

***Southwestern Business Administration Journal***  
***(SBAJ)***

**ISSN: 1554-7892**

**Volume 13 Issue 1&2, 2013, pp. 1-22**

---

**THE IMPACT OF MACHIAVELLIANISM AND OPPORTUNISM  
ON BUSINESS STUDENTS' LOVE OF MONEY**

**Rafik Z. Elias, California State University, Los Angeles**

**ABSTRACT**

*The love of money psychological variable has been linked to unethical behavior in business. The current study examines business students' love of money and relates it to two important psychological determinants: Machiavellianism and opportunism. A total of 474 business students in two universities were surveyed. The majority of business students were money admirers and many were money worshippers. They scored average on Machiavellianism (i.e. the tendency to manipulate others for their self-interest) and below average on opportunism. The results showed that business students high on Machiavellianism have a higher love of money. Similar results appeared regarding opportunistic behavior and the love of money. The study has important implications for business instructors.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

The past decade has witnessed an increasing number of business scandals (e.g. Enron, Worldcom, Lehman Brothers). Significant research has attributed this unethical behavior to corporate managers' greed and excessive love of money (e.g. Wong 2008). This relationship has generated significant interest in the love of money psychological variable. Tang (1992) defined it as one's meaning and aspiration for money. Excessive love of money has been related to unethical behavior in business (Vitell et al. 2007).

The current study examines the extent of the love of money among undergraduate business students. These students will be the future accountants, managers, and financial analysts. Therefore, it is important to understand how they view money in that very early stage of their career before they even enter the workplace. The study also relates the love of money to two psychological variables: Machiavellianism and opportunism. Individuals who are high Machiavellianists have a tendency to look out only for themselves and manipulate others for personal gain (Christie and Geis (1970)). Opportunists will behave unethically under tempting circumstances to maximize their self-interest (Williamson 1975). The study will give us an understanding of business students as they learn about business practices and norms and will show their current stage regarding the love of money.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: The next section provides a background on the love of money and its consequences as well as Machiavellianism and opportunism, especially as they relate to business situations. Hypotheses are introduced based on the literature review. The following section discusses the study design and methodology. This will be followed by a discussion of the results, implications and suggestions for future research.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### ***The Love of Money***

Money has different social meanings (Zelizer, 1994). Lea and Webley (2006) characterize money as a tool and a drug. Money as a tool is instrumental in satisfying biological and psychological needs. Yet, just like drugs, money is a powerful, addictive and insatiable drug to some people (Lea and Webley, 2006). Therefore, the meaning of money is in the eye of the beholder.

Building on this concept, Tang (1992) introduced the love of money as a psychological variable. He defined it as one's attitude toward money, the meaning people attribute to money, and people's aspiration for money. More specifically, he identified positive and negative attitudes toward money such as achievements using money, obsession with money and money management and self-esteemed. Tang (1992) developed the Money Ethics Scale and a modification of this scale will be used to conduct the current study. The love of money construct has been considered one of the most well-developed and systematically used measures of money attitude in the literature (Mitchell and Mickel, 1999).

Research investigated the consequences of the love of money on behavior in a business environment. Many cases of corporate fraud were discovered in the last decade (e.g. Enron and more recently Lehman Brothers). These scandals resulted in hundreds of thousands of job losses, the bankruptcy of a major accounting firm and the implementation of the Sarbanes Oxley Act. Significant research concluded that these scandals were not caused by executives' lack of intelligence, but rather by their lack of virtue and their love of money (Feiner, 2004). Wong (2008) found that individuals with a higher love of money exhibited higher unethical perception. Similar results were obtained by Vitell et al. (2007) in a marketing environment. Tang and Liu (2012) found that in the presence of an ethical and higher-character supervisor, an employee with significant love of money was likely to obey authority figures and do what is ethically right. However, in the presence of an unethical supervisor, high love of money individuals could not resist temptation and would behave unethically.

