

Decision: The Space between the Code of Ethics and the Ethical Behaviour

👤 Carmen Lucía Carmona Paredes

Second Prize ex-aequo
Iberoamerican Prize

Carmen Lucía
Carmona Paredes
Mexico,
Decision Analyst
for a consulting firm
in the UK



EN Decision making has the required power to transform a code of ethics into ethical behavior since it is the space in time between reflection and action. Given that decision making is a skill that has to be learnt with practice, corporate decision makers require a procedure for systematic learning which has to let them to compare information, understand different points of views and handle the continuous changes in the business environment. The document suggests the inclusion of Multi criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) as a practical methodology to address the complexity in evaluating investment projects. It is a technique with the potential to transform the Project Portfolio Management of a company because it requires a particular definition of ethics for each business model and because it translates the ethics general concept into tangible, real and relevant values. MCDA is an analysis approach that brings to light the true motivation behind the investments.

FR Une décision a le pouvoir suffisant de changement pour transformer un code d'éthique en un comportement éthique, car elle est l'espace dans le temps entre la réflexion et l'action. Etant donné que la prise de décision est une compétence qui s'apprend avec la pratique, les décideurs au sein d'une entreprise ont besoin d'une procédure pour que son apprentissage soit fait d'une manière systématique et flexible pour répondre aux changements continus. Cela afin de permettre de comparer des informations, des perceptions et de comprendre des points de vue différents. L'auteure propose notamment la méthodologie d'aide à la décision multicritère (MCDA) comme une alternative pratique pour aborder la complexité dans l'évaluation des projets d'investissement avec le potentiel de transformer la gestion de portefeuille de projets d'une entreprise. La méthode MCDA implique la définition de l'éthique d'une manière explicative et particulière dans chaque modèle d'affaires ce qui traduit un concept général en valeurs éthiques tangibles, concrets, réels et pertinents pour les investisseurs. Il s'agit d'un moyen de mettre sur la table les vraies motivations qui se trouvent derrière les investissements.

Introduction

The financial crisis and frauds that have occurred in the last decade have inspired an extraordinary wave of regulatory reforms, changes in corporate governance structures, adoption of codes of ethics, and implementation committees (Dominguez, Alvarez and Sanchez, 2009). However, despite these clear efforts that promote ethical behaviour in the financial world, the fact is that the link between preventive solutions and a reduction in the number of scandals is not clear. (Huse, 2005; Roberts et al., 2005; Hans et al., 2009; Schwartz, 2005; Bonn & Fisher 2005). That is, to quote the popular saying, there is still a «gap between what it is said and what it is done».

Therefore, the new question that arises is how to form this bond and transform a code of ethics in ethical actions? The answer lies in a change in the decision making process since the decision is the time gap between reflection and action, that is, between the code of ethics and the ethical behaviour.

La question qui se pose est de savoir comment transformer un code d'éthique en un comportement éthique. La réponse réside dans un changement dans le processus décisionnel, puisque la décision est l'espace dans le temps entre la réflexion et l'action, c'est-à-dire, entre le code d'éthique et le comportement éthique.

To Maximize or Not to Maximize

A good decision qualifies as such when it carries out a procedure of analysis that takes into account certain principles (Howard, 1976). Therefore, the quality of analysis in the decision-making of a manager is of fundamental importance to the transformation of corporate plans and strategies. This, in turn, framed in the context of business growth, embodies the essential need to fit the decision analysis approach into the corporate internal financial perspective because it is almost impossible to think about strategic decisions regardless of from the allocation of resources.

Nous observons souvent le débat éternel entre les financiers et les professeurs d'éthique pour essayer de répondre au dilemme quant à savoir si l'objectif de l'entreprise est oui ou non de maximiser la valeur des actionnaires. Pour dépasser ce débat, - qui est si présent dans la littérature- il est nécessaire tout d'abord de préciser la ou les valeurs à maximiser.

