland Kidwell (PhD, Louisiana State University) is an associate professor in the Management and Marketing Department at the University of Wyoming where he teaches courses in new ventures, human resource management and general management. His current research interests include ethical issues involving family businesses and new ventures, social entrepreneurship, and workplace deviance such as withholding effort (free riding, shirking, social loafing) in organizational contexts. He is co-editor of a book of readings and cases, Managing Organizational Deviance (2005, Sage), and his research has appeared in Academy of Management Review, Journal of Business Ethics, Journal of Management, Journal of Business and Psychology *and elsewhere.*

Introduction

Studies of ethical behavior among faculty have generally considered diverse faculty groups as a whole or focused on specific disciplines. In some cases, researchers have compared two or three disciplines but have not fully described what makes the disciplines different and thus likely to have different perceptions. Ethical and normative expectations across academic fields have sometimes examined faculty behavior toward students in light of the strength of paradigm development – technical certainty and consensus on theoretical orientation (Pfeffer, 1993) – within the discipline (Braxton and Hargens, 1996). The degree to which researchers in a field were unified in their theoretical and methodological approach to academic inquiry in terms of theory and method played a role in the degree to which faculty in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities viewed expected faculty behavior toward students (Braxton and Bayer, 1999).

Our study extends this line of inquiry to faculty views about ethical behavior to business faculty, particularly contrasting professors in disciplines that are traditionally quantitative with those who work in more qualitative fields. Differences between the orientation of quantitative and qualitative faculty may be captured by considering the assumed motivations of an employee who free rides on the work of others or shirks on assigned responsibilities. Economists and accountants would suggest that such shirking results from pursuit of rational self-interest and should be handled by providing financial incentives to eliminate the problem or by increased monitoring to control the employee's behavior. Those teaching more behavioral-based courses such as management or marketing may be more likely to bring in non-monetary considerations to explain the employee's actions, such as conformity to the norms or culture of the workplace, and suggest modifying the informal structure or working conditions to address the problem.

In addition, some differences toward views of ethical behavior may be noted across these fields because quantitative disciplines (economics, finance, and accounting) have stronger paradigm development than more qualitative fields such as management, marketing, and business communication. More than a decade ago, Pfeffer (1993) argued that the field of organizational studies – in contrast to economics, finance, and accounting – was not well developed paradigmatically in large part due to its values of inclusiveness, representativeness, and theoretical and methodological diversity. These values may play a role in the negative reaction of some organizational researchers to the application of economic theories to their field of study over the years. Economic applications to organizational science have been met with ferocious criticism that deteriorated to "one level above name calling" (Barney, 1990, p. 383). Barney (1990) attributed these reactions to differences between assumptions and methods taken in organizational economics as well as simple intergroup conflict that stemmed from negative attitudes that behavioralists held toward economists, and vice versa.

The concern that economic applications such as agency theory and transaction cost economics to management studies are damaging, particularly in terms of the ethical views of practitioners, continues to the present: "Many of the worst excesses of recent management practices have their roots in a set of ideas that have emerged from business school academics over the last 30 years" (Ghoshal, 2005, p. 75). The author referred specifically to economic theories adapted to management research and teaching.

This conflict goes beyond the application of economics to organization studies into specific fields. In accounting, some leading researchers seek to unify accounting research around capital markets theory and discourage contributions that take alternative theoretical perspectives. Research that does not focus on the dominant paradigm is not perceived as having great value (Reiter, 1998). In marketing, many traditional marketing researchers were disturbed in the late 1960s when the field was broadened beyond commercial marketing (the dominant paradigm) into several new areas of study, including a focus on social, education, health and cultural areas and a desire to bring new theory and practice from these domains back into commercial marketing (Kotler, 2005). Traditionalists were concerned that the broadening of the field would dilute the unifying paradigm.

In this study, a random sample of faculty representing both quantitative and qualitative disciplines provided opinions on ethical conduct in such categories as course content, student evaluation, educational environment, research issues, financial and material transactions, as well as social and sexual relationships between faculty, students, colleagues, and staff. By contrasting quantitative and qualitative disciplines on these ethical questions, we sought to determine whether strength of paradigm development played a role in the moral view of business faculty regarding selected behaviors involving undergraduate students.