These findings point to the importance of the love of money variable in business situations. This importance should be

***Southwestern Business Administration Journal***  
***(SBAJ): 13(1&2), 1-22***

emphasized in business education, before students enter the workplace. In 1971, only 49.9% of freshmen said the major reason for going to college is “to make more money”. Twenty years later, that percentage jumped to 75.1% (The American Freshman, 1994). More recent research found that the lack of money is a major cause of dissatisfaction among University students (Bryan, 2004). In a recent study, Elias and Farag (2010) found that 35% of accounting students admired money and an additional 25% actually worshipped money. The current study offers two psychological variables as potentially related to the love of money: Machiavellianism and opportunism.

***Machiavellianism***

Christie and Geis (1970) developed a personality trait they called “Machiavellianism” based on studying religious and political leaders who manipulated their subordinates for their own self-interest. This trait suggests a calculating rationality little influenced by emotions, interpersonal attachments or empathy (Wastell and Booth, 2003). Christie and Geis (1970) identified several characteristics of high Machiavellianists such as a willingness to use manipulative tactics and endorsement of a cynical, untrustworthy view of human nature.

Significant research has investigated the consequences of possessing a Machiavellianist personality. High Machs engaged in influence tactics such as building political connections and intimidation (Harrell, 1980), had little job satisfaction (Gabel and Topol, 1987), chose management or legal careers (Chonko, 1982) and were less likely to help others when an accident occurred (Wolfson, 1981). In addition, Machiavellianists tended to be disagreeable (Elfenbein et al., 2008), uncooperative (Paal and Bereczkei, 2007), and exploitive in relationships (Mullins and Kopelman, 1988).

In a business context, Machiavellianism was positively associated with choosing financial success as a primary goal in life, rather than self-actualization, family or community (McHoskey, 1995). Sakalaki et al. (2009) found that Machiavellianism was positively correlated with economic locus of control. Ross and Robertson (2003) reported that Machiavellianists believed that bribes produced good customer relations and Tziner et al. (1996)

found them to believe that performance appraisals may need to be falsified for political reasons. In a study of undergraduate students, Malinowski (2009) found that students high in Machiavellianism were less likely to believe questionable actions were wrong and did not anticipate guilt if they engaged in such action. Based on the previous research, it is reasonable to assume that students high in Machiavellianism would have a higher love of money and therefore H1 is tested in the current study:

H1: Business students scoring higher on Machiavellianism will have a higher love of money than those scoring low on the Machiavellianism scale.

### ***Opportunism***

Williamson (1975, 6) defined opportunism as “a lack of candor or honesty in transactions to include self-interest seeking with guile”. Rodney and Heide (1996) expanded the concept to include malicious behavior such as lying, cheating, deceit and violations of agreements. Opportunistic behavior can include withholding or distorting information or failing to fulfill promises for obligations. John (1984) noted that people had a tendency to act opportunistic whenever it was feasible and profitable. Williamson (1985) noted that people did not behave opportunistically all the time. However, it was necessary to take opportunism for granted because there was no way to distinguish opportunists from non-opportunists. Sakalaki et al. (2009) found that opportunists tended to have an external economic locus of control and believed strongly in chance and luck.

In a business context, opportunistic tendencies can cripple efficient exchange because it was possible to profit from such behavior (John, 1984). Research has examined the negative consequences of opportunism. Al-Khatib et al. (2005) found that opportunistic shoppers were less likely to perceive questionable actions as unethical. In an academic environment, Rawwas et al. (2004) found that students in the U.S. and China who were more opportunistic perceived cheating actions as less unethical compared to less opportunistic students. Similar findings were reported by Rawwas et al. (2007). Based on the previous research, the current study examines the relationship between the love of money and opportunism as stated in the following hypothesis:

H2: There is a positive relationship between the love of money and opportunism.

Previous research has also shown a relationship between Machiavellianism and opportunism. Sakalaki et al. (2007) found that students scoring higher on Machiavellianism were more likely to behave opportunistically compared to other students.

Therefore, the current study examines this relationship in the following hypothesis:

H3: There is a positive relationship between Machiavellianism and opportunism.

## **STUDY METHODOLOGY**

### ***Sample Selection***

The sample for this study consisted of undergraduate business students enrolled in two universities on the West Coast (one large public AACSB-accredited, and one medium liberal arts). Students taking a variety of undergraduate classes were surveyed during class time. The survey took about 15 minutes to complete and anonymity was guaranteed. After disregarding surveys with missing responses, the final sample consisted of 474 students (333 in the large university and 141 in the other one). A comparison of the results on each scale was conducted to determine if there were significant differences between students in both universities. No statistically significant differences were found. Therefore, both samples were combined in the statistical analyses that followed.