Reconnaître les vraies valeurs d'une entreprise va au-delà de la lecture de son rapport social, de sa mission et même de son code d'éthique. Adam et Shavit (2008) proposent d'analyser la manière dont l'entreprise procède à l'évaluation d'options d'investissement et d'observer les critères utilisés pour l'allocation des ressources. Ces critères sont une reconnaissance et une expression plus réaliste des valeurs de l'entreprise, car les décideurs se basent sur eux pour juger si une proposition d'investissement est bonne ou mauvaise dans le contexte d'affaires.

It is common to observe the continued discussion among financial people and ethics teachers trying to give an answer to the dilemma as to whether the goal of corporations is or is not to maximize shareholder value. To account for this debate very present in the literature, it is necessary as a first step to clarify the value or values that want to be maximized. Only that way, with the formalization of the ethics in a tangible value or values, a new sense to the analysis and a specific meaning to this universal concept may be given.

Recognizing the true values of a company goes beyond reading its corporative social report, its mission, and even its code of ethics. Adam and Shavit (2008) suggest to analyze the way in which the company carries out the assessment of the investment options and to observe the criteria used for the allocation of resources. These criteria are a more realistic demonstration of corporate values because decision makers use them to judge whether a proposal is good or bad for the business context. In many companies the evaluation of investment options is a fundamental part of the process of Portfolio Management of Strategic Projects (CPM for short English Corporate Portfolio Management).

Throughout this process, the decision-maker constantly faces difficult choices mainly by selecting projects that fulfill the growth target of the company without contradicting the ethics of the business. The reality is that the evaluation of investment options that maximize these two types of values involves a complex thought process filled by a tangle of interactions. An effective technique for addressing the complexity of this type of situations is the use of Analysis for Decision Making with Multiple Criteria (MCDA) as an internal procedure for making strategic investment decisions. The implementation of this method allows to transform the approach to Project Portfolio Management by translating a general concept of ethical values into tangible and specific values, and by providing a useful learning tool for achieving better decision-makers education, and as a result to achieve more ethical actions.

Value vs. Investment Values

If we pay attention to recent changes in regulations (Somarnes Oxley Act in the United States and Bribery Act in the United Kingdom, etc.) and to the changes in corporate governance schemes, it can be observed that the efforts of recent years have seen monitoring and auditing as an universal solution for the reduction of cases of unethical behaviour. One consequence of this type of solution is the tendency for companies to consider ethical behaviour from a legal compliance point of view. In this respect, a recent survey of the FTSE350 (Barma, 2010) confirms this tendency by showing that about 70% of participants

identified the Internal Audit Committee as responsible for ethical behaviour.

The challenge is to get companies to depart from this policy and to move on from delegating the topic to a specialist, or a committee of the Board of Directors, or to a group of consultants to making ethics an integral part of their business models, included into strategic processes and hence investments evaluation.

Looking for a substantive definition of Ethics

For this to happen, the first step is to define ethics in a way that is congenial with a specific business pattern. With a substantive definition I do not mean a code of ethics or a list of business values because too often we think that these efforts are enough to create an organizational culture. However, the expert in CPM, Kevin Bossley (Catalyzed¹ Consultant) who has participated in dozens of strategic decisions, in an interview described otherwise. When asked how often is expressed and taken into account in decisions the commitment that some companies have to preserve the environment, human rights or a particular community, he, surprisingly, pointed out the lack of inclusion of these values in the evaluation of strategies.

Unfortunately, these observations are not surprising from a personal point of view, if one takes into account that a company's growth, the success of a product, the value of the shares, and so on, is epitomized only in financial values or indexes that represent them. Consequently, this way of reporting and measuring success is a source of pressure for decision-makers. In a way, this is what the survey by AMA (2006) reveals, in which two-thirds of the participants responded that the pressure to "meet unrealistic business goals" is the most likely cause for making the ethical standards of an organization irrelevant.

