3457-Revision.docx

by 1 1

Organizational Culture and Ethical Blind Spots in Managerial Accounting

ABSTRACT

In recent years, ethical concerns in managerial accounting have become more prominent, especially in light of corporate scandals. While traditional ethics frameworks emphasize individual responsibility and legal compliance, they often overlook how organizational culture shapes ethical decision-making. One crucial but often neglected factor is the presence of ethical blind spots—moral oversights influenced by cognitive biases and cultural norms within organizations. This study explores how such blind spots emerge and persist in managerial accounting, using a qualitative multiple-case approach. Interviews with managerial accountants and financial controllers from three mid-sized manufacturing firms revealed patterns of ethical reasoning shaped by internal culture. Findings suggest that organizations focused heavily on performance targets and rule compliance—while discouraging ethical dialogue—are especially prone to ethical blind spots. Concepts like ethical fading and organizational silence explain how unethical behavior can become normalized over time, even among well-meaning professionals. These moral lapses are not merely personal shortcomings but reflect deeper cultural dynamics. Addressing them requires more than strict rules; it involves cultivating a culture that promotes ethical reflection, open communication, and psychological safety. The study highlights the need for ethical culture assessments and calls for ethics training to be embedded in accounting education to foster long-term integrity and resilience within organizations.

Keywords: Ethical Blind Spots, Managerial Accounting, Organizational Culture, Ethics in Accounting, Moral Disengagement.

ABSTRAK

Dalam beberapa tahun terakhir, isu etika dalam akuntansi manajerial semakin mendapat perhatian, terutama setelah berbagai skandal korporat besar. Kerangka etika tradisional umumnya menekankan tanggung jawab individu dan kepatuhan hukum, namun sering mengabaikan pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap pengambilan keputusan etis. Salah satu faktor penting yang sering diabaikan adalah ethical blind spots—yaitu area kelalaian moral yang dipengaruhi oleh bias kognitif dan norma budaya dalam organisasi. Studi ini meneliti bagaimana blind spot etis muncul dan bertahan dalam praktik akuntansi manajerial melalui pendekatan studi kasus kualitatif. Wawancara dengan akuntan manajerial dan pengendali keuangan dari tiga perusahaan manufaktur menengah menunjukkan pola penalaran etis yang dibentuk oleh budaya internal. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa organisasi yang sangat berfokus pada target kinerja dan kepatuhan aturan—namun tidak mendorong diskusi etis—lebih rentan terhadap blind spot etis. Konsep seperti ethical fading dan organizational silence menjelaskan bagaimana perilaku tidak etis dapat menjadi kebiasaan, bahkan bagi profesional yang bermaksud baik. Kegagalan moral ini bukan semata

kesalahan individu, tetapi mencerminkan dinamika budaya yang lebih dalam. Oleh karena itu, perlu adanya perubahan budaya yang mendorong refleksi etis, komunikasi terbuka, dan rasa aman secara psikologis. Pendidikan etika dalam pelatihan akuntansi juga menjadi langkah penting untuk membangun ketahanan etis jangka panjang.

***Kata kunci**: Ethical Blind Spots, Akuntansi Manajerial, Budaya Organisasi, Etika dalam Akuntansi, Pelepasan Moral.*

INTRODUCTION

Managerial accounting plays a vital role in supporting strategic and operational decision-making within organizations. However, over the past decade, several cases involving cost manipulation, financial risk concealment, and internal budget misappropriation have highlighted critical ethical weaknesses in managerial accounting practices (Leeming, 2018; Kirana & Novita, 2021; DeTienne et al., 2021). High-profile corporate scandals such as Enron, Toshiba, and, in the Indonesian context, Jiwasraya and Asabri, have demonstrated that although accounting systems are technically designed to promote transparency and accountability, ethical integrity often remains a neglected dimension (Cowton, 2021). Traditional approaches to accounting ethics typically emphasize compliance with professional codes of conduct, external regulation, and individual responsibility. While these elements are important, they fall short in explaining why individuals who understand ethical principles and legal boundaries still engage in unethical behavior. This phenomenon leads to the concept of ethical blind spots areas in decision-making where moral considerations become blurred or completely overlooked, often due to social and cultural influences within the organization (Bazerman & Gino, 2012; Payne et al., 2020).

Ethical blind spots do not occur in a vacuum, they emerge within the context of organizational culture, which shapes how accounting professionals think, behave, and interpret ethical situations. Organizational cultures that prioritize performance, efficiency, and loyalty to superiors without providing space for critical dialogue or ethical reflection significantly contribute to the collective justification of deviant practices. In such environments, small transgressions are likely to be normalized and may evolve into systemic misconduct (Rooij & Fine, 2018; Seshoka, 2021; Dodgson, 2021). Recent research has shown that organizational culture plays a crucial role in shaping ethical awareness and ethical decision-making in accounting. Cultures that promote openness, dialogue, and moral courage, commonly referred to as ethical voice, have been proven to help prevent ethical violations. In contrast, cultures that rely on rigid hierarchies and results-driven pressure, without ethical deliberation, tend to reinforce moral disengagement (Treviño et al., 2014; Lewis, 2021; Victoria, 2025).