### ***Study Measures***

Several scales were used to conduct this study. The Love of Money 15-point scale developed by Tang et al. (2003) was used. Respondents recorded their agreement with each statement regarding money on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scores indicate higher love of money. The scale yielded five factors: Budget (one's ability to manage money carefully), Evil (the love of money is the root of all evil), Equity (internal and individual equity), Success (money is a measure of success), and Motivator (money motivates people to

***Southwestern Business Administration Journal***  
***(SBAJ): 13(1&2), 1-22***

work harder). Several studies also identified clusters of individuals with certain combinations of the five factors above. The current study yielded three clusters: Money worshippers (who possessed the highest love of money and the most positive attitude toward it), money admirers (who admired money but did not necessarily think it had positive consequences), and money repellents (who considered money as evil and had negative attitude toward it).

In order to measure Machiavellianism, the scale developed by Dahling et al. (2009) was used. The scale developed by Christie and Geis (1970) has been extensively used in the literature to measure Machiavellianism. However, recent research found several problems with this scale such as inconsistent reliability, an ambiguous factor structure and the inclusion of several poor items (Dahling et al. 2009). On the other hand, the scale developed by Dahling et al. (2009) had excellent reliability of .84 and consisted of 16 statements. The respondent recorded his/her agreement with each statement on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scores indicated higher Machiavellianism. The scale yielded four factors: Amorality (the lack of ethics vision in different situations), Desire for control (the desire to manipulate others for a person's self-interest), Desire for status (the desire to show wealth and power), and Distrust of others (the constant suspicion of others' intent).

To measure opportunism, the scale developed by Rawwas et al. (2004) was used. Although consisting of only two items, this scale was better related to students' academic life than other scales. It measures acting on an opportunistic situation such as taking advantage of answers that a student inadvertently saw on another student's exam. The student recorded his/her perception of the ethics of such situations on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly ethical) and 7 (strongly unethical). If a student scores higher on this scale, it is assumed that he/she is less opportunistic since he/she would not take advantage of such opportunistic situations.

**STUDY RESULTS**

Table 1 presents demographic information about the sample. As indicated, the sample was almost equally divided between males and females, and between sophomores, juniors and seniors, and consisting of mostly younger students. Accounting majors represented the majority of the sample.

**TABLE 1: DEMOGRAPHIC AND SUMMARY INFORMATION (N=474)**

<b>Panel A: Demographic Information</b>					
<u>Gender</u>	<u>N</u>		<u>Major</u>	<u>N</u>	
Male	250		Accounting	138	
Female	224		Management	77	
			Marketing	42	
			Economics	18	
<u>Age</u>	<u>N</u>				
years or <	339		CIS	36	
25 years old	135		Finance	35	
			General Business	97	
			Nonbusiness major	31	
<u>Class Grade</u>	<u>N</u>				
Sophomore	108				
Junior	217				
Senior	149				
<b>Panel B: The Love of Money*</b>					
<u>Factor</u>	<u>Mean(SD)</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>	<u>Money clusters</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Budget	5.21(1.28)	.78	Money worshippers	254	54
Evil	4.18(1.37)	.63	Money admirers	125	26
Equity	4.72(1.08)	.51	Money repellents	95	20
Success	4.58(1.63)	.85			
Motivator	5.93(1.01)	.71			
<b>Panel C: Machiavellianism*</b>					
<u>Dimension</u>	<u>Mean(SD)</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>			
Amorality	2.43 (1.36)	.75			
Desire for Control	4.15 (1.53)	.68			
Desire for Status	5.07 (1.41)	.82			
Distrust of Others	3.93 (1.28)	.80			
Total Machiavellianism	3.79 (1.02)	.78			



