Relationship between morality and ethics pdf

As the 1990s have overtaken us, public interest in ethics is at a historic high. While the press draws attention to blatant disregards on Wall Street, in the defense industry, in the Pentagon, and at questionable activities in the White House, in the Attorney General's Office and in Congress, observers are wondering whether our society is sicker than usual. Probably not. Standards applied to corporate behaviour have increased over time, and this has increased the average rightness of businessmen and politicians. It's been a long time since we could say with Mark Twain that we have the best Senate money you can buy or negotiate with muckrakers like Upton Sinclair that our big companies are fiefdoms of robber barons. But illegal and unethical behavior persists, even though attempts to expose it often manage to make his rewards short-lived. Why is business ethics a problem that traps not only a few mature criminals or scammers in adoption, but a host of apparently good people who lead exemplary privacy by hiding information about dangerous products or systematically falsifying costs? My observation suggests that the problem of corporate ethics has three aspects: the development of executive power as a moral person; the influence of the corporation as a moral environment; and the actions needed to chart a high path to economic and ethical activity, and to install fencing to keep corporate travelers on track. Because of the bad choices, a few bad apples are sure to appear in any big barrel. But these corporate inconsistencies can then be scooped up. We used to think that managers have the right to rely on the character of individual employees without being distracted from business objectives. Moral character is formed by family, church and education long before a person joins the company to make a living. In an ideal world, we could end up here. In the real world, moral development is an unresolved problem at home, at school, in the church and at work. The two-career family, television and virtual disappearance of the dining table as a forum to discuss moral issues are clearly outdated instructions in the basic principles on the mother's lap, if this legendary textbook was ever as effective as folklore would have it. We cannot expect our battered school systems to take on the moral role of the family. Even religion is less of help than it once was when membership in an individual community is encouraged or coerced into normal moral behavior. The growing secularization of society, the abundance of sects, the rejection of the conservative church from the new way of life, the widespread distrust of the religious right - all this means that we cannot depend on a uniform for armor business recruits against temptation. Higher education also does not take a slack, even in the disciplines in which moral indoctrination once flourished. Great literature can be a self-evident source of ethical instruction, for together it informs the mind and heart of the complexities of moral choice. Emotionally engaged fictional or historical characters who must choose between death and dishonor, integrity and personal advancement, power and responsibility, her and others, we also expand our own moral fantasies. However, literature professors rarely offer recommendations in an ethical interpretation, preferring instead to emphasize technical, aesthetic or historical analysis. Moral philosophy, which is a proper academic home for ethical learning, is even more remote, and few professors prefer to teach applied ethics. When you add to this the studied discipline of separation from the world of practical affairs, it is not surprising that most students (or managers) find little in the subject to attract them. What attracts students in large numbers is the economy, with its theory of human behavior, which connects all motivation with personal pleasure, satisfaction and personal interests. And since it is easier to serve vested interests than not to reflect on the vested interests of others, the Darwinian consequences of traditional economic theory are essentially immoral. Competition produces and requires the will to win. Careerism focuses on advantage. Immature people of all ages are the victim of the moral flabbiness that William James said attends exclusive services to the bitch goddess of success. In part, inspired by recent infamous examples of such flabbiness, many business schools are making a determined effort to restore ethics to optional and compulsory courses. But even if these efforts were further than they are, boards of directors and senior managers would be unwise to assume that recruits can enter the corporate environment without the need for additional education. The role of any school is to prepare its graduates for a life of learning from an experience that will go better and faster than it would have done without formal education. No matter how much colleges and business schools increase their investment in moral education, most business ethics education (as in all other aspects of business acumen) will occur in organizations where people spend their lives. Making ethical decisions is easy when the facts are clear and the choice is black and white. But this is a different story when the situation is marred by ambiguity, incomplete information, numerous points of view and contradictory responsibilities. In situations where leaders all the time, ethical decisions depend on both the decision-making process itself and the experience, intelligence and integrity of the Creator. Responsible moral judgment cannot be passed on to a prepared decision-making authority. Its development in business is partly an administrative process, including: recognition of the ethical consequences of the decision; Discussion to identify different points of view; and testing the adequacy of a preliminary solution in balancing one's own interests and accounting for others, importing it for future policy, and combining it with the company's traditional values. But after all this, if there is no clear consensus, the executive branch must make a decision based on its intuition and conviction. Thus, the calibre of decision-making is crucial, especially when an immediate decision should arise from instinct rather than discussion. This existential resolution requires that the new moral man be the final authority in a situation where conflicting ethical principles join them. It does not preclude prior consultation