This gap indicates a need for a new perspective that views ethical violations not merely as individual failings but as the result of complex interactions between individuals and organizational culture. This becomes especially relevant in managerial accounting, where practitioners serve as key actors in bridging financial information, business strategy, and day-to-day operations. Their responsibilities extend beyond data presentation to include the construction and framing of narratives that influence managerial decisions (Collier, 2015; Duckett, 2021). Nevertheless, empirical literature on ethical blind spots in managerial accounting remains limited particularly within the context of organizational culture in the Indonesian private sector. Most studies focus on normative ethics or post-scandal analyses, leaving a gap in our understanding of the internal mechanisms that create and sustain moral insensitivity in organizations. This study seeks to fill that gap by qualitatively analyzing how organizational culture fosters the emergence and persistence of ethical blind spots, specifically in the managerial accounting practices of mid-sized manufacturing firms (Stake, 2013; Cousins et al., 2014).

Using a multiple-case study approach and in-depth interviews, this research explores not only how organizational norms and values shape accountants' ethical perceptions, but also how power structures, internal communication, and performance pressure generate ethical gray zones in decision-making. The study is grounded in a conceptual framework that integrates the theories of ethical fading, organizational silence, and cultural cognition, offering a deeper understanding of how unethical behavior becomes internalized and collectively accepted. By deepening our understanding of how organizational culture influences ethical blind spots, this study aims to contribute both theoretically and practically to improving ethical governance in organizations. The findings are expected to serve as a foundation for developing more context-sensitive ethics training, conducting cultural ethics audits, and formulating internal policies that are more responsive to the moral dynamics of managerial accounting environments. The purpose of this research is to investigate how specific elements of organizational culture such as shared beliefs, communication patterns, and authority dynamics contribute to the formation and persistence of ethical blind spots in managerial accounting.

LITERATURE REVIEW & HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT
Ethics in Managerial Accounting

Managerial accounting functions not only as a tool for internal recording and reporting but also as a critical instrument in decision-making processes that significantly influence the strategic direction of an organization (Okoro & Ekwueme, 2020; Putri & Triwidatin, 2025). In their role, managerial accountants have access to and authority over sensitive data, cost allocations, and the interpretation of financial information, all of which can shape the perceptions of management and other stakeholders. Therefore, integrity and ethical sensitivity are fundamental pillars of this practice (Karabay et al., 2018; Gallagher

et al., 2023). However, ethical approaches in managerial accounting are often limited to formal compliance with regulations and professional standards, without addressing deeper and more contextual moral dimensions (Heywood et al., 2017; Akpan & Oluwagbade, 2023).

This gap becomes increasingly critical as managerial accountants are frequently involved in complex judgment areas, such as budgeting, cost control, and performance evaluation, where ethical dilemmas may not always be clearly defined by standard rules. The ability to recognize and respond to ethical issues requires more than adherence to codes—it demands professional judgment, moral reasoning, and an awareness of the broader implications of financial decisions (Okoro & Ekwueme, 2020; Ermawati & Suhardianto, 2024). Furthermore, the organizational environment and leadership behavior play a vital role in shaping ethical culture within accounting functions. Without active efforts to embed ethical considerations into everyday practices, there is a risk that accounting decisions may prioritize efficiency or profitability at the expense of transparency and accountability (Bayes et al., 2022: Putri & Triwidatin, 2025). Therefore, cultivating ethical sensitivity through education, training, and leadership example is essential to ensuring managerial accounting supports long-term organizational integrity.

Ethical Blind Spot Concept

The term ethical blind spots refer to an individual's failure to recognize that a situation contains ethical dimensions. This phenomenon typically occurs not due to malicious intent, but because of cognitive and social processes that obscure the moral aspects of a decision (Bandura, 2014; Imam & Kim, 2023). Bazerman dan Gino (2012) explain that ethical blind spots arise from mechanisms such as motivated reasoning, bounded ethicality, and ethical fading, in which individuals do not consciously consider the moral consequences of their actions. In the context of managerial accounting, ethical blind spots can occur when the focus on achieving financial targets overrides integrity and transparency.

These blind spots are especially dangerous because they allow unethical behavior to persist under the guise of rational business practices. Managerial accountants may unknowingly rationalize questionable decisions, such as manipulating cost allocations or selectively presenting financial data, as necessary for organizational performance (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004; Bazerman & Gino, 2012). Over time, repeated exposure to such decisions can normalize unethical conduct, particularly in high-pressure environments where success is measured primarily through financial indicators (Ashforth & Anand, 2003; Collier, 2015). This normalization process is often reinforced by organizational silence and implicit rules that discourage ethical voice (Detert & Edmondson, 2011; Ozer et al., 2024). It highlights the need for ethical awareness training and the cultivation of a reflective mindset that encourages professionals to consistently

evaluate the ethical implications of their actions (Trevino & Nelson, 2021; Cowton, 2021). Addressing ethical blind spots requires not only individual vigilance but also structural support through ethical leadership and a values-based organizational culture (Ogunfowora et al., 2022; Imam & Kim, 2023).

Organizational Culture and Ethical Formation

Organizational culture is a system of shared values, norms, and beliefs that influences how members of an organization think and behave. A culture that emphasizes outcomes (outcome-oriented culture) often creates pressure to meet targets at the expense of ethical standards. In such contexts, deviant behavior can become normalized, especially when there are no consequences or when leaders set similar examples (Ashforth & Anand, 2003; Nafei, 2016). An organizational culture that is permissive toward ethical compromises tends to facilitate the release of moral responsibility, or moral disengagement, thereby creating space for the emergence of ethical blind spots (Bayes et al., 2020; Jones et al., 2024).