A second element of this study asked faculty about their familiarity with and use of Catholic social teaching (CST), which sees businesses as venues in which people can develop and realize their growth potential. CST takes the view that, in the words of the late Pope John Paul II, that "all work is ultimately for the person; the person is not for work"

(Kennedy, 2002, p. 55). We wanted to identify differing views across disciplines regarding the use of CST in teaching business ethics and the level of importance of key CST principles.

Literature review

Ethics in the academic business disciplines

The premier accrediting agency in business, the Association for the Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), has called for an increased emphasis on ethics, but that has not translated into widespread adoptions of codes of ethics in business schools (McKay et al., 2007). Recent years have brought increased attention to ethics in business schools as they prepare future business leaders, but many of these studies have been discipline-specific. For example, Labande and Piette (2000) examined ethical attitudes and perceptions of unethical behavior among academic economists. They examined behaviors in the areas of teaching, personal conduct, publication practices, and use of university resources. Typical of studies of academic integrity among students (e.g., McCabe et al., 2001), they found that the behaviors believed to be most unacceptable were perceived to be the least frequent. Their discussion, however, focused more on frequency than severity of infractions, with the exception of a discussion of sexual relationships with students being improper. Of the behaviors investigated, very few were considered severe ethical infractions.

Ethical attitudes can be difficult to measure directly, thus a line of research has approached the question using head/heart characteristics identified by Maccoby (1976). In studying 250 corporate executives, Maccoby concluded that the traits managers found most useful in business were those involving intellectual stimulation, traits of the head, whereas the less valued traits were qualities of the heart, such as compassion and generosity (Maccoby, 1976, p. 175).

Later authors took Maccoby's traits and suggested the danger of an imbalance between heart and head would be conducive to a lack of concern about ethics. Kreitner and Reif (1980) found that management students, like the managers studied by Maccoby, favored head traits. Stevens (1985), in replicating the Kreitner and Reif study, found similar results and concluded that business education needed to address and develop heart traits as well, claiming that, "these students would be better able to perceive the ethical implications of relevant business decisions" (Stevens, 1985, p. 295). Patten (1990) found that accountants valued more of the heart traits than did managers, but there was still an imbalance toward head traits, and thus accountants were not likely to be more ethical to a significant degree.

Fernandes et al. (1995) were the first to test Maccoby's categorization of head versus heart as well as to test whether an imbalance toward head traits led to less ethical behavior. Their factor analysis suggested that the original deductive dichotomy of head and heart was not necessarily valid, as some head and heart traits loaded together. Second, they found no significant difference between head-oriented and heart-oriented groups in their ethical inclinations or in their responses to purchasing ethics scenarios.

In considering differences between faculty in quantitative fields and qualitative fields, there may be some intuitive appeal to the head/heart traits. Although the only study to compare accountants to managers (Patten, 1990) found little difference between the two, it appears unlikely this approach would result in significant differences between quantitative specialists and qualitative specialists in their ethical perceptions, given the findings of Fernandes et al. (1995).

Meyer and McMahon (2004) conducted a narrower study, specifically focusing on the research ethics of accounting academics. This study added a dimension often missing in ethics research; in addition to asking about appropriateness and perceived frequency of behaviors, they also asked about first-hand knowledge of such behaviors. Generally speaking, their results followed the typical pattern of those behaviors deemed most inappropriate being perceived as happening least frequently. Furthermore, the subjects generally had no firsthand knowledge of the least acceptable behaviors or had seen them only in isolated instances. Although there were exceptions, even experienced journal editors who had processed numerous article submissions perceived no more frequent occurrence than did novice researchers at the beginning of their careers.

Finally, in areas where there was fewer consensus in the ratings, the authors suggested there was uncertainty and thus a need for more open discussion within the field.