with others or recognition that you may be abolished in a hierarchical organization. Ethical decisions therefore require three qualities that can be defined and developed by individuals. First, it is the competence to recognize ethical issues and to consider the consequences of alternative resolutions. Second, self-confidence to look for different points of view and then decide what is right at a given time and place, in a certain set of relationships and circumstances. Third, what William James called a rigid mindset that is in management is a willingness to make decisions when everything that needs to be known cannot be known, and when the questions that are edict on answers have no established and irrefutable solutions. Unfortunately, moral personalities in modern corporations are all too often on their own. However, these people cannot be expected to remain autonomous, however well, without positive organized support. Persistent preservation of ethical problems hides the simplicity of the solution - as soon as the company's executives decide to do something with their ethical standards. Ethical neglect, sleazyness or inertia is not only an individual failure, but also a problem of governance. When they first come to work, people whose moral judgments may ultimately determine the ethical nature of their company are part of a community whose values will influence their own. The economic function of a corporation is necessarily one of these values. But if that's the only value, an ethical investigation can't flourish. If management believes that the invisible hand of the market adequately moderates the damage done by the pursuit of vested interests, ethical policies may be rejected as irrelevant. And if what people see (while they hear about maximizing shareholder wealth) are managers dedicated to their survival and compensation, they will naturally be worried about rewards than about justice. For an individual, the impact of the need to succeed is undoubtedly more straightforward than the influence of neoclassical economic theory. But just as the corporation itself is burdened with the need to establish a competitive advantage over time (after reinvesting what might otherwise be the immediate profit on which the financial community and many shareholders judge its performance), aspiring managers will also depend on how they judge. A highly national and humane executive can preside over an immoral organization, as the incentive system focuses on short-term quantitative results. Under pressure to get ahead, the person (of which the native integrity we hope) is tempted to make progress at the expense of others, to cut corners, to strive to win at all costs, to make things seem better than they have to take advantage, in general, my performance scores. People will do what they are rewarded for. The quantitative results of management are always much more visible than the quality and future effects of the means by which they are achieved. On the contrary, when a corporation is defined as a socio-economic institution with responsibilities to other entities (e.g. employees, clients and communities), a policy of regulating the purposeful desire for maximum immediate profit can be established. The leaders of such a company talk about social responsibility, make ethical policy public and make their personal values accessible to their juniors. They respect neoclassical economic theory, but consider it only partially useful as a management guide. As the corporation moves beyond the daily direct influence of its leader, the ethical implications of size and geographic deployment come into play. Monitoring and enforcing the entire policy is becoming increasingly difficult, but this is especially true of policies set for corporate ethics. Layers of responsibility bring communication problems. The possibility of a penalty gives rise to a lack of frankness. The distance from the headquarters complicates the performance estimate, bringing it to the numbers. When operations are dispersed between different cultures and countries where corruption acquires exotic guises, it is difficult to reach and maintain consensus on moral values. Moreover, decentralization itself has ethical implications, not least because it absolutely requires trust and breadth for mistakes. The inability to control managers' tasks assigned to their superiors cannot be known in detail about the results inexorably in delegation. Corporate leaders are used to it on the business acumen of the managers of the profitable center, the results of which the leaders look with a practiced eye. Those who maintain the ethical standards of their companies simply depends on the judgement and morality of the leaders to whom the authority is delegated. Aside from the fact that you keep your fingers crossed, what can you do? - Fortunately for the future of the corporation, this microcosm of society may be, within that of its leadership and membership to do so. A corporation is an organization in which people influence each other to establish conventional values and ways of doing things. This is not democracy, but in order to be fully effective, the authority of its leaders must be supported by their followers. Its leadership has more power than elected officials to choose who will join or remain in the association. Its members expect direction to be offered, even if they threaten resistance to change. Careless or lazy leadership allows its organizations to drift, continuing their economic performance along previously established and leaving their ethics at a chance. Resolute management believe they can overcome the problems I've lived on-once they have separated these problems from their camouflage. From our pluralistic, multicultural society, we can carve out a coherent community with a strategy that defines both its economic goals and the standards of competence, quality and humanity that govern its activities. The nature of the corporation may well be more malleable than that of a human being. Of course, its culture can be formed. Insoluble persons can be replaced or retired. Those who are committed to the company's goals can create formal and informal sanctions to restrict and alienate those who are not. The formation of such a community begins with the personal influence of the Chief Executive Officer and the executives who are heads of business units, human resources departments or any other sub-organizations to which the authority is delegated. This is followed by a clear