This phenomenon is further exacerbated when psychological safety is lacking, making employees hesitant to voice ethical concerns (Sherer, 2022; Anyamesem-Poku & Parmar, 2024). A culture where silence is rewarded or where dissent is discouraged fosters an environment in which unethical behaviors go unchallenged, contributing to ethical fading (Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004). Over time, the normalization of such conduct results in widespread moral disengagement and ethical insensitivity (Bandura, 2014; Ogunfowora et al., 2022). The absence of strong ethical norms, combined with performance-driven pressures, weakens the organizational checks that typically prevent unethical decisions. Consequently, organizations with such cultures risk long-term reputational damage, employee disengagement, and regulatory consequences (Treviño et al., 2014; Adler, 2022).

Mechanism for Normalization of Ethical Violations

Normalization of deviance is the process by which unethical actions, initially seen as violations, gradually become accepted practices because they occur frequently without consequences. Within organizations, this process is reinforced by organizational silence, a culture of silence that discourages employees from reporting misconduct due to fear of managerial retaliation, reputational risk, or social exclusion (Sherer, 2022; Ozer, 2024). This dynamic allows ethical violations to become embedded within the system, making ethical blind spots increasingly difficult to detect.

This condition is often rooted in the absence of psychological safety, where employees feel unsafe to express dissenting views or ethical concerns, fearing backlash or exclusion (Joseph & Shetty, 2022; Anyamesem-Poku & Parmar, 2024). Furthermore, as Ashforth and Anand (2003) argue, repeated unethical behavior, when left unpunished, can evolve

into normalized corruption within the organization. In such settings, moral disengagement mechanisms are activated, making individuals justify or minimize their unethical decisions (Bandura, 2014; Guay & Johnston, 2022; Ogunfowora et al., 2022). Additionally, Adler (2022) highlights the need for trustworthiness in organizational systems to counteract these dynamics. Without institutional checks and a culture of integrity, normalization processes can deeply erode ethical standards, making deviance the organizational norm rather than the exception.

Ethical Voice and the Role of Accountants

An individual's ability to express moral concerns within an organization, known as ethical voice, plays a crucial role in preventing the emergence of ethical blind spots. Unfortunately, in many organizational contexts, there is a lack of psychologically safe environments that support open dialogue on ethical issues, often due to structural hierarchies or repressive organizational cultures (Trevino & Nelson, 2021; Anyamesem-Poku & Parmar, 2024). This is particularly evident in managerial accounting, where the pressure to achieve financial targets and maintain loyalty to organizational goals often suppresses ethical expression. As Detert and Edmondson (2011) explain, implicit voice theories—unspoken beliefs about the consequences of speaking up—discourage individuals from voicing ethical concerns, even when they are aware of wrongdoing.

This silencing effect is further amplified when leadership fails to model ethical behavior or provide formal channels for ethical discourse (Joseph & Shetty, 2022; Andriani et al., 2024). In such cases, accountants may experience internal conflict between their professional responsibilities and organizational expectations (Gallagher et al., 2023; Adler, 2022). Moreover, Seshoka (2021) warns that blind loyalty within organizational settings can foster environments where moral disengagement becomes routine. Thus, fostering a culture of ethical voice is not only a matter of individual courage but also of organizational design that prioritizes psychological safety, ethical integrity, and open communication as essential values.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts a qualitative approach with a multiple-case study design to deeply explore how organizational culture shapes and influences the emergence of ethical blind spots in managerial accounting practices. The case study method was selected for its capacity to investigate complex organizational phenomena within real-world settings, particularly those involving the lived experiences of accountants. Research was conducted in three mid-sized manufacturing firms in Indonesia, each possessing formal managerial accounting systems and hierarchical structures. These companies were purposefully selected to reflect diverse organizational cultures, industry characteristics, and a willingness to participate. Key informants included managerial accountants, financial

controllers, and unit managers engaged in accounting-based decision-making. Data collection relied on in-depth semi-structured interviews with 12 informants, focusing on ethical dilemmas, perceptions of organizational values, managerial pressures, and communication dynamics. This approach allowed for the exploration of both explicit and tacit knowledge related to ethical behavior and organizational culture. It was complemented by non-participatory observation of work environments and informal interactions to capture spontaneous expressions, day-to-day routines, and ethical attitudes that might not surface in formal interviews. Additionally, the analysis of internal documents such as codes of ethics, financial reporting policies, audit reports, and internal communication materials provided important contextual data and served as a foundation for triangulation.

Thematic analysis was used to identify meaningful patterns from interview transcripts, observation notes, and documents. The analytical process involved several stages, including data familiarization, open coding, theme generation—such as ethical fading, organizational silence, and cultural reinforcement—and thematic interpretation aligned with broader ethical and organizational behavior frameworks. To ensure validity and robustness of findings, the study applied both source and method triangulation and incorporated member checking to verify whether the interpretations accurately reflected participants' perspectives. In terms of methodological rigor, credibility was enhanced through prolonged engagement, triangulation, and feedback loops. Transferability was addressed by providing thick descriptions of the organizational context and participant narratives. Dependability and confirmability were ensured by maintaining a transparent audit trail of decisions and conducting critical self-reflection throughout the research process to minimize bias and enhance interpretive clarity.