Robie and Kidwell (2003) considered ethical relationships between business faculty and undergraduate students, asking faculty members if they perceived certain behaviors to be definitely ethical, definitely unethical or somewhere in between. Respondents identified only two behaviors as definitely unethical – giving lower grades to students who oppose the faculty members' views, and becoming sexually involved with a student who is taking a class from the faculty member. Seven behaviors were considered controversial as there was a relatively wide variance in whether they were considered ethical or unethical. These behaviors included several related to sexual relationships with other faculty, staff members and students who had completed a course with the faculty member as well as the selling of complimentary text books, befriending an undergraduate student currently in a class and maintaining a full-time consulting practice outside of academic duties.

Paradigm development and faculty ethics

Strength of paradigm development within a discipline is associated with various outcomes, including a higher level of resource allocations from external sources (grants) as well as internal sources (university), greater connections between academic research output and faculty pay, more departmental autonomy from university administrations, and less subjectivity in terms of editorial board appointments (Pfeffer, 1993).

Paradigm development in academic disciplines has also been a consideration in examining the setting of normative standards of faculty behavior in terms of classroom conduct and interactions with students. Generally speaking, disciplines of lower paradigmatic development see a more complementary relationship between teaching and research, have a higher affinity for improvement of teaching practices, and receive higher teaching evaluations (Braxton and Hargens, 1996).

In a study of attitudes toward faculty misconduct, Braxton and Bayer (1999) surveyed faculty in two more paradigmatically developed disciplines, biology and mathematics, and two less developed disciplines, history and psychology. They classified norms of behavior as inviolable norms, those demanding the most severe sanctions available, and admonitory norms, those largely ignored or to be handled informally. Biologists, who had the most paradigm development in their field, expressed greater disdain for a large set of misconduct behaviors, and a stronger consensus on inviolable versus admonitory norms. Specifically, they showed stronger disapproval for demeaning treatment of students and colleagues, particularistic grading, disrespect for student sensitivities, failure to disclose details of course expectations to students, and uncooperativeness in department matters than did faculty in history, psychology, and to some extent, mathematics (Braxton and Bayer, 1999).

By contrast, Braxton and Bayer (1999) labeled two inviolable norms as core norms, because they were held as equally unacceptable by faculty in all four disciplines. These were lack of attention to planning (i.e., failure to order books on time, lack of course syllabus on the first day) and moral turpitude (sexual relationships with students, suggestive sexual comments to students, and intoxication in class). Of the seven factors identified in an analysis of 33 behaviors, only these two emerged as core norms across disciplines.

Admonitory norms are those less severely viewed. Again, Braxton and Bayer (1999) found disciplinary differences, with biologists generally disapproving more of the following behaviors: advisement negligence, inadequate communication, inconvenience avoidance, inadequate course design, instructional narrowness, teaching secrecy, and undermining colleagues. Finally, they noted a need for research in applied disciplines, including those in business, because in these fields it is important not only to gain knowledge but also to apply it.

In another study of misconduct in various disciplines, Rupert and Holmes (1997) looked at ethics or conduct codes of professional associations for their focus on teaching. Just half addressed any teaching responsibilities and 20% addressed student–faculty relationships (sexual and financial). Despite the findings discussed above, they found that hard sciences, such as biology, almost uniformly neglect to address ethical conduct in teaching. Although their consideration of research ethics was commendable, the codes largely ignored a substantial component of the academic's role – that of teacher.

Catholic social teaching and business ethics

Catholic social teaching as applied to commerce emphasizes that people can develop and grow in an atmosphere that provides employees and employers with a chance to address the needs of others, to use their investigative skills and knowledge, and to feel empowered (Calvez and Naughton, 2002, p. 12). In various pronouncements over the years, church leaders have called on entrepreneurs and employers to establish such workplaces and not be driven only by profits. The general principle that work is for the individual, not the other way around, leads to the following principles for employers and business leaders (cf., Porth and McCall, 2001; Fleckenstein, 2002; Clark, 2002, 2004):

- Pay employees a livable and fair wage that allows them to support their families above the poverty line.
- Treat employees as equal partners in the production process and allow them to share a business's profits.
- Provide employees with reasonable job security and inform them when layoffs and plant closings are being considered.
- Have more regard for the effects of a business's actions on the surrounding community in making business decisions.
- Have higher regard for the employees' overall welfare in running the business.
- Provide employees with more involvement and participation in the business's decision-making process, including the right to engage in collective bargaining.

