Ethical Conduct and Decision Making in the Workplace

Posted on September 22, 2018

Introduction

Ethical conduct in the workplace is not limited to obeying a written code or avoiding obvious illegality. It involves how people make decisions when goals conflict, incentives create pressure, information is incomplete, and the easiest action may harm colleagues, customers, investors, or the public. Integrity, honesty, fairness, loyalty, and accountability provide important principles, but employees also need structures that allow them to act on those principles without being punished for raising concerns.

The original discussion identifies three major sources of unethical behavior: unrealistic performance goals, competitive pressure, and managers who model or tolerate misconduct. These factors often operate together. An employee may begin by taking a small shortcut to meet a target, observe that supervisors reward the result, and gradually accept conduct that would once have seemed unacceptable. A strong ethical organization therefore does more than tell workers to “do the right thing.” It designs goals, reporting systems, leadership practices, and consequences so that ethical behavior is realistic and visible. (Overall, 2018; Tenbrunsel, 2004)

Conflicting Goals and Ethical Pressure

Employees regularly face multiple obligations. A salesperson is expected to increase revenue but also describe products accurately. A manager must control costs while protecting safety and fair treatment. An accountant may be asked to present strong results while remaining faithful to reporting standards. A health worker may need to move quickly while protecting confidentiality and informed consent. Ethical conflict begins when one objective is treated as more important than every other responsibility.

Goals can improve motivation when they are specific, attainable, and connected to legitimate outcomes. They become dangerous when they are unrealistic, narrowly measured, or linked to severe rewards and penalties. Under extreme pressure, people may falsify records, hide defects, manipulate timing, misclassify expenses, misuse customer data, or remain silent about risks. The problem is not simply that a few employees possess bad character. The organization may have created a system in which misconduct is the predictable route to success.

Conflicting goals also create rationalization. Employees tell themselves that everyone takes shortcuts, the rule is impractical, the customer will not be harmed, or the action is temporary. A small exception becomes precedent. Repetition reduces discomfort, and the conduct becomes part of normal work rather than a conscious ethical decision.

Ethical Fading and the Language of Business

Ethical fading occurs when the moral dimensions of a decision disappear from attention. People describe a harmful action as “meeting the number,” “managing the message,” “being competitive,” or “protecting the team.” This language makes the issue appear purely technical or financial. The decision maker may focus on whether the action is efficient or likely to be detected rather than whether it is honest or fair.

Organizational vocabulary can either conceal or clarify responsibility. Calling layoffs “rightsizing” may hide the effects on employees, while calling a bribe a “facilitation payment” may make corruption sound administrative. Ethical decision making requires naming the stakeholders and consequences directly. Who could lose money, opportunity, safety, privacy, or dignity? Who receives the benefit? Who bears the risk if the assumption is wrong?

Time pressure increases ethical fading. When a deadline is urgent, people narrow their attention and rely on routines. Organizations should therefore build ethical review into ordinary processes rather than waiting for a crisis. Checklists, approval thresholds, conflict-of-interest declarations, and independent review can slow decisions at the points where harm is most likely.

Leadership and Moral Example

Managers influence ethics through both formal instruction and daily behavior. Employees pay close attention to what leaders reward, ignore, and punish. A manager who speaks about integrity but promotes workers who manipulate results sends a stronger message through promotion than through policy. Similarly, a supervisor who humiliates employees for reporting problems teaches the team to conceal information. (Fleischman, 2017)

Ethical leadership requires consistency. Leaders should explain the reasoning behind difficult decisions, admit errors, disclose conflicts, and accept scrutiny. They should also distinguish between an honest mistake and deliberate deception. If every mistake is punished harshly, employees may hide problems until they become more serious. A learning culture encourages early reporting while maintaining clear consequences for misconduct.

Power creates additional duties. Senior employees control assignments, evaluations, schedules, information, and career opportunities. They can therefore pressure subordinates without making an explicit threat. Policies against harassment, retaliation, discrimination, and favoritism must recognize these unequal relationships. Consent and agreement are not always freely given when one person controls another’s livelihood.

Culture, Norms, and the Spread of Misconduct

Workplace culture consists of shared expectations about how work is actually performed. A written code may prohibit misconduct, while informal norms encourage employees to ignore the code. New workers learn these norms by watching experienced colleagues. If they see expense reports inflated, safety checks skipped, or customers misled without consequence, they may conclude that such behavior is required for acceptance.

Rivalry can intensify this process. Research by Kilduff and colleagues found that rivalry can increase willingness to engage in unethical conduct because winning against a familiar competitor becomes emotionally significant. Internal rankings and winner-take-all rewards may transform colleagues into opponents. Competition is not inherently unethical, but the organization must ensure that performance measures do not reward harm. (Kilduff, 2016)

Culture can also protect ethical behavior. Teams that discuss uncertainty, invite dissent, and review near misses are more likely to identify risks. Employees should be able to ask, “Is this allowed?” and also, “Is this appropriate?” The second question captures situations where an action is technically permissible but inconsistent with the organization’s responsibilities.

Incentives and Performance Measurement

Incentives communicate priorities. A company that pays solely for sales volume may encourage misrepresentation or unsuitable sales. A warehouse that measures only speed may increase injuries or damaged goods. A call center that rewards short calls may discourage genuine problem solving. Balanced measurement should include quality, safety, customer outcomes, teamwork, compliance, and long-term effects.

Targets should be tested for foreseeable gaming. Managers should ask how an employee could meet the metric without achieving its purpose. If the answer is easy, the measure needs safeguards. Data should be audited, and exceptions should be reviewed. Employees should not be placed in positions where ethical refusal guarantees failure while misconduct is quietly necessary to reach the target.