Figure 1. Research Methodology Flowchart

The Figure 1 illustrates the methodological framework of a qualitative multiple-case study focused on ethical blind spots in managerial accounting. The research design employs a qualitative approach involving three purposively selected medium-sized manufacturing firms in Indonesia. Participants include managerial accountants, financial controllers, and unit managers. Data collection involves thematic analysis, coding of ethical and cultural concepts, identification of key themes, and thematic interpretation. These methods inform the data analysis, which reiterates the use of thematic analysis, concept coding, and internal documentation review. To ensure validity and reliability, the study applies triangulation of sources and methods, member checking, and adherence to principles of trustworthiness, which are integrated at both the data collection and analysis stages.

RESULTS

Table 1. Thematic Analysis Matrix on Ethical Blind Spots within Organizational Culture

Main Theme	Sub-Theme	Indicator Empiris
Organizational Culture	Target-oriented culture	Pressure of number achievement, performance-based bonuses, short-term achievement
	Hierarchy and control	Managerial dominance in decisions, limited criticism space
	Norma informal	The culture of "the origin of the satisfied leader", loyalty to the boss
Blind Spot Etis	Ethical fading	Unaware of the moral dimension of action
	Bounded ethicality	Not considering moral values due to pressure or bias of the system
	Normalization of deviation	Deviant practices that become routine
Organizational Silence	Fear of speaking	Fear of the consequences of disclosing the violation
	No discussion room	There is no forum or time to talk about ethics
Moral Justification	Collective rationalization	Mutual justification for unethical behavior
	Redefining integrity	Adjusting the meaning of integrity for organizational convenience

Solutions and Expectations	The need for contextual training	ethics	Hope there is training adapted to the reality of work

Table 1 presents the results of a thematic analysis on ethical blind spots within organizational culture. This matrix outlines the main themes, sub-themes, and empirical indicators that reflect how certain cultural patterns—such as target orientation, hierarchical control, and informal norms—contribute to ethical fading, bounded ethicality, and organizational silence. It also highlights moral justification mechanisms and proposed solutions, including ethics training and cultural audits, as critical steps toward addressing deeply embedded ethical vulnerabilities in organizational settings.

Organizational Culture That Encourages Ethical "Blind Spots"

Interview and field observation results reveal that an organizational culture heavily oriented toward achieving financial targets and short-term performance is the primary trigger for the emergence of ethical blind spots in managerial accounting practices. The three companies studied exhibited a consistent cultural pattern: a strong focus on numerical outputs, pressure to report positive unit performance, and an incentive system based on quantitative achievements. In this context, financial figures are no longer merely reflections of performance but have become managerial legitimacy symbols that must not "fail" in the eyes of top management and stakeholders. This creates a condition where managerial accountants serve not only as data reporters but also as "narrative managers" through the manipulation of numbers. Several informants mentioned that, although they technically recognize that report adjustments could be unethical, structural pressures and leadership expectations render these practices "silent obligations." In many cases, data inaccuracies or minor manipulations of performance reports are regarded as loyal contributions to the team and organization. This indicates a distortion in ethical perception, where collective success is defined by the ability to maintain the company's positive image, even at the expense of accuracy and transparency.

"Good numbers are considered important, especially for monthly meetings. Sometimes, if they are not aligned, they have to be 'tidied up'. Otherwise, the team is perceived as underperforming." (Informant A, Controller)

This statement highlights how a performance-driven culture can lead to internal justifications for unethical behavior. Actions like "tidying up the numbers" are seen not as violations but as strategic responses to unrealistic expectations. In such environments, ethical considerations become blurred as individuals focus more on meeting targets than on upholding moral standards. Organizational cultures that emphasize performance without ethical balance tend to foster climates that enable moral disengagement, where success is measured by compliance rather than integrity. In high-power distance contexts

like Indonesia, employees are less likely to question directives from superiors, which increases the likelihood of following ethically questionable instructions that appear socially acceptable. Over time, this dynamic contributes to a systemic shift in ethical perception, shaped by organizational norms rather than professional values. Ethical blind spots, therefore, are not merely personal failures but the result of cultural distortions within organizations that discourage ethical reflection, suppress transparency, and undermine critical moral judgment.

Normalization of Deviance and Collective Rationalization

Ethical blind spots in managerial accounting do not only arise from structural pressures or result-oriented organizational cultures but also develop gradually through collective rationalization mechanisms that institutionalize deviant behavior as part of "operational routine." Interview data indicate that practices such as number adjustments, delaying expense recognition, or reallocating costs are not seen as violations but as adaptive strategies considered reasonable for maintaining financial performance stability in the eyes of management. In other words, there is a transformation in the meaning of manipulative actions—from something normatively unethical to "technical wisdom" or even "professional cleverness.