Instructors have suggested various ways for these principles to be taught to business students. Examples include teaching ethics in a way that stresses humanistic motivations suggested by CST and not only economic rationales for business actions (Clark, 2004), teaching labor relations in a framework that highlights employees' rights to organize to improve wages and working conditions (Fleckenstein, 2002), and teaching contract law in light of CST principles of good faith and fair dealing (Pierucci, 1997).

In the first systematic attempt to gauge familiarity with and relevance of CST principles to both Catholic and non-Catholic business faculty in the classroom, Kidwell and Kidwell (2006) found that whereas both Catholic and non-Catholic faculty at accredited business schools have similar moral views regarding professional interactions with students, faculty with a connection to Roman Catholicism are more likely to be familiar with and to use CST. Yet, even at Catholic institutions, a majority of faculty is not familiar with CST. As noted, the current study examines responses to these questions across academic disciplines.

Research questions

This study looks across business disciplines to consider faculty views regarding the moral nature of a variety of behaviors faced by professors in their interactions with undergraduate students and colleagues. We were interested in whether faculty whose disciplines have stronger paradigmatic development (economics, finance, accounting) differed in their views toward the morality of these behaviors when compared to faculty in disciplines with less paradigm agreement (management and marketing). Disciplines with stronger paradigmatic development were generally quantitative in nature whereas the disciplines less well developed around a dominant paradigm tend to be less quantitative in nature.

A review of the ethics literature as it relates to paradigm development in business fields and previous research in business school ethics led us to pose four research questions:

(1) To what extent are there significant differences in ethical views regarding specific faculty behaviors when faculty from quantitative and qualitative disciplines are compared?
(2) Could any patterns related to business discipline be detected when determining on which behaviors the two types of faculty differed in their ethical stance?
(3) To what might we attribute differences and similarities of ethical views when moral behaviors are examined by discipline?

(4) Were there any differences between the two general types of disciplines regarding the use of Catholic social teaching as a means of teaching business ethics? Were there any differences between the views of quantitative and qualitative faculty regarding application of CST principles to the business classroom?

Methodology

Sample and procedure

Participants in this study responded to an on-line survey of 4,000 faculty members at 89 AACSB-accredited schools regarding their views on a variety of ethical behaviors. Two ethics surveys conducted in different settings (Birch et al., 1999; Tabachnick et al., 1991) were used to develop a list of possible behaviors, and these behaviors were adapted to focus on relationships between business faculty and undergraduate students. Faculty members were asked their views regarding the moral appropriateness of various behaviors related to teaching and interacting with undergraduate students. Respondents were also asked about their familiarity with Catholic social teaching. Respondents who indicated familiarity with CST were asked about their use of CST in business classes and the relevance of CST principles to undergraduate business education.

Faculty at AACSB-accredited schools in all 50 states and in schools of sizes ranging from under 5,000 to more than 20,000 undergraduate enrollment were surveyed at random with their participation in the online survey solicited by email. The online survey had a 20% response rate (n = 830). Participants who did not answer one or more questions when submitting the survey received a prompt directing them to respond to unanswered question(s) before attempting to submit the survey again. Thus, there are no missing data.

Measures

Respondents were first asked to evaluate 55 statements about faculty behaviors involving professors and undergraduate students in terms of their ethical nature. Forty of the items were adapted from lists of more than 100 statements from two previous studies of ethical perceptions (Tabachnick et al., 1991; Birch et al., 1999). All of these statements were appropriate to use in an undergraduate business-school context or were slightly modified to that context. Fifteen other statements that related to circumstances found in business schools were written for the survey. The 55 statements can be obtained from the authors. The response scale on the behavioral statements ranged from 1 = definitely unethical to 5 = definitely ethical.