**Southwestern Business Administration Journal**  
**(SBAJ): 13(1&2), 1-22**

<b>Panel D: Opportunism **</b>	
	<u>Mean(SD)</u>
Opportunism	5.08 (1.58)
<b>*1 (strongly disagree) 7(strongly agree)</b>	
<b>Higher scores indicate higher love of money and Machiavellianism</b>	
<b>** 1 (strongly ethical) 7 (strongly unethical)</b>	
<b>Lower scores indicate higher opportunism</b>	

Students generally agreed that budgeting using money is important and strongly agreed that money was a motivator. They slightly agreed that money is a sign of success and that it provides equity among individuals. They were neutral in their assessment on whether money was evil. Cluster analysis was performed on the sample to determine students who share similar views of money similar to Tang et al. (2003). Overall, more than half (54%) of the students were classified as money worshippers, while an additional quarter (26%) were classified as money admirers and only 20% of the students were money repellents. These results are consistent with those obtained by Tang et al. (2003).

Regarding Machiavellianism, students were neutral on their Machiavellian attitudes. They generally scored higher on desire for status and slightly high on desire for control of others. However, their amorality scores were low and their scores were average regarding distrust of others. Their opportunism mean score of 5.08/7.0 indicates they were not highly opportunistic.

The next series of tests examined demographic factors and their relationships with the study variables. The results are presented in Table 2.

**Southwestern Business Administration Journal**  
**(SBAJ): 13(1&2), 1-22**

**TABLE 2: LOVE OF MONEY, MACHIAVELLIANISM, OPPORTUNISM AND DEMOGRAPHICS**

<b>Panel A: Love of Money and Demographics</b>							
	<u>Gender</u>		<u>Age</u>		<u>Grade</u>		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>25 or &lt;</u>	<u>&gt; 25</u>	<u>Sopho.</u>	<u>Junior</u>	<u>Senior</u>
Budget			5.15*	5.37*			
Evil	4.24*	4.09*			3.90*	4.23*	4.30*
Equity							
Success			4.67**	4.34**			
Motivator	5.98*	5.83*					
<b>Panel B: Machiavellianism and Demographics</b>							
	<u>Gender</u>		<u>Age</u>				
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>25 or &lt;</u>	<u>&gt;25</u>			
Amorality	2.62***	2.21***	2.38**	2.43**			
Desire for Control	4.37***	3.90***	4.01**	4.18**			
Desire for Status	5.16***	4.90***					
Distrust of Others							
Total Machiavellianism	3.92***	3.65***	3.75*	3.81*			
<b>Panel C: Opportunism and Demographics (lower scores indicate higher opportunism)</b>							
	<u>Gender</u>		<u>Age</u>		<u>Grade</u>		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>25 or &lt;</u>	<u>&gt; 25</u>	<u>Sopho.</u>	<u>Junior</u>	<u>Senior</u>
Opportunism	4.85***	5.33***	5.11***	5.00***	4.79**	5.05**	5.32**
***p<.01							
**p<.05							
*p<.10							

Male students were more likely to agree that money was evil and that it was a motivator compared to females. Nontraditional students were more likely to agree with the importance of budgeting and less likely to agree that money was a measure of success compared to younger students. In addition, seniors were more likely to perceive money as evil followed by juniors and sophomores.

***Southwestern Business Administration Journal***  
***(SBAJ): 13(1&2), 1-22***

Regarding Machiavellianism, male students scored higher on the Machiavellianism scale compared to females. Specifically, males were more likely to believe in the amorality of actions, the desire to control others and the desire for status compared to females. Nontraditional students also scored higher on the Machiavellianism scale and specifically on the immorality of actions and the desire for controlling others compared to younger students. Regarding opportunism, male students, nontraditional students and sophomores were more opportunistic compared to females, younger, and junior and senior students respectively.

Correlation analyses were performed among the study variables. The results are presented in Table 3.