"It is not considered lying, but more about arranging the time and presentation of numbers which is commonly done by many people." (Informant B, Managerial Accountant)

This statement highlights how individuals justify unethical actions by aligning them with group norms, leading to the collective acceptance of deviance. When such behaviors go unpunished and are subtly approved by leaders or peers, they become normalized and integrated into daily work practices. Small violations no longer trigger ethical concerns and are instead seen as necessary or harmless parts of professional life. Common justifications like "everyone does it" or "it's for the good of the organization" help reinforce these actions as acceptable. This normalization occurs not only through personal reasoning but also through shared organizational narratives that reframe manipulation as loyalty or contribution, allowing individuals to detach their behavior from moral responsibility.

In organizational cultures that emphasize harmony and avoid conflict, such as in many Indonesian companies, challenging unethical practices is often discouraged. Individuals who speak out risk being labeled uncooperative. As rationalizations become normalized, they are woven into daily operations and informal governance, making them difficult to dismantle. Ethical fading, in this context, is not always unconscious—it can be intentional. Managerial accountants may recognize the ethical implications of their actions but justify them through organizational cues, incentives, or peer approval. Over time, these behaviors stop triggering moral concern. Ethical blind spots formed this way reflect not personal

flaws but deeply rooted cultural norms, requiring structural reform that goes beyond education to challenge the collective narratives enabling deviance.

Organizational Silence and the Inhibition of Ethical Voice

This study also found that one of the key factors reinforcing the presence of ethical blind spots in managerial accounting practices is organizational silence. Organizational silence refers to a condition where members of an organization are reluctant to voice opinions, criticisms, or objections to practices deemed deviant, primarily due to social pressure, rigid hierarchical structures, or fear of negative consequences. In the three organizations studied, most informants stated that although they recognized ethical discrepancies in reporting or decision-making practices, they chose to remain silent because they felt there was no safe space to speak up.

"If you are too vocal, you're seen as troublesome. But sometimes we just want to remind so things don't get overlooked." (Informant C, Accounting Supervisor)

The barrier to raising ethical concerns in some organizations is cultural rather than technical. In environments where loyalty to superiors is seen as the highest virtue, speaking out about potential wrongdoing is often discouraged or viewed negatively. This leads to the suppression of ethical dialogue and reinforces unchecked authority. Even when unethical behavior is noticed, it often goes unreported due to the absence of supportive mechanisms and fear of being labeled a troublemaker. Employees prefer to conform socially rather than risk professional or social consequences. Ironically, the stronger the culture of loyalty, the more ethical blind spots emerge, as silence and compliance take precedence over moral accountability.

Furthermore, in many Indonesian companies with hierarchical and conflict-avoidant cultures, organizational silence becomes deeply ingrained. Subordinates' input is often viewed as disobedience rather than valuable feedback, rendering ethical voice ineffective. A "please the boss" mindset overrides principles like transparency and accountability, institutionalizing silence and allowing ethical violations to persist. This has serious implications for managerial accounting. Accountants, pressured by professional loyalty and organizational culture, may suppress doubts, adjust financial reports, and ignore unethical practices. Over time, this behavior weakens the ethical integrity of the organization and leads to a financial information system prone to distortion and manipulation.

Thus, organizational silence is not merely the absence of voice but an active representation of organizational failure to create safe spaces for ethical oversight. To address this, it is insufficient to merely establish formal reporting systems like whistleblowing—which are often underutilized due to low trust. More importantly, there must be a cultivation of a work culture that encourages openness, moral courage, and two-way dialogue at all organizational levels.

Redefinition of Ethical Values in an Organizational Context

One of the most interesting and worrying findings in this study is the existence of systemic tendencies in which moral concepts such as "integrity" and "professionalism" undergo contextual reinterpretation in the organizational environment. Based on interviews with informants, it appears that these two terms, which should be principled, have undergone a shift in meaning and are given pragmatic content by the expectations of superiors, internal power dynamics, and organizational operational needs. Integrity is no longer interpreted as a commitment to truth and accuracy, but rather as the ability to maintain internal harmony and loyalty to the command structure. Professionalism is no longer a reflection of ethical standards and objectivity, but is synonymous with flexibility and loyalty to the interests of the institution.

"The important thing is to be loyal and be able to maintain the good name of the team. When it comes to right and wrong, sometimes it can be negotiated as long as it doesn't interfere with the system." (Informant D, Financial Manager)

This statement reflects that formal ethical framework are often subordinated by the socio-cultural realities of the organization. In this context, individuals tend to avoid moral judgments based on universal principles and replace them with pragmatic calculations: whether an action will embarrass the team, interfere with the interests of the leadership, or disrupt the "smooth running of the system". As a result, ethical judgments become relative and dependent on position, power relations, and internal political dynamics. This phenomenon leads to cultural cognition, a concept introduced by Kahan (2015), which explains how moral beliefs and perceptions of "truth" are shaped by the dominant values in a particular social group, rather than by objective moral logic.

In organizational cultures that prioritize loyalty, harmony, and stability, moral values are reshaped by internal consensus rather than objective principles. Integrity is often redefined as conformity to group interests, making ethical courage appear disruptive. Faced with dilemmas, managerial accountants tend to choose politically safe options, even if morally unclear. This leads to ethical blind spots not just from ignorance, but from altered perceptions of right and wrong shaped by the organization's social norms. Ethical values are adjusted to align with managerial expectations, turning questionable actions into acceptable adaptations. Over time, this creates a pseudo-ethical environment where moral language remains, but its true meaning is lost.