ethical policy, followed by the same governance procedures that are used to implement any political body in effective organizations. The way in which the chief executive makes moral judgments is universally recognized as more influential than written politics. The CEO, who orders an immediate recall of the product, at a cost of millions of dollars in sales due to a quality defect affecting a limited number of untraceable deliveries, sends a type of message. An executive branch that suppresses information about the actual or potential negative effects of the manufacturer or, consciously or not, condones the recharge, sends another. Politics is implied in behavior. The ethical aspects of product quality, staff, advertising and marketing solutions are immediately obvious. Executives say much more than they know in the most casual contact with those who follow each of their Pretending is useless. Don't say anything, Emerson once wrote. What you are standing over you at the time and the thunders so I can't hear what you're saying to the contrary. It follows that if wouldn't be known to do anything, never do that. A humble person can answer this appropriation of transparency with who, I am? Self-confident sophisticated will refuse to consider themselves so easily readable. Almost all leaders underestimate their authority and do not recognize respect in others. The import of this, of course, is that the CEO must be aware of how the position reinforces his or her most casual judgments, jokes and silences. But an even more important consequence, given that people can't hide their characters, is that the choice of chief executive (actually any contender for managerial responsibility) should include a clear assessment of his or her character. If you ask how to do it, Emerson will answer: Just look. Once the company's executives have decided that its ethical intentions and performance will be managed rather than go unnoticed in a corrosive environment of unprincipled competition, they must define their corporate policies and make it explicit, as is the case in other areas. The need for written policies is especially relevant in companies without having a strong tradition to build on or where a new era should be started after a public scandal, say, or an internal investigation into questionable behavior. Ethical codes are now commonplace. But in themselves they are not effective, and this is especially true when they are so widely stated that they can be dismissed as just cosmetic. Domestic policies specifically focused on industry, company and functional vulnerability make it easier to audit and train. Where special practices are of serious concern, such as pricing or bribing public officials or complying with procurement requirements, compliance can be a condition of employment and is certified annually by employees' signatures. However, the most common problems cannot be contemplated, and may not be so laid out by the proper procedures in advance to tell the person on the line what to do. Unnecessarily repressive rules undermine trust, which remains irreplaceable. Managers can understand in advance what problems can be foreseen. Because policies cannot be effective if it is not understood, some companies use corporate training to discuss the application of their ethical standards. In difficult situations, the decision on how to move from general political statements to situationally specific actions can be based on discussion. Such a discussion, if carefully worked out, may reveal the inadequacy or ambiguity of current policies, new areas in which the company should take a unified position, and new ways of supporting individuals in making the right decisions. As in all policy language and implementation, the deportation of the Director General, the development of appropriate policies and the training of its meaning and Enough. In companies determined to maintain or raise ethical standards, management expands the information system to illuminate pressure points - the speed of manufacturing defects, product returns and warranty requirements, special cases of quality shortages, competitive benchmarking requests - anything that makes sense in the company's special circumstances. Since trust is necessary, ethical aspirations must be supported by information that serves not only to inform but also to control. Control should be not so much coercive as ordinary, not suspicious, but normal interest in the quality of operations. Experienced leaders do not replace trust with the realization that politics is often distorted in practice. Extensive information, like full visibility, is a powerful deterrent. That is why ethical organizations deliberately expand the traditional scope of external and internal audit (wherever fraud occurs), including compliance with corporate ethical standards. More importantly, such organizations pay attention to all kinds of barriers that limit productivity and to problems that need ventilation so that help can be addressed. To obtain information that is under deep protection to avoid punishment, internal auditors, long taught not to scour as police or detectives, must be people with sufficient management experience to be sensitive to the need for a manager for economically viable solutions. For example, they should have enough imagination to imagine the ethical results of bread-and-butter profits and price decisions, equal opportunities and winning dilemmas, or shrinking crunches. Creating a climate of audit and control, which accepts as this open exchange of information between the company's operational levels and policy-making levels, is not difficult - once, that is, the need to do so is recognized and individuals with adequate experience and respect are assigned to work. But no matter how much sympathy the show's audit teams have, discipline ultimately requires action. A secretary who steals small cash, a successful salesman who falsifies his account account, an accountant and her boss who change the value of records, and, more problematicly, a chronically sleazy operator who never does anything actually illegal- should all be dealt with cleanly, with minimal attention to alleged mitigating circumstances. It is true that hasty punishments can be unfair and absolve superiors of improperly liability for wrongdoing. However, long delays or waffle attempts to be humane obscure the message that the organization demands whenever there is an event Attempting to hide a serious gap or protect the names of