This kind of pressures could be alleviated if corporate employees had a tool to show to managers in a frank way the challenges involved in making decisions, particularly when you need to decide where to invest money often in millions dollars amounts. Hence, the importance of a process allowing the definition of values that are real business goals and explicitly relevant for the investors.

One practical manner in which we can identify the investment priorities of a company is through the decisions taken pursuant to the Portfolio Management of Strategic Projects. This function is an internal financial process which can be defined as a sequence

Le défi est d'amener les entreprises à s'éloigner de cette tendance et que ce sujet ne soit pas uniquement une affaire d'un spécialiste du domaine au sein de l'entreprise, d'un comité de direction, ou d'un groupe de consultants, mais aussi une question clé dans les modèles d'affaires et qui doit être intégrée dans les processus stratégiques et donc dans l'évaluation des investissements.

La réalité est que si un projet est préféré à un autre, c'est parce qu'il est apprécié pour plus d'une raison. Cette déclaration de Ralph Kenney est la prémisse sur laquelle est basée la méthodologie d'aide à la décision multicritère (MCDA), qui est une méthode de prise de décision permettant l'évaluation des options en tenant compte de critères multiples ou des objectifs.

1. www.catalyze.co.uk

C'est un processus qui aide à la cohérence et permet de donner une structure à la pensée.

Cette méthodologie a été utilisée systématiquement dans le cadre du processus de gestion stratégique de portefeuille de projets dans de nombreux processus, aussi bien dans le secteur public que privé, et sa popularité tient à la cohérence des jugements effectués et à la transparence de l'analyse qui combine des éléments techniques aux aspects sociaux. (Phillips, 2002)

La première étape de la méthode d'analyse se base sur la théorie d'utilité. L'utilité étant le reflet de la valeur inhérente que donne le décideur aux alternatives et sur laquelle est basée la décision finale. (Howard, 1976). Fondamentalement, cette étape consiste à identifier et à définir les lignes directrices pour l'évaluation des options

of decisions seeking the best combination of projects and programs ensuring business growth. This sequence of decisions includes identification, prioritization, authorization, and project management. (Sanwal, 2007).

In theory, a Portfolio of Projects at the highest level is designed to define strategies and give a direction to financial decision making. A typical life cycle of a project portfolio begins with the introduction of the strategic plan from which we derive the determining criteria for the allocation of resources. (Sanwal, 2007). We would expect that the mission and vision could give specific clues about the criteria for making decisions and provide guidance as to the values to be maximized through investments, i.e., which value or values it will give value thru money. Under this premise it is said that a strategic project portfolio shows the real interest behind the investment.

Ethical dilemmas are complex decisions

The reality is that if a project is preferred over another it is because it is valued for more than one reason. This statement by Ralph Kenney is the premise on which the Analysis for Decision Making with Multiple Criteria (MCDA) is based which, as its name indicates, allows evaluating options taking into account multiple criteria. Its main feature is that it enables the decision-maker criteria to include «soft» criteria, to resort to trials to evaluate the differences between options, and uses preference values for measuring the degree to which the options (projects, programs and strategies) achieve the goals put forth in the criteria. It is a process that helps giving structure to the coherence of thought. (Howard, 1976)

The MCDA method builds on a set of consistent judgments in a preference scale which allocates scores to each option. These scores constitute a single numerical scale that allows comparison of options with different units. This is possible because the methodology does not evaluate the importance of one criterion against another, but it compares the value of the change in units of one versus another. This methodology has been used as part of Portfolio Management of Strategic Projects (CPM) in various processes in the private and public sectors and its popularity emerges from the consistency of judgments made and the transparency of the analysis that combines social with technical elements. (Phillips, 2002).

The objective of the analysis is to provide an overall ranking of the options and consists of five steps illustrated in table 1. The first step has its basis in the utility theory. Utility is understood to reflect the inherent value that the decision-maker gives to the alternatives and on which depends the final decision (Howard, 1976). Basically, this step identifies and defines guidelines for

evaluating the options (investments, programs and projects) and in particular, it is the space in which the company can translate the meaning of ethics in a business context through explicit values.