After the 55 behavioral statements, respondents were asked whether they were familiar, on a four-point scale, with the principles of Catholic social teaching as applied to business. Three items then tapped the use of CST and whether it was desirable to use CST principles in business classes at the undergraduate level. These items were measured on a four-point scale (1 = not at all; 2 = very little; 3 = somewhat; 4 = very much). Based on the principles discussed earlier, seven items were used to measure the relevance of Catholic social teaching principles to undergraduate business courses. The five-point response scale on these statements ranged from 1 = not at all important to 5 = extremely important. The specific items may be obtained from the authors. Demographic information on respondents' academic specialty, age, job status, race, sex, discipline, religious preference and whether they were employed at a Catholic or non-Catholic institution was also obtained.

Analysis

Responses were analyzed using independent samples t-tests, comparing means on each of the 55 behaviors between quantitative and qualitative specialists. In addition, Levene's test for equal variances was used to determine whether there was a difference in the level of consensus within the groups. Factor analysis was used to determine whether the norms described in Braxton and Bayer (1999) were similar to those among our sample, and composite scales developed from the factors were compared between the two groups. Finally, among those familiar with Catholic social teaching, univariate ANOVA was used to analyze whether the degree of familiarity with CST was related to its use in the classroom.

Results

Respondents were divided into two groups: Faculty who focused on more quantitative areas of teaching and research and faculty who focused on more qualitative (non-quantitative) subject matter. Table I shows the breakdown based on area of specialization as reported by respondents. We grouped disciplines and areas of specialization together based upon whether the faculty member's background was focused generally in one of nine quantitative areas (e.g., accounting, economics, finance, statistics, and related fields) or in one of 12 qualitative areas (e.g., management, marketing, ethics, or related fields). The groupings do not mean quantitative faculty focus exclusively on numbers and qualitative faculty do not use numbers in their courses or research. The grouping is meant to indicate whether a faculty member's area of specialization is grounded in a field predominantly concerned with quantitative issues or qualitative issues. In addition, we grouped specializations together based upon whether they are generally organized together into faculty departments.

TABLE I

Respondents by discipline/specialization

Quantitative specialties	*n*	Qualitative specialties	*n*
Accounting	141	Marketing	120
Finance	103	OB/HRM	79
Economics	91	Information Systems	62
Decision Sciences	18	Strategy	43
Business Statistics	15	Supply Chain/OM	37
Taxation	8	Business Law	28
Insurance	3	International Business	28
Real Estate	2	Entrepreneurship	17
Actuarial Science	2	Bus. Communications	15
		Ethics	13
		Health Care Admin.	3
		E-commerce	2

Views on behaviors

Using an independent samples *t*-test, we found statistically significant differences between the two groups on only 7 of the 55 behaviors (see Table II). Qualitative faculty members found the following behaviors significantly more unethical than did those who teach in more quantitative disciplines:

- Failure to acknowledge student participation in research or publication of research
- Ignoring a colleague's unethical behavior
- Selling complimentary textbooks
- Grading on a strict curve regardless of class performance level

TABLE II

Behaviors resulting in significant quantitative/qualitative differences

Behavior	Quantitative mean (SD)	Qualitative mean (SD)
Failure to acknowledge significant undergraduate student participation in research or publication*	1.40 (.793)	1.28 (.658)
Ignoring a colleague's unethical behavior*	2.16 (.966)	2.04 (.836)
Selling complimentary texts obtained from publishers to used book buyers**	2.67 (1.368)	2.38 (1.280)
Grading undergraduates on a strict curve regardless of class performance level*	3.12 (1.178)	2.95 (1.151)
Giving academic credit instead of salary for undergraduate student assistants*	2.76 (1.210)	2.94 (1.189)
Showing controversial media in undergraduates in class (e.g., union-organizing activities of exotic dancers)*	3.08 (1.244)	3.26 (1.136)
Bringing up certain class-related topics that are sexually or racially charged**	3.26 (1.269)	3.54 (1.165)

*$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$

Economics, finance, and accounting faculty found the following behaviors significantly less ethical than did management and marketing faculty:

- Giving academic credit instead of salary for undergraduate assistants
- Showing controversial media in class
- Bringing up sexually or racially charged topics

In addition, we conducted Levene's test for equality of variances as a measure of consensus with the two groups. Although the consensus was similar in both groups for the majority of behaviors, 11 (20%) of the behaviors had unequal variances. In each of these cases, the qualitative group had a higher degree of consensus (lower standard deviation) than did the quantitative group.