**TABLE 3:CORRELATION BETWEEN LOVE OF MONEY, MACHIAVELLIANISM AND OPPORTUNISM**

	Evil	Equity	Success	Motivator	Amorality	Control	Status	Distrust	Machiav.	Oppor
Budget	.08**	.12***								
Evil	.12***		.15***		.06*	.25***	.17***			
Equity		.11***			.06*		.10**			
Success		.43***	.22***	.15***	.45***	.14***	.32***	-.10**		
Motivator			.12***	.21***	.44***	.07**	.25***	-.07**		
Amorality				.35***	.28***	.41***	.70***	-.25***		
Control					.44***	.26***	.66***	-.14***		
Status						.25***	.60***	-.13***		
Distrust							.71***			
Machiav.									-.18***	
***p<.01	**p<.05			*p<.10						

The results generally show that the love of money is positively associated with Machiavellianism. These results were more significant among those who believed that money was a measure of success and a motivator. Those students were more Machiavellianists compared to others. Even those who perceived money as evil showed higher levels of Machiavellianism than others, especially concerning the amorality of actions and distrust of others. These results, therefore, lead us to accept H1.

There was also a significant relationship between the love of money and opportunism. Students who believed money provided equity among individuals were less opportunistic than others. Students who believed money was a measure of success and a motivator were more opportunistic than others. Therefore, these results support H2. As expected, there was also a significant relationship between Machiavellianism and opportunism. Students scoring higher on Machiavellianism were more opportunistic than others and H3 is supported.

Table 4 presents the results of Analysis of Variance using the love of money clusters. The results showed that money worshippers were much more likely to be Machiavellianists compared to money admirers and money repellents. Specifically, money worshippers were more likely to believe in the amorality of actions and more likely to distrust others compared to money repellents. Money worshippers were also generally more opportunistic than money repellents.

**TABLE 4: LOVE OF MONEY CLUSTERS, MACHIAVELLIANISM AND OPPORTUNISM**

	Money worshippers	Money admirers	Money repellents
	Mean	Mean	Mean
Amorality	2.57**	2.47**	2.35**
Desire for control			
Desire for status			
Distrust of others	4.05*	3.93*	3.84*
Total Machiavellianism	3.87*	3.79*	3.71*
Opportunism	5.00*	5.05*	5.14*
**p<.05			
*p<.10			

## DISCUSSION

The current study found significant relationships between business students' love of money and their Machiavellianism and opportunism tendencies. Generally, the great majority of students were at least money admirers (80%). These results are normal and consistent with the emphasis on "the bottom-line" in business education. However, the troubling results were that students with higher love of money tended to be Machiavellianists and opportunists. These negative results are not comforting since current business students are tomorrow's business leaders and the business world has been rocked by significant scandals in the last decade. Business instructors should be aware of this relationship and work on sensitizing students to ethics in business. They should focus less on the "win-at-all-costs" mentality and instead emphasize the love of money in an ethical environment. A future interesting study can examine whether business ethics education can mediate

the relationship between the love of money and Machiavellianism and opportunism.

### REFERENCES

- Al-Khatib, J. A., Stanton, A. D., & Rawwas, M. Y. A. (2005). Ethical segmentation of consumers in developing countries: A comparative analysis. *International Marketing Review*, 22, 225-246.
- The American Freshman (1994). *Higher Education Research Institute*. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Bryan, R. G. (2004). A survey on causes of dissatisfaction at college. Paper presented at the 112<sup>th</sup> annual convention of the American Psychological Association.
- Chonko, L. B. (1982). Machiavellianism: Sex differences in the profession of purchasing management. *Psychological Reports*, 51, 645-646.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York, Academic Press.
- Dhaling, J. J., Whitaker, B. G., & Levy, P. E. (2009). The development and validation of a new Machiavellianism scale. *Journal of Management*, 35, 219-257.
- Elfenbein, H. A., Curhan, J. R., Eisenkraft, N., Shirako, A., & Baccaro, L. (2008). Are some negotiators better than others? Individual differences in bargaining outcomes. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 1463-1475.
- Elias, R. Z., & Farag, M. (2012). The relationship between accounting students' love of money and their ethical perception. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 25, 269-281.
- Feiner, M. (2004). *The Feiner Points of Leadership*. New York, Warner Business Books.

