Table 4
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Matrix of Variables Used in Study 2

Variable	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Charitable giving	2.48	0.71	—							
2. Gender	0.46	0.50	.28**	—						
3. Age	21.34	2.99	.03	.01	—					
4. Social desirability bias	3.72	2.97	.04	.09	.05	—				
5. Moral identity internalization	6.07	0.97	.09	.21**	.03	.21**	—			
6. Moral identity symbolization	4.05	1.19	.27**	.23**	−.12	−.01	.26**	—		
7. Perceptual moral attentiveness	3.89	1.14	.15*	.04	−.05	−.06	.11	.16*	—	
8. Reflective moral attentiveness	4.26	1.05	.03	.01	.00	.10	.08	.14*	.46**	—

Note. $N = 241$.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Study 3: Moral Attentiveness and Reported Moral Behavior

Method

Sample

Participants were recruited from a standing panel of participants that had been created for social scientific research (see http://studyresponse.syr.edu/studyresponse/index.htm for details). With the assistance of list administrators, a recruitment e-mail was sent to roughly 2,000 managers in a variety of industries inviting them to participate anonymously in the secured online study about "decision making." A reminder e-mail was sent 1 week later. Two hundred forty-two managers completed the survey. Within this sample, 101 (41.7%) were male, and most (84.3%) were Caucasian. Forty were younger than 30 years old, and 42 were older than 50 years old. Although low, the response rate is not unusual for a Web survey conducted under these conditions (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000). A comparison of the dependent variables across the first and last 50 respondents indicated no statistical differences; self-reported moral behavior, $F(1, 99) = 0.05$, $p = .83$, others' moral behavior, $F(1, 99) = 1.76$, $p = .19$, suggesting no systematic sampling error (Dilman, 1978).

Table 5
Regression Results: Predicting Self-Reported Moral Behavior (Charitable Giving) in Study 2

		Model 2	
Variable	Model 1 *B*	*B*	CI
Constant	1.70**	1.50**	0.58, 2.43
Gender	0.33**	0.33**	0.15, 0.50
Age	0.01	0.01	−0.02, 0.04
Social desirability	0.01	0.01	−0.02, 0.04
Moral identity internalization	−0.01	−0.02	−0.12, 0.07
Moral identity symbolization	0.14**	0.13**	0.05, 0.21
Perceptual moral attentiveness		0.10*	0.01, 0.18
Reflective moral attentiveness		−0.04	−0.13, 0.05
R^2	.13	.14	
F	6.63**	5.50**	
ΔR^2		.02	
ΔF		2.48	

Note. $N = 241$. CI = confidence interval.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Measures

Self-reported moral behavior. Self-reported moral behavior was measured with Newstrom and Ruch's (1975) scale of ethical behavior. The scale, which is widely used in business ethics research (Akaah, 1996; Ford & Richardson, 1994; Moon & Franke, 2000), lists 17 workplace behaviors considered a priori to be unethical, such as "divulging confidential information" and "falsifying reports." Participants were instructed to "indicate how often you have personally engaged" in each of the behaviors (1 = *never,* 7 = *very frequently*; $\alpha = .91$).

Others' moral behavior. Others' moral behavior was measured with a modified version of the self-reported moral behavior measure. Respondents were asked to "please indicate how often, to the best of your knowledge, others at your work have engaged in the following behaviors." Newstrom and Ruch's (1975) list of 17 unethical workplace behaviors followed. Although this scale is typically used as a self-report measure, Weaver and Treviño (1999) used a similar "others" version of this scale to reduce social desirability bias and provided evidence of the validity of this approach. The reliability figure for this measure was .93.

Other measures. As in Study 2, the instrument included measures that have repeatedly been linked to these kinds of moral behaviors: gender, age, social desirability, internalization, and symbolization. As in Study 2, the last three measures each demonstrated acceptable reliability (αs = .75, .78, and .88, respectively).

Results and Discussion

A correlation matrix of the data and results of the regression analysis are presented in Table 6 and Table 7, respectively. As Table 7 reveals, even after accounting for the effects of key variables from the literature, perceptual moral attentiveness was positively associated with the dependent variable self-reported moral behavior; the greater the moral attentiveness of the individual, the more he or she self-reported immoral behaviors. The effect size (f^2) of perceptual moral attentiveness was .02, which suggested a small but meaningful influence. To wit, when the moral attentiveness measures were included in the model, gender and

Table 6
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Matrix of Variables Used in Study 3