MCDA Stages:

1. Identification of objectives or criteria
2. Identification of options
3. Evaluation of options
4. Sensitivity analysis

Table 1 : MCDA Stages

It is important to note that MCDA has no commutative property so that the order of the steps alter the result. Carrying out the identification of objectives as the first step before considering possible solutions avoids unnecessary ethical dilemmas.

Once these criteria and alternatives have been identified, they need to be evaluated. (step 4, Table 1). This procedure is performed by comparing all alternatives within each criterion, one at a time, in order to define the difference between the alternatives. This technique clarifies the situations in which there is an investment option X that is better at certain value, an option Y that give a best result at another value and an option Z that has the potential to give good results at both values but with a high level of risk.

In many cases the ethical dilemmas faced by decision-makers arise out of this tangle of interactions. The MCDA methodology is an effective tool to reduce complexity because the analysis is focused on answering what you value and how much you value each situation.

The MCDA methodology does not change the mentality of the decision maker. It is a process that can zoom in the decision-making and transform a process that in many occasions takes place unconsciously into an explicit sequence, which moreover, is also transparent, auditable and systematic.

MCDA a tool for learning

Decision making is a skill that is learned by doing, so having a tool that allows a continuous learning is essential to develop better decision makers. The MCDA is an effective learning tool because it meets the two requirements for authentic learning of complex situations (Serman, 1994). On the one hand, the methodology allows for obtaining the knowledge and perceptions of decision makers and also allows for creating feedback structures on these knowledge and perceptions. This is important because we must not forget that decision-makers of a company are impro-

(investissements, programmes, projets) et elle est en définitive l'espace dans lequel l'entreprise peut traduire le sens de l'éthique dans le contexte des affaires à travers des valeurs explicites.

Il est important de noter que la MCDA n'est pas commutative, c'est-à-dire que l'ordre des étapes modifie le résultat. Identifier les objectifs comme étant une première étape avant d'envisager des solutions possibles permet d'éviter les dilemmes éthiques inutiles.

Dans de nombreux cas, les dilemmes éthiques auxquels sont confrontés les décideurs naissent de cet enchevêtrement d'interactions. La MCDA est un outil efficace pour réduire la complexité, car l'analyse se centre sur le fait de répondre combien et comment chaque situation est pondérée.

La MCDA est un outil d'apprentissage efficace, car elle répond aux deux exigences nécessaires à l'apprentissage authentique des situations complexes.

Le processus de MCDA permet d'établir un diagnostic du contexte de chaque décision, les décideurs peuvent aussi regarder en arrière et comparer des informations, des perceptions, et comprendre les raisons pour lesquelles certaines actions ont été choisies.

Ce cycle d'apprentissage a un potentiel de réussite, même dans les cas extrêmes où il n'y a pas de traduction claire de la décision explicite de valeurs éthiques, la première étape consiste à accepter le problème.

La proposition d'inclure la méthodologie MCDA vise à donner aux décideurs un regard plus fin qui permette de définir des valeurs, de les mesurer sur une échelle commune afin de les comparer avec d'autres.

vising in the sense that the problems they are facing are never the same since business context is in constant motion.

Therefore the MCDA processes allows for capturing the context of each decision, and permits decision makers to look back and compare information, perceptions and understanding of the reasons why certain courses of action have been chosen. This learning and continuous improvement cycle is achieved because there is real transparency in the evaluation of the options, and this goes beyond the simple formulation of possible business options. It means transparency in the participants, even including their different points of view, the flow of information, the definition of monitoring indicators and mainly the allocation of resources to implement strategies (Adam and Shavit 2008).

The crucial factor is that the integrity of decision makers will result from following rules of conduct consistently. The impartiality of the decision makers will emerge in the repetition of these rules, the result being a pattern of ethical decisions, while habits are not achieved by thinking or writing codes of ethics, but through actions. Consequently, integrity will affect both the decisions made as well as the action that they generate and that will define the strategy of the company.