**Southwestern Business Administration Journal**  
**(SBAJ): 13(1&2), 1-22**

- Gabel, M., & Topol, M. (1987). Job satisfaction and Machiavellian orientation among department store executives. *Psychological Reports*, 60, 211-216.
- Harrell, W. A. (1980). Retaliatory aggression by high and low Machiavellians against remorseful and non-remorseful wrongdoers. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 8, 217-220.
- John, G. (1984). An empirical investigation of some antecedents of opportunism in marketing channels. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 21, 278-288.
- Lea, S. E. G., & Webley, P. (2006). Money as a tool, money as drug: The biological psychology of a strong incentive. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 29, 161-209.
- Malinowski, C. (2009). The relationship between Machiavellianism and undergraduate student attitudes about hypothetical marketing moral dilemmas. *Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal*, 19, 398-408.
- McHoskey, J. W. (1995). Narcissism and Machiavellianism. *Psychological Reports*, 77, 755-759.
- Mitchell, T. R., & Mickel, A. E. (1999). The meaning of money: An individual difference perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 568-578.
- Mullins, L. S., & Kopelman, R. E. (1988). Toward the assessment of the construct validity of four measures of narcissism. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52, 610-625.
- Paal, T., & Bereczkei, T. (2007). Adult theory of mind, cooperation, Machiavellianism: The effect of mindreading on social relations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, 541-551.



**Southwestern Business Administration Journal**  
**(SBAJ): 13(1&2), 1-22**

- Rawwas, M. Y. A., Swaidan, Z., & Isakson, H. (2007). A comparative study of ethical beliefs of Master of Business Administration students in the United States with those in Hong Kong. *Journal of Education for Business*, January/February, 146-158.
- Rawwas, M. Y. A., Al-Khatib, J. A., & Vitell, S. (2004). Academic dishonesty: A cross-cultural comparison of U.S. and Chinese Marketing students. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26, 89-100.
- Rodney, S., & Heide, J. B. (1996). Controlling supplier opportunism in industrial relationships. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33, 431-441.
- Ross, W. T., & Robertson, D. C. (2003). A typology of situational factors: Impact of salesperson decision-making about ethical issues. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 46, 213-234.
- Sakalaki, M., Kanellaki, S., & Richardson, C. (2009). Is a manipulator's externality paradoxical? The relationship between Machiavellianism, economic opportunism, and economic locus of control. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39, 2591-2603.
- Sakalaki, M., Richardson, C., & Thepaut, Y. (2007). Machiavellianism and economic opportunism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 1181-1190.
- Tang, T. L. P., & Liu, H. (2012). Love of money and unethical behavior intention: Does an authentic supervisor's personal integrity and character (ASPIRE) make a difference? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107, 295-312.
- Tang, T. L. P., Luna-Arocas, R., & Whiteside, H. D. (2003). Money ethic endorsement, self-reported income, and life satisfaction among university faculty in the U. S. and Spain. *Personnel Review*, 32, 756-773.
- Tang, T. L. P. (1992). The meaning of money revisited. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 197-202.

***Southwestern Business Administration Journal***  
***(SBAJ): 13(1&2), 1-22***

- Tziner, A., Latham, G. P., Price, B. S., & Haccoun, R. (1996). Development and validation of a questionnaire for measuring perceived political considerations in performance appraisal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17*, 179-190.
- Vitell, S. J., Singh, J. J., & Paolillo, J. (2007). Consumers' ethical beliefs: The roles of money, religiosity, and attitude toward business. *Journal of Business Ethics, 73*, 369-379.
- Wastell, C. A., & Booth, A. (2003). Machiavellianism: An alexithymic perspective. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 22*, 730-744.
- Williamson, O. E. (1985). *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism-Firms, Markets, Relationship Contracting*. New Work, Free Press.
- Williamson, O. E. (1975). *Markets and Hierarchies, Analysis and Antitrust Implications*. New York, Free Press.
- Wolfson, S. L. (1981). Effects of Machiavellianism and communication on helping behavior during an emergency. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 4*, 328-332.
- Wong, H. M. (2008). Religiousness, love of money, and ethical attitudes of Malayasian Evangelical Christians in business. *Journal of Business Ethics, 81*, 169-191.
- Zelizer, V. A. (1994). *The Social Meaning of Money*. New York, Basic Books.

**SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

Please record your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements according to the following scale. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any question and record your first impression. (adapted from Tang et al. (2003), Dahling et al. (2009) and Rawwas et al. (2007)).