Compensation should also avoid extreme short-term horizons. Bonuses based on immediate results can encourage decisions whose costs appear later. Deferred incentives, clawback provisions, and long-term quality measures can better align rewards with sustainable performance.

Reporting Misconduct and Fear of Retaliation

Employees often observe misconduct before senior leaders or regulators do. Reporting systems are therefore essential, but a hotline alone does not create trust. Workers assess whether previous reporters were ignored, isolated, denied promotion, or dismissed. If retaliation is common, silence becomes a rational form of self-protection.

Organizations should provide several channels: direct supervisors, human resources, compliance officers, independent hotlines, unions, and governing boards where appropriate. Anonymous reporting can be valuable, though investigators must still assess evidence fairly. Employees need clear information about confidentiality, investigation steps, and limits on what can remain private.

Non-retaliation policies require active enforcement. Retaliation can be subtle, including unfavorable shifts, exclusion from meetings, reduced responsibilities, hostile evaluations, or social isolation. Managers should monitor treatment of reporters and document employment decisions after a complaint. Protecting good-faith reporting does not mean accepting knowingly false allegations; it means separating the employee’s right to raise a concern from the eventual finding.

An Ethical Decision-Making Framework

A practical framework can help employees move beyond intuition. The first step is to identify the decision accurately and gather facts. Assumptions, rumors, and incomplete data should be separated from verified information. The second step is to identify stakeholders, including people who are not present in the meeting but may bear the consequences.

The third step is to review legal duties, professional standards, contracts, and organizational policies. Compliance establishes a minimum, not necessarily the complete ethical answer. The fourth step is to evaluate alternatives through several perspectives: consequences, rights, fairness, duties, and character. An action that benefits the majority may still violate a person’s basic rights; an action that follows a rule may still distribute burdens unfairly.

The fifth step is to test transparency. Would the decision maker be comfortable explaining the action to affected employees, customers, regulators, or the public? This test is not perfect because confidential decisions can be ethical, but discomfort about honest explanation is an important warning. The final steps are to document reasoning, seek independent advice when needed, decide, and review the outcome.

Conflicts of Interest

A conflict of interest exists when personal, financial, family, or outside interests could interfere with professional judgment. The existence of a conflict does not prove corruption. The ethical failure often occurs when the conflict is concealed or unmanaged. Examples include selecting a relative as a vendor, accepting valuable gifts from a supplier, trading on confidential information, or evaluating a business in which the employee has an investment.

Disclosure allows the organization to determine whether recusal, divestment, independent review, or another safeguard is required. Policies should define meaningful thresholds and apply them consistently to senior leaders as well as junior staff. A culture that treats disclosure as an accusation discourages transparency; disclosure should be understood as a normal risk-management practice.

Fairness, Inclusion, and Respect

Ethical workplaces protect people from discrimination, harassment, bullying, and arbitrary treatment. Fairness does not always mean identical treatment because employees may require accommodations or different resources to participate equally. Decisions about hiring, pay, promotion, discipline, and termination should be based on relevant evidence and consistent standards.

Respect also affects daily communication. Public humiliation, exclusion, intrusive monitoring, and misuse of personal information can damage dignity even when productivity remains high. Psychological safety allows employees to question decisions without being labeled disloyal. It is especially important in safety-critical industries, where silence can endanger lives.

Building an Ethical Organization

Ethics programs should combine a clear code, regular education, accessible advice, reliable reporting, fair investigation, and leadership accountability. Training is most useful when it presents realistic scenarios rather than asking employees to memorize slogans. Employees should practice responding to pressure, disclosing conflicts, protecting data, and escalating concerns.

Boards and senior leaders should receive information about culture, not only confirmed violations. Useful indicators include survey results, turnover, complaint patterns, safety incidents, audit findings, exit interviews, and whether employees believe they can report without retaliation. High reporting numbers do not necessarily indicate a worse culture; they may indicate greater trust in the system.

Organizations should also examine root causes after misconduct. Removing one employee may be necessary, but it is insufficient when targets, staffing, supervision, or incentives made the behavior likely. Corrective action should address both the individual act and the system that enabled it.

Conclusion

Unethical conduct often develops through conflicting goals, narrow incentives, rivalry, managerial example, ethical fading, and fear of retaliation. Employees need personal integrity, but organizations determine whether integrity is supported or punished. Ethical decision making requires clear facts, stakeholder analysis, legal and professional review, multiple moral perspectives, transparent reasoning, and follow-up. The strongest workplace cultures align performance with safety, fairness, honesty, and long-term responsibility. They invite concerns early, protect good-faith reporters, and hold leaders to the same standards expected of everyone else.

References

Fleischman, G. M., Johnson, E. N., Walker, K. B., and Valentine, S. R. “Ethics Versus Outcomes: Managerial Responses to Incentive-Driven and Goal-Induced Employee Behavior.” *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2017.

Kilduff, G. J., Galinsky, A. D., Gallo, E., and Reade, J. J. “Whatever It Takes to Win: Rivalry Increases Unethical Behavior.” *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 59, no. 5, 2016, pp. 1508–1534.

Overall, J. “All Around the Mulberry Bush: A Theory of Cyclical Unethical Behavior.” *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, vol. 20, no. 2, 2018, pp. 251–267.

Tenbrunsel, Ann E., and David M. Messick. “Ethical Fading: The Role of Self-Deception in Unethical Behavior.” *Social Justice Research*, vol. 17, 2004, pp. 223–236.