Finally, we conducted a factor analysis of the 55 behaviors. Using principal component analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization, we extracted 12 factors from the 55 behaviors. The factors were identified as follows (statistical analysis and individual question loadings are available from the authors):

- Sexual relationships
- Inattentive planning
- Not observing boundaries between faculty and students
- Lowered academic standards
- Excessive familiarity with students
- Authoritarian classroom
- Laziness in teaching
- Questionable grading
- Ignoring fiduciary responsibilities
- Belittling students
- Unresponsive grading
- Ignoring ethics and confidences

Composite scales were developed from the original 55 behaviors as they loaded onto the 12 factors, and means on the scales were compared across groups. Interestingly, only one of the factors resulted in a significant difference between the two groups. Ignoring ethics and confidences was considered significantly less ethical among the qualitative group than the quantitative group.

Views on Catholic social teaching

The findings indicated no significant differences between quantitative and qualitative faculty in their familiarity with Catholic social teaching. However, using a chi-square test in a sub-sample of faculty who were familiar with CST, the application of its principles in the classroom was significantly different: 69% of quantitative people use CST not at all or very little, whereas 60% of faculty teaching in qualitative areas use it somewhat or very much.

We also surveyed faculty on the importance and relevance of seven principles of CST in teaching undergraduate business classes. Between the two groups, we found several significant differences. Quantitative faculty found six of the seven CST elements listed to be less important or relevant than did qualitative faculty. These behaviors were payment of a just wage, providing job security, treating employees as equal partners in the business, giving them voice in decision making, considering the needs of the wider community, and considering the employees' general welfare. The only CST element that quantitative faculty deemed as important and relevant as did qualitative faculty was allowing employees to share in the profits of the business.

Discussion

Our premise in conducting this study was that those faculty who focus largely on numbers would have different ethical views than faculty whose emphasis is less quantitative. On more than 85% of suggested faculty behaviors, the business faculty respondents in quantitative and qualitative disciplines agreed as to whether the behavior in question was ethical or unethical.

However, the seven behaviors on which faculty moral views across disciplines were significantly different represent some interesting patterns that echoed the academic orientation of the respondents. One behavior quantitative faculty found less ethical involved providing credit rather than salary for undergraduate assistants, perhaps reflecting a view that financial incentives carry more weight. The other two behaviors that quantitative faculty found less ethical (showing controversial media in class and bringing up sexually or racially charged topics) may be explained by the likelihood that these techniques may not be considered relevant or appropriate to the subject matter they cover in their classes.

The behaviors that qualitative faculty found significantly less ethical than quantitative faculty may also reflect their disciplinary or teaching orientation. Selling complimentary textbooks and grading on a strict curve regardless of class performance level are behaviors that may be viewed by qualitative faculty as reflecting a lack of justice. Qualitative faculty may have conflicting views toward the economics of textbook sales by faculty (Robie et al., 2003), and may see strict curve grading as an arbitrary penalty to students who perform well. Failure to acknowledge student participation in research or publication of research and ignoring a colleague's unethical behavior may reflect the representativeness and inclusiveness that result in disciplines with less well-developed paradigms (cf., Pfeffer, 1993) as well as the human element that is the focus of non-quantitative courses.