***The scale is from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7)***

\_\_\_\_\_ I budget my money very well

\_\_\_\_\_ I use my money very carefully

\_\_\_\_\_ I pay my bills immediately to avoid interest or penalties

\_\_\_\_\_ I do financial planning for the future

\_\_\_\_\_ Money undermines one's ethical norms and standards of conduct

\_\_\_\_\_ People perform unethical acts to maximize their monetary gains

\_\_\_\_\_ Money is evil

\_\_\_\_\_ The love of money is the root of all evil

\_\_\_\_\_ People on the same job should be paid equally

**Southwestern Business Administration Journal**  
**(SBAJ): 13(1&2), 1-22**

\_\_\_\_\_ People on the same job should be paid based on merit

\_\_\_\_\_ Lower-level job with little responsibility should be paid less

\_\_\_\_\_ Money is a symbol of success

\_\_\_\_\_ Money represents one's achievement

\_\_\_\_\_ Money is a motivator

\_\_\_\_\_ I am motivated to work hard for money

\_\_\_\_\_ I believe that lying is necessary to maintain a competitive advantage over others

\_\_\_\_\_ The only good reason to talk to others is to get information that I can use to my benefit

\_\_\_\_\_ I am willing to be unethical if I believe it will help me succeed

\_\_\_\_\_ I am willing to sabotage the efforts of other people if they threaten my own goals

\_\_\_\_\_ I would cheat if there was a low chance of getting caught

\_\_\_\_\_ I like to give orders in interpersonal situations

\_\_\_\_\_ I enjoy having control over other people

\_\_\_\_\_ I enjoy being able to control the situation

\_\_\_\_\_ Status is a good sign of success in life

**Southwestern Business Administration Journal**  
**(SBAJ): 13(1&2), 1-22**

\_\_\_\_\_ Accumulating wealth is an important goal  
for me

\_\_\_\_\_ I want to be rich and powerful someday

\_\_\_\_\_ People are only motivated by personal gain

\_\_\_\_\_ I dislike committing to groups because I  
don't trust others

\_\_\_\_\_ Team members backstab each other all the  
time to get ahead

\_\_\_\_\_ If I show any weakness at work, other  
people will take advantage of it

\_\_\_\_\_ Other people are always planning ways to  
take advantage of the situation at my expense

**Regardless of the previous statements, please  
indicate your ethical perception of each of the  
following actions performed by a student in your  
class.**

**The scale is from: Strongly Ethical  
(1) to Strongly Unethical (7)**

\_\_\_\_\_ Overhearing answers to exam questions when  
your neighbor whispers to another student

\_\_\_\_\_ Taking advantage of answers you  
inadvertently saw on another student exam

**Southwestern Business Administration Journal**  
**(SBAJ): 13(1&2), 1-22**

Finally, please answer the following important demographic questions. Your anonymity is guaranteed.

**GENDER:** \_\_\_\_\_ Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female

**AGE:** \_\_\_\_\_ 25 years old or less \_\_\_\_\_  
Older than 25 years

**CLASS GRADE:** \_\_\_\_\_ Freshman  
\_\_\_\_\_ Sophomore  
\_\_\_\_\_ Junior  
\_\_\_\_\_ Senior

**MAJOR:** \_\_\_\_\_ Accounting  
\_\_\_\_\_ Management  
\_\_\_\_\_ Marketing  
\_\_\_\_\_ Economics  
\_\_\_\_\_ Computer Information Systems  
\_\_\_\_\_ Finance  
\_\_\_\_\_ General Business  
\_\_\_\_\_ Nonbusiness major

**About the Author:**

**Rafik Z. Elias** is Professor of Accounting at California State University, Los Angeles. He received his DBA in Accounting from Louisiana Tech University and he is a CPA. His research has been published in *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Advances in Accounting*, *Journal of the Academy of Business Education*, *Managerial Auditing Journal*, *Advances in Public Interest Accounting*, *Research in Accounting Ethics* and many national and regional conference proceedings. His research interests are in the areas of Auditing, Accounting Education and Ethics. He can be reached at: Tel: (323) 343-2867 Fax: (323) 343-6439 [relias@calstatela.edu](mailto:relias@calstatela.edu)