Furthermore, in many organizations, moral values are reinterpreted through internal consensus rather than objective ethical principles. Integrity becomes defined by loyalty and conformity to group interests, while ethical courage is seen as disruptive. This leads individuals, particularly managerial accountants, to make morally ambiguous decisions that are politically safe and socially acceptable. Over time, questionable actions are normalized, turning into adaptive behaviors supported by internal narratives. This process

creates ethical blind spots, not from ignorance, but from value distortions shaped by organizational norms. The phenomenon is reinforced by moral licensing, where individuals justify unethical behavior based on past contributions or symbolic roles, such as "working hard for the team." As a result, moral transgressions go undetected, free from guilt or self-correction. Addressing this issue requires more than ethical training—it demands a cultural shift through regular values audits that critically assess how integrity, accountability, and professionalism are defined and practiced. Without this, ethics risk becoming symbolic tools that legitimize systemic misconduct.

Redefinition of Ethical Values in an Organizational Context

Although many ethical blind spots were identified, almost all informants stated that change is still possible, particularly through real-world work context-based ethics training and organizational culture audits. They expect the training to be no longer normative, but to address real dilemmas and how to manage them ethically. This shows that to overcome ethical blind spots, organizations not only need to improve reporting or compliance systems, but also transform organizational culture, emphasizing transparency, psychological safety, and ethical voice empowerment at all levels.

DISCUSSION

This study concludes that ethical blind spots in managerial accounting are not simply the result of individual mistakes or moral failures, but are rooted in the interplay of structural pressures, cultural rationalizations, and inadequate ethical oversight. These findings echo previous research by Sims (2003) and Burchell (2020) that highlights how an overemphasis on target achievement often marginalizes ethical considerations. However, this study goes further by showing that these blind spots are institutionalized through shared narratives that redefine loyalty and professionalism in ways that undermine moral autonomy. Building on the work of Ashforth and Anand (2003), this study supports the idea that normalization of deviance occurs when minor violations become routine and go unpunished. Unlike previous research that often emphasizes regulatory or external controls such as those presented by Payne et al. (2020) and Cowton (2021), this study highlights how informal organizational cultures and hierarchical structures facilitate the silencing of persistent ethical concerns. This echoes the findings of Joseph and Shetty (2022), who describe how hierarchical and authoritarian leadership stifles ethical voice. Furthermore, as Detert and Edmondson (2011) have argued, organizational silence—when reinforced by fear and lack of psychological safety— significantly increases ethical risk. Our findings confirm that this silence is not passive, but socially constructed and maintained by collective fear of reputational or career-related consequences.

Compared to Bazerman and Gino's (2012) behavioral ethics framework, this study reinforces the view that moral disengagement is often context-driven and reinforced by the organizational system itself. This phenomenon is exacerbated in cultures with high power distance, such as Indonesia, where dissent is discouraged, and ethical issues are viewed as distractions rather than constructive input. This extends Bandura's (2014) theory of moral reasoning by illustrating how moral reasoning is manipulated through collective reframing, transforming potentially unethical actions into perceived contributions to organizational success. In this regard, our study contributes by conceptualizing ethical blind spots not as a failure to know what is right, but as a failure to act on that knowledge due to cultural reinterpretation and peer reinforcement.

Practically, this study offers significant implications for organizational ethics management. Consistent with Anyamesem-Poku and Parmar (2024), psychological safety must be institutionalized as part of an organization's ethics infrastructure. This requires a shift from a punitive approach to a reflective approach that emphasizes dialogue, trust, and collective responsibility. While previous recommendations have often focused on compliance measures and ethics training, as Payne et al. (2020) and Gallagher et al. (2023) both argue, our findings advocate for more contextually grounded interventions: embedding ethics into performance metrics, reconfiguring incentives, and promoting narrative change around what constitutes "professional success."

In addition, drawing on Adler's (2022) emphasis on credibility and trustworthiness in qualitative inquiry, this study underscores the importance of creating internal mechanisms that ensure transparency and shared accountability. Ethics audits, values-based performance appraisals, and participatory forums for ethical reflection can shift ethics from symbolic rhetoric to active practice. As supported by Braun and Clarke's (2024) thematic approach, this structural reinforcement must be informed by a context-specific interpretation of moral values that acknowledges employees' lived experiences.

This study contributes to the growing discourse on accounting ethics by framing ethical blind spots as systemic and culturally embedded phenomena rather than isolated lapses. It calls for a transformation of organizational consciousness—moving from a rigid performance paradigm to a culture that supports ethical courage, narrative transparency, and collective moral reasoning. In line with insights from Ermawati and Suhardianto (2024), such a transformation is key to fostering ethical resilience and sustainability in managerial accounting practices.

CONCLUSION

This study finds that ethical blind spots in managerial accounting are not merely individual moral failings but are systemic outcomes shaped by organizational structures, performance pressures, and cultural rationalizations. In work environments where achieving targets is prioritized over ethical reflection, minor deviations become

normalized and are gradually accepted as legitimate practices. Even professionals with good intentions may be absorbed into a culture that subtly redefines integrity as loyalty to authority rather than adherence to ethical standards. The study identifies three primary mechanisms sustaining ethical blind spots: ethical fading, organizational silence, and cognitive distortion through cultural consensus.

