Ethical Conduct and Decision Making in the Workplace

Posted on September 22, 2018

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/ethical-conduct-and-decision-making-in-the-workplace/

Introduction

Ethical conduct in the workplace depends on more than an employee's personal character because organizational systems shape what people notice, what they fear, and what behavior is rewarded. Employees often face competing duties: increase sales without misleading customers, reduce costs without undermining safety, meet deadlines without falsifying records, and support colleagues without concealing misconduct. Pressure becomes dangerous when one measurable target dominates every other obligation. A worker who initially takes a small shortcut may observe that supervisors reward the result, see colleagues doing the same, and gradually reinterpret misconduct as normal business practice. Ethical decision-making therefore requires both individual judgment and an environment in which honest concerns can be raised without retaliation. Organizations should design goals, incentives, reporting channels, and leadership expectations so that employees are not quietly required to violate stated values in order to succeed. Integrity becomes durable when the organization makes ethical behavior operationally realistic, not when it merely publishes a code that employees are expected to follow while performance systems reward the opposite.

Pressure, Targets, and the Architecture of Misconduct

Unrealistic goals and narrow performance measures can create a predictable architecture of misconduct. A salesperson paid only for volume may exaggerate benefits or hide limitations; a warehouse evaluated only on speed may bypass safety checks; an accountant facing an inflexible earnings target may manipulate timing or classification; and a call center rewarded for short conversations may end calls before problems are resolved. The ethical danger increases when failure threatens employment, bonuses, promotion, or team status. Employees then begin to rationalize exceptions by telling themselves that everyone does it, customers will not notice, the rule is outdated, or the shortcut is temporary. Over time, repetition reduces discomfort and misconduct becomes routine. Managers should therefore test metrics for foreseeable gaming before implementation. They should ask how a person could technically achieve the target while defeating its real purpose. Balanced measures that include quality, safety, customer outcomes, teamwork, compliance, and long-

term effects reduce the incentive to sacrifice one stakeholder simply to improve a visible number.

Leadership Signals and Ethical Fading

Leadership influences ethical behavior most strongly through example rather than slogans. Employees watch what managers reward, ignore, excuse, and punish, especially when formal values conflict with everyday practice. A leader who speaks about integrity but promotes people known to manipulate results teaches that performance outranks honesty. Ethical fading makes this problem harder to recognize because harmful conduct is described in neutral business language such as "managing the message," "hitting the number," or "protecting the team." Those phrases can shift attention away from who loses money, privacy, opportunity, safety, or dignity. Leaders can counter ethical fading by naming stakeholders and consequences directly, admitting mistakes, disclosing conflicts of interest, and explaining difficult decisions. They should also distinguish deliberate deception from honest error. If every mistake produces humiliation or severe punishment, employees learn to hide problems until they become larger. A learning culture encourages early reporting while maintaining clear consequences for intentional misconduct, retaliation, harassment, fraud, and abuse of authority.

Reporting, Retaliation, and Conflicts of Interest

Reporting systems are essential because employees often encounter misconduct before auditors, regulators, or senior executives do. A hotline alone, however, does not create trust. Workers judge the system by what happened to previous reporters: whether concerns were investigated, whether confidentiality was respected, and whether retaliation appeared through poor shifts, exclusion, hostile evaluations, reduced duties, or stalled promotion. Organizations should provide several reporting channels, including supervisors, human resources, compliance officers, independent hotlines, unions, or governing boards where appropriate. Conflicts of interest should be handled with similar transparency. A personal relationship, investment, gift, or outside role does not automatically prove corruption, but concealment prevents independent judgment about whether recusal or another safeguard is needed. Policies should apply to senior leaders as well as junior employees. Ethical organizations treat disclosure as a normal form of risk management rather than an accusation. They also monitor the treatment of employees who raise good-faith concerns so that formal non-retaliation promises become observable practice rather than language in a policy manual.

A Practical Decision Framework

A practical decision process helps employees respond when rules do not provide an obvious answer. The first step is to define the actual decision and separate verified facts from assumptions, rumors, or pressure. The second is to identify everyone who may be affected, including customers, coworkers,

investors, communities, or future users who are not present in the meeting. The third is to review legal requirements, professional duties, contracts, and organizational policies while remembering that compliance is a minimum rather than a complete moral analysis. Alternatives can then be tested through consequences, rights, fairness, duties, and character. One option may produce the greatest aggregate benefit while violating an individual right; another may follow a rule while distributing burdens unfairly. A useful transparency test asks whether the reasoning could be explained honestly to affected people or an independent reviewer. Finally, the decision should be documented and revisited after implementation. Ethical judgment improves when organizations learn from outcomes instead of treating each difficult case as an isolated event.

Culture Becomes Ethical When Systems Align

Building an ethical workplace requires alignment between culture and operating systems. Training should use realistic scenarios involving pressure, privacy, conflicts, reporting, and competing goals rather than asking employees to memorize abstract values. Boards and senior leaders should review indicators such as complaint patterns, turnover, safety incidents, exit interviews, audit findings, and employee confidence in reporting mechanisms. High numbers of reported concerns do not always mean a culture is worse; they may indicate that employees trust the system enough to speak. When misconduct occurs, organizations should examine root causes as well as individual responsibility. Removing one employee may be necessary, but it does not solve a problem created by impossible targets, understaffing, weak supervision, or incentive structures that reward concealment. The strongest cultures combine accountability with the ability to surface bad news early. Ethical conduct is most sustainable when employees know that honesty, quality, safety, and fairness are part of performance itself rather than obstacles that must be ignored until after the numbers are achieved.

Conclusion

Unethical behavior rarely appears from a single cause. Conflicting goals, rivalry, fear, narrow incentives, managerial example, ethical fading, and weak reporting systems can combine until misconduct feels ordinary. Employees remain responsible for their choices, but organizations determine whether ethical judgment is supported or punished. A defensible workplace therefore gives people clear standards, realistic performance expectations, several routes for advice and reporting, protection from retaliation, and leaders who accept the same scrutiny imposed on others. Decision-making should begin with accurate facts and stakeholder identification, then examine legal duties, consequences, rights, fairness, and transparency before action is taken. Afterward, outcomes should be reviewed so that the organization learns from both success and failure. Ethics should not function as a public-relations layer added after business decisions are made. It should shape how goals are set, how people are rewarded, how data are used, how conflicts are disclosed, and how concerns are investigated. When these systems align, integrity becomes part of ordinary work rather than an exceptional act of personal courage.

References

Fleischman, G. M., Johnson, E. N., Walker, K. B., & Valentine, S. R. (2017). Ethics versus outcomes: Managerial responses to incentive-driven and goal-induced employee behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Kilduff, G. J., Galinsky, A. D., Gallo, E., & Reade, J. J. (2016). Whatever it takes to win: Rivalry increases unethical behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 59*(5), 1508–1534.

Tenbrunsel, A. E., & Messick, D. M. (2004). Ethical fading: The role of self-deception in unethical behavior. *Social Justice Research, 17*, 223–236.