Variable	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1. Self-reported moral behavior	1.93	0.75	—								
2. Others' moral behavior	3.06	1.18	.47**	—							
3. Gender	0.42	0.49	.16*	.01	—						
4. Age (categorical)	1.49	1.01	−.21**	−.10	.15*	—					
5. Social desirability bias	6.24	3.70	−.48**	.26**	−.12	.26**	—				
6. Moral identity internalization	6.23	0.89	−.36**	−.10	−.15*	.18**	.38**	—			
7. Moral identity symbolization	4.27	1.41	−.06	.04	−.19**	.07	.25**	.29**	—		
8. Perceptual moral attentiveness	3.67	1.52	.21**	.16*	.06	−.07	−.15*	−.05	.16*	—	
9. Reflective moral attentiveness	4.14	1.45	.05	.02	.00	−.02	−.01	.14*	.26**	.58**	—

Note. $N = 242$.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

symbolization both became insignificant. These results provided additional evidence to support Hypothesis 1. Additionally, results revealed that perceptual moral attentiveness significantly predicted the reporting of others' immoral behaviors. Although the effect size was small ($f^2 = .02$), to the extent that an individual scored high on perceptual moral attentiveness, he or she reported more unethical behaviors by others in the workplace. This result also supported Hypothesis 1.

Considered by themselves, the results of Study 2 could have led to a conclusion that individuals who are perceptually morally attentive are more moral. The results of Study 3, however, suggest that these findings are an artifact of the attention the individual pays to moral issues such that when a question about morals and morality is asked, whether it pertains to moral or immoral behaviors, the perceptually morally attentive person is able to recall information more readily and to report a greater incidence of morality-related behaviors than a less morally attentive person. This point underscores the interpretive aspect of perceptual moral attentiveness. Morally attentive individuals are simply more cognizant of the potentially moral content or consequences of everyday behavior, and such perceptual differences influence their evaluations of their own behavior and the behavior of others.

Study 4: Linking Moral Attentiveness to Moral Awareness

Studies 2 and 3 established a perceptual effect of moral attentiveness on reporting of morality-related behaviors (Hypothesis 1). The purpose of Study 4 was to explore the relationship between moral attentiveness and moral awareness (Hypothesis 2).

Method

Sample and Procedure

Participants were 159 second-year MBA students in a management course at a West Coast university. Of the respondents, 120 were male, and most were Caucasian (60%) or Asian (24%). Ages

Table 7
Regression Results of Study 3

	Self-reported moral behavior			Others' moral behavior		
		Model 2			Model 2	
Variable	Model 1 *B*	*B*	CI	Model 1 *B*	*B*	CI
Constant	3.192**	2.99**	2.37, 3.62	3.35**	3.08**	1.95, 4.22
Gender	0.18*	0.17	−0.00, 0.33	0.01	−0.01	−0.31, 0.30
Age	−0.06	−0.05	−0.14, 0.03	−0.04	−0.03	−0.19, 0.12
Social desirability bias	−0.08**	−0.08**	−0.10, −0.05	−0.08**	−0.08**	−0.12, −0.03
Moral identity internalization	−0.17**	−0.16**	−0.26, −0.06	−0.02	0.00	−0.18, 0.19
Moral identity symbolization	0.07*	0.06	−0.01, 0.12	0.10	0.09	−0.03, 0.20
Perceptual moral attentiveness		0.07*	0.00, 0.13		0.13*	0.01, 0.25
Reflective moral attentiveness		−0.01	−0.08, 0.06		−0.09	−0.21, 0.04
R^2	.29		.31	.08		.09
F	19.07**		14.46**	3.86**		3.43**
ΔR^2			.01			.02
ΔF			2.39			2.26

Note. $N = 242$. CI = confidence interval.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 5.12. Sample Regression Table

Table X

Predictors of Self-Reported Moral Behavior

	Self-reported moral behavior		
		Model 2	
Variable	Model 1 *B*	*B*	95% CI
Constant	3.192**	2.99**	[2.37, 3.62]
Gender	0.18*	0.17	[–0.00, 0.33]
Age	–0.06	–0.05	[–0.14, 0.03]
Social desirability bias	–0.08**	–0.08**	[–0.10, –0.05]
Moral identity internalization	–0.17**	–0.16**	[–0.26, –0.06]
Moral identity symbolization	0.07*	0.06	[–0.01, 0.12]
Perceptual moral attentiveness		0.07*	[0.00, 0.13]
Reflective moral attentiveness		–0.01	[–0.08, 0.06]
R^2	.29	.31	
F	19.07**	14.46**	
ΔR^2		.01	
ΔF		2.39	

Note. $N = 242$. CI = confidence interval. Adapted from "Moral Attentiveness: Who Pays Attention to the Moral Aspects of Life?" by S. J. Reynolds, 2008, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93,* p. 1035. Copyright 2008 by the American Psychological Association.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.