The practical implication of this finding is the urgent need for transformational change in organizational ethics management. Addressing ethical vulnerabilities requires more than strengthening internal control systems; it necessitates embedding ethical awareness into daily routines. This includes implementing organizational culture audits focused on values such as integrity, transparency, and accountability, reformulating incentive structures that reward ethical behavior, and developing ethics training rooted in real-world dilemmas faced by managerial accountants.

Theoretically, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of how organizational culture interacts with behavioral ethics. It confirms and extends prior work on ethical fading and moral disengagement by demonstrating that blind spots are not passive omissions, but active reinterpretations shaped by group norms and leadership models. This supports the view that ethics must be treated as a dynamic, context-sensitive process rather than a fixed individual trait.

However, this study has limitations in scope and sample size, focusing primarily on mid-sized Indonesian companies. Future research could explore cross-cultural comparisons or sectoral variations to generalize findings more broadly. Longitudinal studies are also recommended to examine how ethical perceptions evolve over time in response to organizational reforms or crises.

REFERENCES

[1]   Adler, R. H. (2022). Trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Journal of Human Lactation*, *38*(4), 598–602.

[2]   Akpan, J. U., & Oluwagbade, O. (2023). Social and environmental responsibility in accounting: Beyond financial metrics. *International Journal of social sciences and management research*, *9*(9), 163-188.

[3]   Andriani, I., Lasmana, A., & Aziz, A. J. (2024). Employee perceptions of the fraud risk triangle factors against asset misappropriation. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi Kesatuan*, *12*(4), 535-544.

[4]   Anyamesem-Poku, F., & Parmar, R. M. (2024). Ensuring psychological safety in the workplace to enhance performance: Our Corporate Responsilibity, Counselling Perspective. *Library of Progress-Library Science, Information Technology & Computer*, *44*(3), 45-60.

[5]   Ashforth, B. E., & Anand, V. (2003). The normalization of corruption in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *25*, 1–52.

[6]   Bandura, A. (2014). Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action. In *Handbook of moral behavior and development* (pp. 45-103). Psychology press.

[7]   Bayes, R., Druckman, J. N., Goods, A., & Molden, D. C. (2020). When and how different motives can drive motivated political reasoning. *Political Psychology*, *41*(5), 1031-1052.

[8]   Bazerman, M. H., & Gino, F. (2012). Behavioral ethics: Toward a deeper understanding of moral judgment and dishonesty. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, *8*(1), 85–104.

[9]   Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2024). Thematic analysis. In *Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research* (pp. 7187–7193). Springer.

[10]   Burchell, J. (2020). *The corporate social responsibility reader*. London: Routledge.

[11]   Collier, P. M. (2015). *Accounting for managers: Interpreting accounting information for decision making*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

[12]   Cousins, J. B., Bourgeois, I., & Associates. (2014). Multiple case study methods and findings. *New Directions for Evaluation*, *2014*(141), 25–99.

[13]   Cowton, C. J. (2021). Accounting ethics in the undergraduate curriculum and the impact of professional accreditation. In *Accounting Ethics Education* (pp. 64–79). Routledge.

[14]   Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A. C. (2011). Implicit voice theories: Taken-for-granted rules of self-censorship at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *54*(3), 461–488.

[15]   DeTienne, K. B., Ellertson, C. F., Ingerson, M. C., & Dudley, W. R. (2021). Moral development in business ethics: An examination and critique. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *170*, 429-448.

[16]   Dodgson, J. E. (2021). Critical analysis: The often-missing step in conducting literature review research. *Journal of Human Lactation*, *37*(1), 27-32.

[17] Duckett, L. J. (2021). Quantitative research excellence: Study design and reliable and valid measurement of variables. *Journal of Human Lactation*, *37*(3), 456-463.

[18] E Karabay, M., Sener, I., & A Tezergil, S. (2018). Ethical climate as a mediator between employees' organizational silence behaviors and their trust in leader: An empirical research on insurance sector employees. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, *7*(1), 70-83.

[19] Ermawati, Y., & Suhardianto, N. (2024). Accounting and sustainability practices grounded in spirituality and ethics. *Atestasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi*, *7*(1), 13-28.

[20] Gallagher, A., Kennedy, R., Jones, M., Smith, H., Reynolds, L., & Coniam, P. (2023). Ethics and Professionalism Pillar. In *Nursing Practice and Education* (pp. 30–48). Routledge.

[21] Guay, B., & Johnston, C. D. (2022). Ideological asymmetries and the determinants of politically motivated reasoning. *American Journal of Political Science*, *66*(2), 285-301.

[22] Heywood, P., Marquette, H., Peiffer, C., & Zuñiga, N. (2017). *Integrity and integrity management in public life*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.

[23] Imam, A., & Kim, D. Y. (2023). Ethical leadership and improved work behaviors: A moderated mediation model using prosocial silence and organizational commitment as mediators and employee engagement as moderator. *Current Psychology*, *42*(13), 10519-10532.

[24] Jones, D. N., Beekun, R., Schermer, J. A., MacDonald, K. B., & Compton, J. (2024). Inoculating Against Moral Disengagement Creates Ethical Adherence for Narcissism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 01461672241276562.