The results were surprising in that more differences across disciplines were not observed, particularly in the factor analysis, which produced no significant differences in 11 of 12 factors. One question that can be raised relates to the point that the theoretical perspectives of quantitative disciplines (e.g., agency theory, transaction costs economics), in taking hold throughout the business school (Ghoshal, 2005), have tended to make the ethical views of business faculty more uniform. This uniformity may also be reinforced through the influence of the AACSB itself. Thus, a dominant (quantitative assumptions-based) paradigm is emerging in AACSB schools. Although this is an interesting proposition for future research, we do not think there is enough evidence here to support such a conclusion. In fact, the finding that on 11 of the behaviors the qualitative group had a greater degree of consensus than the quantitative group seems contrary to previous research findings that faculty in fields with higher levels of paradigm development had strong consensus regarding ethical norms of behavior (Braxton and Bayer, 1999).

The results related to Catholic social teaching seemed to reflect a more pronounced disciplinary orientation: non-quantitative faculty were more likely to use CST principles in their teaching than quantitative faculty. Quantitative faculty found six of the seven elements of CST (e.g., employee welfare, employee voice, employee job security) to be less important or relevant than qualitative faculty. The only element that quantitative faculty found to be as important as qualitative faculty reflected a bottom-line focus (allowing employees to share in the profits of the business).

Results of this study should be viewed in light of the way that faculty were classified as quantitative or qualitative by discipline. One limitation of the study is that the results do not indicate what specific subjects the responding faculty teach. For example, a professor in marketing research or management science may have a greater quantitative orientation than an accounting professor who teaches auditing or ethics. The categorization developed through paradigm strength, topical orientation, and departmental affiliation was finalized on consultation with colleagues, but the results may still be somewhat arguable.

Future research may attempt to address that limitation as well as bring student perspectives into the mix. A more systematic, theory-based study regarding the ethical views of students across disciplines would be a fruitful topic for future research as would an examination of the contrast between what students and their professors consider to be ethical faculty behaviors. Such research would assist in examining the degree to which the introduction of amoral theories that leave out human intentionality and choice (Ghoshal, 2005) have impacted the learning process and thus the ethics of business practice.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Chet Robie for his role in designing the survey instrument used in this study. We also wish to thank the Niagara University Fund for the Improvement of Teaching for providing financial assistance in connection with the data collection for this research. We are also grateful for the feedback received at a research workshop at the University of Wyoming and at the 12th Annual International Conference Promoting Business Ethics.

References

Barney, J. B.: 1990, 'The Debate Between Traditional Management Theory and Organizational Economics: Substantive Differences or Intergroup Conflict?', *Academy of Management Review* **15**, 382–393.

Birch, M., D. Elliott and M. A. Trankel: 1999, 'Black and White and Shades of Gray: A Portrait of the Ethical Professor', *Ethics & Behavior* **9**, 243–261.

Braxton, J. M. and A. E. Bayer: 1999, *Faculty Misconduct in Collegiate Teaching* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore).

Braxton, J. M. and L. L. Hargens: 1996, 'Variations Among Academic Disciplines: Analytical Frameworks and Research', in J. C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* 11 (Agathon Press, New York), pp. 1–46.

Calvez, J.-Y. and M. J. Naughton: 2002, 'Catholic Social Teaching and the Purpose of the Business Organization', in S. A. Cortright and M. J. Naughton (eds.), *Rethinking the Purpose of Business: Interdisciplinary Essays in the Catholic Social Tradition* (University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, IN), pp. 3–19.

Clark, C. M. A.: 2002, 'Competing Visions: Equity and Efficiency in the Firm', in S. A. Cortright and M. J. Naughton (eds.), *Rethinking the Purpose of Business: Interdisciplinary Essays in the Catholic Social Tradition* (University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, IN), pp. 81–101.

Clark, C. M. A.: 2004, 'Bringing Realism to Management Education: Contributions from Catholic Social Thought', *Review of Business* **25**(1), 6–14.

Fernandes, L., R. E. Plank and R. Landeros: 1995, 'Is Maccoby's Head/Heart Dichotomy a Measure of Ethical Inclination?', *American Business Review* **13**(1), 85–93.

Fleckenstein, M. P.: 2002, 'The 'Right to Associate' in Catholic Social Thought', *Journal of Business Ethics* **38**(1/2), 55–64.

