Organizational Culture And Morality

Posted on January 25, 2020

Introduction

Organizational culture is often described through mission statements, values, and codes of conduct, but employees usually learn the real culture in a different way. They watch what managers reward, what behavior is ignored, and what happens when someone raises an uncomfortable concern. If the company praises integrity but protects a high-performing manager who behaves dishonestly, the message received by employees is stronger than anything written in a policy.

Morality in the workplace therefore involves more than individual character. It also depends on the systems around employees: incentives, supervision, reporting channels, training, and whether rules are applied consistently.

Culture and Ethical Behavior

Schein and Schein (2017) describe culture at several levels. Some parts are easy to see, such as office layout, dress, ceremonies, policies, and benefits. Beneath them are the values the organization says it believes in, followed by deeper assumptions that employees gradually come to treat as normal.

This distinction helps explain why two companies can have similar ethics policies but very different behavior. In one organization, staff may believe that concerns will be investigated fairly. In another, employees may learn that speaking up damages a career. The written policy may be identical, but the working culture is not.

Ethical Culture and Accountability

Treviño, Butterfield, and McCabe (1998) distinguish between ethical climate and the wider systems that support ethical conduct. In practice, employees look for consistency. If junior staff are disciplined for an expense violation while a senior manager is excused for the same conduct, employees quickly understand that status matters more than the rule.

Accountability should therefore apply across levels of the organization. That does not mean every violation deserves the same punishment. It means that decisions should be based on the conduct, evidence, and seriousness of the case rather than the person’s title or revenue contribution.

Training That Employees Can Actually Use

Annual ethics training has limited value if it consists only of slides and a completion certificate. Employees need examples that resemble the situations they face. A procurement employee may need to recognize conflicts of interest and inappropriate gifts. A supervisor needs to understand retaliation and complaint handling. Finance staff need clear controls around records, approvals, and segregation of duties.

The U.S. Department of Justice's compliance guidance makes a similar point by asking whether training is tailored, understandable, properly resourced, and tested for effectiveness (U.S. Department of Justice, 2024). Attendance alone does not show that employees know what to do when a real problem occurs.

Learning From Misconduct

When theft, fraud, or another serious violation is discovered, organizations often focus entirely on the individual employee. Personal responsibility matters, but stopping there can leave the same weakness in place.

A useful review asks how the misconduct became possible. Did one person control purchasing and payment? Were passwords shared? Were unusual expenses ignored? Had earlier warnings been dismissed? Did unrealistic performance targets encourage employees to take shortcuts?

These questions do not excuse wrongdoing. They help prevent the next incident.

Employee Voice and Psychological Safety

Edmondson (1999) describes psychological safety as a shared belief that people can take interpersonal risks without being humiliated or unfairly punished. In an ethics context, this matters because the first person to notice a problem is often an ordinary employee rather than an auditor.

The Association of Certified Fraud Examiners reported that tips were the most common initial method of detecting occupational fraud in its 2024 study, accounting for 43% of cases. That makes reporting culture a practical control, not merely an employee-relations issue.

Psychological safety does not mean every accusation must be accepted as true. A good-faith report should be taken seriously, but allegations still need evidence and a fair investigation.

Retaliation

Retaliation deserves particular attention because employees watch what happens to people who speak up. If a reporter is suddenly excluded, demoted, threatened, or given obviously different treatment, other employees may decide that silence is safer.

The legal position can be complicated. Different anti-retaliation and whistleblower protections apply to different types of complaints and industries. Equal-employment laws, financial laws, state statutes, contracts, and internal policies may all be relevant depending on the facts. Organizations should therefore avoid making sweeping legal claims and obtain appropriate advice where necessary.

Even apart from the law, retaliation against a good-faith reporter is damaging because it weakens the organization’s ability to discover problems early.

Responding to Suspected Financial Misconduct

A report of possible theft or financial misconduct should begin with documentation, not conclusions. The organization should record what has been alleged, identify records that may need to be preserved, and decide whether there is any immediate risk of further loss or destruction of evidence.

The investigator should be sufficiently independent from the people involved. Depending on the seriousness of the allegation, that role may fall to HR, compliance, internal audit, legal counsel, security, or an external specialist. Interviews should be fair, records should be preserved, and established facts should be separated from suspicion.

If misconduct is confirmed, the company should consider both the individual response and the control failure that allowed it to happen. A disciplinary decision without a process change may solve only half of the problem.

Leadership Sets the Standard

Employees pay close attention to what leaders do under pressure. A manager who talks about integrity but manipulates expenses teaches a lesson about culture, even if that lesson is never written down. The same is true when a supervisor asks employees to speak openly and then reacts badly when challenged.

Incentives matter as well. If bonuses depend only on sales, speed, or short-term results, employees may start to see compliance as an obstacle. Performance systems should therefore consider how results are achieved, not only whether a target was reached.

Reporting Systems

Employees should have more than one route for raising a concern. A supervisor may be appropriate for many issues, but not when the supervisor is part of the problem. HR, compliance, internal audit, an ombuds function, or a confidential hotline can provide alternatives.

The channel itself is only the beginning. Someone must review the report, decide what happens next, and communicate appropriately with the reporter. A sophisticated hotline that leads nowhere can damage trust more than having no hotline at all.

Google as an Example of Visible Culture

Google is often used as an example of organizational culture because of its offices, benefits, and informal working environment. Those features are visible artifacts, but they do not prove that a culture is ethical. Comfortable offices cannot substitute for fair investigation, reporting systems, accountability, and responsible leadership.

The more useful lesson is that ethics should be judged by how an organization handles difficult decisions rather than by how attractive the workplace appears.

Internal Ethics Memorandum

To: Senior Management and Human Resources
From: Ethics and Compliance Officer
Re: Review of Integrity, Financial Misconduct, and Retaliation Procedures

I am concerned about the way allegations of possible financial misconduct are currently being handled. A workplace in which employees believe that raising a concern may damage their position is unlikely to identify problems early.

I recommend that the present complaint be reviewed to confirm that it has been properly documented, assigned to an impartial investigator, and supported by appropriate preservation of financial and employment records. This recommendation does not assume that the allegation is true. Its purpose is to make sure the company reaches a conclusion through evidence rather than influence or seniority.

For future cases, the organization should maintain clear reporting routes, investigation responsibilities, confidentiality expectations, anti-retaliation procedures, and consistent disciplinary standards. After a serious incident, management should also examine whether weaknesses in supervision or internal controls contributed to the problem.

Conclusion

An ethical culture is built through repeated decisions. Employees notice whether managers follow the standards they expect from others, whether complaints are handled fairly, and whether reporting a concern creates risk for the person who raised it.

Preventing misconduct requires both values and controls. Training, reporting channels, fair investigations, financial safeguards, and leadership behavior reinforce one another. When one of these is missing, a strong code of ethics may exist only on paper.

References

Association of Certified Fraud Examiners. (2024). *Occupational Fraud 2024: A Report to the Nations*.

Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*(2), 350–383.

Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2017). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (5th ed.). Wiley.

Treviño, L. K., Butterfield, K. D., & McCabe, D. L. (1998). The ethical context in organizations: Influences on employee attitudes and behaviors. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 8*(3), 447–476.

U.S. Department of Justice. (2024). *Evaluation of Corporate Compliance Programs*.

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (n.d.). *Retaliation*.