people who have been dismissed is good to the offender, but dulls the beneficial effects of disclosure. For the executive, discipline management carries one ethical dilemma after the How do you weigh your attention to the abuser, for example, and how do you weigh the future of the organization? The company dramatizes its uncompromising commitment to legitimate and ethical behavior when it separates employees who commit crimes that have been classified in advance as inexcusable. When such a decision is fair, the vine makes its fairness clear, even if more formal advertising is inappropriate. Difficult decisions should not be postponed simply because they are painful. Sustained support for corporate integrity is never without emotional costs. In a large, decentralized organization, consistently ethical performance requires difficult decisions not only from the current CEO, but also from the continuity of managers. Here the board of directors comes on stage. The Board has the opportunity to ensure the continuity of leaders whose personal values and characters are consistently adequate to maintain and develop established traditions of ethical conduct. Once they are adopted, managers must rely on two resources to do what they cannot do in person: the nature of their associates and the impact of policies and the measures that are taken to make politics effective. An adequate corporate strategy should not include economic objectives. The economic strategy is the best combination of the company's products and market capabilities with its resources and distinctive competence. (The fact that both are constantly changing is certainly true.) But the economic strategy is humanized and achievable, deciding which organization the company will be - its character, the values it maintains, its relationships with customers, employees, communities and shareholders. The personal values and ethical aspirations of the company's executives, although probably not specifically stated, are implied in all strategic decisions. They show through the choice management makes and show themselves how the company goes about its business. That's why this message should be intentional and targeted, not random. While codes of ethics, ethical policies on specific vulnerabilities and disciplined enforcement are important, they do not in themselves contain the ultimate emotional force of commitment. Commitment to quality goals, including compliance with the law and high ethical standards, is an organizational achievement. It is inspired by pride more than the profit that legitimate pride produces. Thus, once the scope of strategic decisions is expanded, their ethical component will no longer be contrary to the right to make a decision for many reasons. I'm not comfortable doing this on my own. Generalizing the ethical aspects of a business decision, leaving behind the specific features that make it often preach, simplify or rationalize the obvious fact that many cases of competing ethical claims do not have a satisfactory solution. But we also hear little public comment from business leaders of integrity when irrefutable misconduct became known, and silence suggests cynics lack of concern. There are many obstacles to an explicit discussion of ethics in business, starting with the chief executive's keen realization that someday he or she may be betrayed by someone in his or her own organization. Moral exhortation and oral piety are offensive, especially when it comes to hypocrisy or real vulnerability to criticism. Any successful or energetic person will ever face questions about his methods and motives, for even good intentions of behavior can be judged unethically from some point of view. The need for cooperation between people with different beliefs reduces the discussion of religion and related ethical issues. The fact that those responsible for governance must find principles to resolve conflicting ethical claims in their own minds and hearts is an unwelcome discovery. Most of us keep quiet about it. So my ideas are pretty simple. Perhaps most importantly, management's full loyalty to profit maximization is a major obstacle to achieving higher standards of ethical practice. Defining a corporation's purpose as purely economic is a deadly simplification that allows us to overestimate vested interests by considering others. Management practice requires a long game of judgment. Leaders must find in their own will, experience and intelligence the principles they apply in balancing conflicting claims. Wise men and women will present their views to others, for open discussion of problems reveals unexpected ethical aspects and develops alternative perspectives that should be taken into account. Ultimately, however, leaders must make a decision based on their own judgments to resolve infinitely contentious issues. Therefore, character investigation should be part of the entire choice of executive branch, as well as all executive development within the corporation. And so it goes. It's not enough. The encouraging result is that the proclamation and institutionalization of ethical policies are not as complex as, for example, saving from coercion to greed. Once implemented, the process can be as simple as formulating and implementing policies in any area. Any company has the opportunity to develop a unique corporate strategy, summing up its main goals and policies. This strategy can cover more than just the economic role it will play national and international markets, but also what it will be like as a human organization. It will cover as well, though perhaps not publicly, the nature and scope of the scale of the management to which the company should be entrusted. To be successfully implemented over time, any strategy must command creativity, energy and the desire of the company's members. Strategic decisions that are economically or ethically unreasonable will not support such commitment for long. A version of this article appeared in the September-October issue of Harvard Business Review for September-October 1989. Reviews. relationship between morality and ethics upsc. relationship between morality and ethics in law enforcement. relationship between morality and ethics pdf. relationship between morality and ethics within american law enforcement. relationship between law ethics and morality. discuss the relationship between ethics and morality. relationship between morality ethics and ethical theory. relationship between ethics morality law and religion