[25] Joseph, S., & Shetty, N. (2022). An empirical study on the impact of employee voice and silence on destructive leadership and organizational culture. *Asian Journal of Business Ethics*, *11*(Suppl 1), 85-109.

[26] Kahan, D. M. (2015). The politically motivated reasoning paradigm. *Emerging Trends in Social & Behavioral Sciences, Forthcoming,* 1-24.

[27] Kirana, C. A., & Novita, N. (2021). Remunerasi direksi, disparitas gaji antar direksi dan kinerja perusahaan. *Jurnal Akuntansi Kontemporer*, *13*(2), 81–95.

[28] Leeming, D. (2018). The use of theory in qualitative research. *Journal of Human Lactation*, *34*(4), 668-673.

[29] Lewis, B. A. (2021). Doing Bad for the Good of the Organization: How Leaders Incite Unethical Employee Behaviors. (Dissertation, University of Houston). https://uh-ir.tdl.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/94a3c3e8-c689-4330-93d5-51fb0a83ef9b/content

[30] Nafei, W. A. (2016). Organizational silence: Its destroying role of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Business Research*, *9*(5), 57-75.

[31] Ogunfowora, B. T., Nguyen, V. Q., Steel, P., & Hwang, C. C. (2022). A meta-analytic investigation of the antecedents, theoretical correlates, and consequences of moral disengagement at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *107*(5), 746.

[32] Okoro, E. G., & Ekwueme, C. M. (2020). Does spirituality belong to accounting? Insights from morality, relevance and fairness dogmas. *Jalingo Journal of Social and Management Sciences*, *2*(4), 118-125.

[33] Ozer, M., Chen, T., & Tang, J. W. (2024). Detrimental Effects of Remaining Silent about Operational Concerns at Work: Implications for employee outcomes. *Organization Studies*, *45*(11), 1611-1643.

[34] Payne, D. M., Corey, C., Raiborn, C., & Zingoni, M. (2020). An applied code of ethics model for decision-making in the accounting profession. *Management Research Review*, *43*(9), 1117–1134.

[35] Phillips, R., Schrempf-Stirling, J., & Stutz, C. (2020). The past, history, and corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *166*(2), 203-213.

[36] Putri, R. W., & Triwidatin, Y. (2025). Accounting Information System for Cash Receipts from Room Sales at The Pall Inn Hotel Cisarua. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi Kesatuan*, *13*(1), 63-72.

[37] Seshoka, M. D. (2021). *Blind loyalty in organization, contributing factors and preventative measures: a theoretical analysis*. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.

[38] Sherer, J. S. (2022). *Organizational commitment as a mediator between organizational climate and employee silence*. Minneapolis: Walden University.

[39] Sims, R. R. (2003). *Ethics and corporate social responsibility*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

[40] Stake, R. E. (2013). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York: Guilford press.

[41] Tenbrunsel, A. E., & Messick, D. M. (2004). Ethical fading: The role of self-deception in unethical behavior. *Social justice research*, *17*, 223-236.

[42] Trevino, L. K., & Nelson, K. A. (2021). *Managing business ethics: Straight talk about how to do it right*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

[43] Treviño, L. K., Den Nieuwenboer, N. A., & Kish-Gephart, J. J. (2014). (Un)ethical behavior in organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *65*(1), 635–660.

[44] Van Rooij, B., & Fine, A. (2018). Toxic corporate culture: Assessing organizational processes of deviancy. *Administrative Sciences*, *8*(3), 23.

[45] Victoria, A. (2025). *Characteristics of a profession*. Cairo: The Nile.

3457-Revision.docx

Implemented, & Sustained in an Intercollegiate Athletic Department.", University of Minnesota
Publication

10 Yue Yuan, Zhiming Wu. "The more Congruence, the Better? The Effect of Leader-Employee Congruence in Moral Identity on Unethical Pro-Supervisor Behavior", Journal of Business and Psychology, 2025
Publication

<1%

11 scholarworks.waldenu.edu
Internet Source

<1%

12 www.ijem.com
Internet Source

<1%

13 Adebukola Oyewunmi, Gill Owens, Ogechi Adeola. "The Dark Side of Leadership: A Cross-Cultural Compendium - With Lessons for Leaders", Routledge, 2025
Publication

<1%

14 Gerald, Robert T.. "Why Black U.S. Army Military Intelligence Officers Continue to Fail: A Real-Time Delphi Study.", University of Arizona Global Campus
Publication

<1%

15 Hira Salah ud din Khan, Matteo Cristofaro, Muhammad Salman Chughtai, Silvia Baiocco. "Understanding the psychology of workplace bullies: the impact of Dark Tetrad and how to mitigate it", Management Research Review, 2023
Publication

<1%

16 Martinez, Joseph Dominick. "The Prohibiting Voice of Toxic Leadership: A Pentecostal Silencing Study", Regent University
Publication

<1%

17 Rasim S. Kurdoglu. "Business Ethics", Elsevier BV, 2024
Publication

<1 %

18 elsaonline.com
Internet Source

<1 %

19 journal.um-surabaya.ac.id
Internet Source

<1 %

20 link.springer.com
Internet Source

<1 %

21 www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
Internet Source

<1 %

22 theses.gla.ac.uk
Internet Source

<1 %

Exclude quotes	On	Exclude matches	Off
Exclude bibliography	On		