This learning cycle has potential for success even in extreme cases in that there is no clear translation of ethics in explicit decision values because, like any addiction, the first step is to accept the problem and recognize that values are not put into practice and that for example, short term interests of investors are consistently put in the first place.

Conclusion

It is important not to confuse good decisions with good results. None of us can know the future, which means that we can take a decision that result in a bad outcome or vice versa. Of course, mistakes can happen but they will be less frequent and they won't be due to a limited analysis. What we do know with certainty is that the lower the quality of decision analysis, the worse the outcomes.

The proposed inclusion of a MCDA methodology has as an objective to zoom in on decision-making by allowing the definition of the values, measuring them on a common scale that permits comparison with each other. It is a practical alternative to address the complexity of the assessment of strategy and an honest way to put on the table the true motivation behind the investments and thereby give a way out of the conflict of interests or values that constantly are joined.

The real effort should not be focused on regulations or monitoring, if it is actually looking for creating values for the individual and develop decision makers that have integrity, and that are motivated by values not by rules and incentives; and with the courage and conviction to resist temptations. It is true that the learning and improvement of analysis in decision-making will grow gradually, but it will not take place if the first step that requires recognition of the true values of investment is not taken.

- In my vision of future corporate practices, I see that MCDA...
- Is the method most often used for corporate representatives as a methodology of analysis of decisions during strategic planning and budget allocation.
- Is a standard on the Boards of Directors and is known among its members as the method “multi-criteria” referring to the way in which directors account for the decisions that have been taken; i.e. the MCDA is the way in which information is shared and reports are given to investors about the reasons behind the evaluations made, the obstacles they face at the time and alternative actions that have been taken into account.

Le vrai effort ne doit être axé ni sur la régulation, ni sur la surveillance, si l'objectif est en réalité la création de valeur chez l'individu et la formation de décideurs intègres, motivés par des valeurs, et non pas par des règles, ou des incitations, et ayant le courage et la conviction de résister aux tentations.

Bibliography

- Adam / Shavit American Management Association, AMA (2006) *The Ethical Enterprise, Doing the Right Things in the Right Ways, Today and Tomorrow*.
- Barma, Hanif (2010) *Culture Clash : policies and procedures are useless if your culture is wrong*. Internal Auditing 34 :11
- Bonn, I. & Fisher, J. (2005) Corporate governance and business ethics: Insights from the strategic planning experience, *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 13: 730–8
- Dominguez L., Alvarez I. & Sanchez I. (2009) Corporate Governance and Code of Ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 90:187-202
- Hans van E, Gabrielsson J. & Morten H. (2009). *Towards a Behavioural Theory of Boards and Corporate Governance*. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*. 17(3): 307–319
- Howard, Ronald (1976) *Readings in Decision Analysis*, Part III, pp. 491-520, Decision Analysis Group, Stanford Research Institute.
- Huse, M. (2005) Accountability and Creating Accountability: a Framework for Exploring Behavioural Perspectives of Corporate Governance. *British Journal of Management*. 16:s65-s79
- Phillips, Larry (1984) A theory of requisite models. *Acta Psychologica* 561 ; 3, 29-48
- Roberts, J. McNulty, T. & Stiles, P. (2005) *Beyond Agency Conceptions of the Work of the Non-Executive Director: Creating Accountability in the Boardroom* *British Journal of Management*. Volume 16. pp:s5-s26
- Sanwal Anand (2007) *Get Sustained Growth by Savvy Portfolio Management*. *The Journal of Corporate Accounting and Finance*.
- Sterman, John (1994) *Learning in and about complex systems*. *Systems Dynamics Review*. 10 : 291-330
- Schwartz M., Dunfee T. & Kline M. (2005) *Tone at the Top: An Ethics Code for Directors*. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 58 79-100