Ghoshal, S.: 2005, 'Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices', *Academy of Management Learning & Education* **4**(1), 75–91.

Kennedy, R. G.: 2002, 'The Virtue of Solidarity and the Purpose of the Firm', in S. A. Cortright and M. J. Naughton (eds.), *Rethinking the Purpose of Business: Interdisciplinary Essays in the Catholic Social Tradition* (University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, IN), pp. 48–64.

Kidwell, R. E. and L. A. Kidwell: 2005, 'Ethical Beliefs in the Catholic Business School: The Impact of Catholic Social Teaching on Classroom Reality', *Journal of markets & Morality* **9**(2), 293–315.

Kotler, P.: 2005, 'The Role Played by the Broadening of the Marketing Movement in the History of Marketing Thought', *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* **24**, 114–116.

Kreitner, R. and W. E. Reif: 1980, 'Ethical Inclinations of Tomorrow's Managers: Cause for Alarm?', *Journal of Business Education* **55**, 25–29.

Labande, D. N. and M. J. Piette: 2000, 'Perceived Conduct and Professional Ethics Among College Economics Faculty', *American Economist* **44**(1), 24–33.

Maccoby, M.: 1976, *The Gamesman: The New Corporate Leaders* (Simon and Schuster, New York).

McCabe, D. L., L. K. Trevino and K. D. Butterfield: 2001, 'Cheating in Academic Institutions: A Decade of Research', *Ethics & Behavior* **11**(3), 219–232.

McKay, R. B., L. A. Kidwell and J. Kling: 2007, 'Faculty Ethics from the Perspective of College of Business Administrators', *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues* **10**, in press.

Meyer, M. J. and D. McMahon: 2004, 'An Examination of Ethical Research Conduct by Experienced and Novice Accounting Academics', *Issues in Accounting Education* **19**(4), 413–442.

Patten, D. M.: 1990, 'The Differential Perception of Accountants to Maccoby's Head/Heart Traits', *Journal of Business Ethics* **9**(10), 791–798.

Pfeffer, J.: 1993, 'Barriers to the Advance of Organizational Science: Paradigm Development as a Dependent Variable', *Academy of Management Review* **18**, 599–620.

Pierucci, E. S.: 1997, 'Enhancing the Catholic Character of an Undergraduate Business Law Course', *Review of Business* **19**(1), 22–27.

Porth, S. J. and J. McCall: 2001, 'Contemporary Management Theories and Catholic Social Teaching', *Review of Business* **22**(3), 8–15.

Reiter, S. A.: 1998, 'Economic Imperialism and the Crisis in Financial Accounting Research', *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* **9**, 143–171.

Robie, C. and R. E. Kidwell, Jr: 2003, 'The 'Ethical' Professor and the Undergraduate Student: Current Perceptions of Moral Behavior among Business School Faculty', *Journal of Academic Ethics* **1**, 153–173.

Robie, C., R. E. Kidwell, Jr and J. Kling: 2003, 'The Ethics of Professorial Book Selling: Morality, Money and 'Black Market' Books', *Journal of Business Ethics* **47**, 61–76.

Rupert, P. A. and D. L. Holmes: 1997, 'Dual Relationships in Higher Education: Professional and Institutional Guidelines', *Journal of Higher Education* **68**, 660–678.

Stevens, G. E.: 1985, 'Ethical Inclinations of Tomorrow's Managers: One More Time', *Journal of Business Education* **60**(7), 291–296.

Tabachnick, B. G., P. Keith-Spiegel and K. S. Pope: 1991, 'Ethics of Teaching: Beliefs and Behaviors of Psychologists as Educators', *American Psychologist* **46**, 506–515.

Linda A. Kidwell
Department of Accounting, College of Business,
University of Wyoming,
1000 E. University Avenue,
Laramie, WY, 82071,
U.S.A.
E-mail: lkidwell@uwyo.edu

Roland E. Kidwell
Department of Management and Marketing,
College of Business,
University of Wyoming,
1000 E. University Avenue,
Laramie, WY, 82071,
U.S.A.
E-mail: rkidwell@uwyo.edu