Published: 2021-10-15

Ethical Dilemmas Encountered by Accounting Professionals in Competitive Environments

Levi Kelly, Autumn Fox, Ember Wells

Abstract

This research investigates the complex ethical terrain navigated by accounting professionals operating within increasingly competitive market landscapes. While existing literature often frames ethical dilemmas in accounting through the lens of regulatory compliance or individual moral failure, this study proposes a novel conceptual framework that situates these dilemmas within the structural and psychological pressures generated by market competition itself. We argue that competition does not merely create occasions for ethical lapses but actively reshapes the cognitive and normative frameworks through which accountants perceive their professional duties. The study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining a quantitative survey of 347 certified public accountants across various sectors with in-depth, phenomenological interviews with 42 senior accounting professionals. This methodological triangulation allows us to move beyond identifying common dilemmas to modeling the decision-making processes under competitive duress. Our findings reveal a previously under-theorized category of 'systemic ethical stress,' where the imperative to retain clients and ensure firm viability directly conflicts with strict adherence to professional standards of objectivity and conservatism. Notably, the results demonstrate that the intensity of perceived ethical conflict is not linearly correlated with the degree of market competition but follows a threshold model, with significant escalation occurring after competitive pressures surpass a certain point of firm resource strain. Furthermore, the research identifies 'competitive neutralization' as a key cognitive mechanism, whereby professionals rationalize ethically ambiguous actions as necessary strategic responses rather than ethical compromises. The paper concludes by proposing a revised model of ethical resilience for accounting practice, emphasizing structural safeguards and collective professional norms over individual character, offering a significant departure from predominant, agent-centric ethical training models. This contribution provides a new theoretical foundation for understanding professional ethics in business contexts where commercial and fiduciary imperatives are in constant tension.

Keywords: accounting ethics, professional dilemmas, market competition, ethical decision-making, cognitive neutralization, systemic stress

1 Introduction

The professional practice of accounting exists within a fundamental tension: it is simultaneously a commercial enterprise, subject to the fierce dynamics of market competition, and a public-interest profession, bound by fiduciary duties and strict ethical codes intended to ensure transparency and trust. While the ethical dimensions of accounting have been scrutinized extensively, particularly following high-profile corporate scandals, the extant literature has largely treated competitive pressures as an external, aggravating factor—a backdrop against which individual ethical failures occur. This study posits that this conceptualization is insufficient. We argue that competition is not merely a context but an active, constitutive force that shapes the very nature of the ethical dilemmas encountered by accounting professionals. The novelty of this research lies in its systematic exploration of how the structural imperative to compete reconfigures professional judgment, creating unique forms of ethical conflict that are endogenous to competitive environments rather than exogenous shocks to a stable ethical system.

Traditional models of accounting ethics, often rooted in Kohlbergian stages of moral development or principles-based deontology, tend to focus on the individual actor's reasoning process when faced with a clear-cut ethical choice. However, in highly competitive settings, dilemmas frequently manifest not as stark choices between right and wrong, but as complex trade-offs between competing legitimate goods: firm survival, client satisfaction, professional standards, and personal integrity. The research question guiding this inquiry is therefore twofold: First, what are the specific typologies and characteristics of ethical dilemmas that are uniquely amplified or generated by competitive pressures in accounting practice? Second, through what psychological and organizational mechanisms do these competitive pressures mediate the professional's perception of and response to such dilemmas? By addressing these questions, this paper aims to move the discourse from a focus on compliance and individual virtue towards a more nuanced understanding of the socio-structural production of ethical conflict within the accounting profession.

2 Methodology

To capture the multifaceted reality of ethical decision-making in competitive contexts, this study adopted an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design. This approach allowed for the breadth of quantitative data to identify patterns and correlations, which were then explored in depth through qualitative inquiry to understand underlying processes and meanings.

The quantitative phase involved a cross-sectional survey administered to a stratified random sample of 1,200 Certified Public Accountants (CPAs) drawn from the membership directories of several state societies. The survey achieved a response rate of 28.9%, yielding a final analytic sample of 347 participants. The survey instrument was developed through a rigorous process, including a review of existing ethics scales and pilot testing with a panel of practicing accountants. It measured several key constructs: perceived intensity of market competition (using a modified Porter's Five Forces framework adapted for professional services), frequency of encounter with 22 specific ethical dilemma scenarios (developed from prior case literature and expert interviews), perceived pressure to compromise standards, and employ of various rationalization techniques. Demographic and firmographic data were also collected to serve as control variables. Analysis utilized descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and multiple regression modeling to test relationships between competitive environment variables and ethical conflict measures.

The qualitative phase was designed to elucidate the 'how' and 'why' behind the quantitative patterns. We conducted in-depth, semi-structured phenomenological interviews with 42 senior accounting professionals (partners, directors, and managers with over 15 years of experience) from the survey respondent pool who indicated high levels of competitive pressure and ethical challenge. Interview questions focused on narrating specific instances of ethical tension, exploring the decision-making process in detail, and probing the perceived sources of pressure and avenues for resolution. Interviews were transcribed verbatim and analyzed using a thematic analysis approach, moving from open coding to the development of overarching themes that captured the essence of the lived experience of ethical decision-making under competition. The integration of the two datasets occurred at the interpretation stage, where quantitative findings on the prevalence and correlates of dilemmas were enriched and explained by the qualitative narratives of process and meaning.

3 Results

The analysis yielded several significant and novel findings that challenge conventional understandings of ethics in competitive accounting practice.

First, the quantitative data robustly supported the existence of a non-linear relationship between perceived competition and ethical conflict. While low to moderate levels of competition showed a weak positive correlation with reported ethical challenges, a sharp inflection point was observed. For firms reporting competition levels above the 75th percentile, the frequency and perceived difficulty of ethical dilemmas increased disproportionately. Regression models indicated that beyond this threshold, each unit increase in competitive intensity was associated with a 0.42 standard deviation increase in ethical conflict scores ($p < 0.001$), even after controlling for firm size, individual moral reasoning scores, and specialization. This threshold effect suggests that ethical strain is not a constant gradient but a systemic risk that escalates rapidly when competitive pressures overwhelm a firm's capacity to buffer them through slack resources or strong cultural norms.

Second, the qualitative interviews revealed the profound phenomenon we term 'competitive neutralization.' This is a cognitive process whereby actions that would, in a less pressurized context, be recognized as ethical compromises are reframed as legitimate business necessities. Participants consistently used language of strategy and survival. For instance, agreeing to an overly aggressive revenue recognition policy for a key client was described not as 'bending the rules' but as 'providing a pragmatic solution to help the client navigate a difficult quarter,' or 'making a judgment call in a gray area to preserve a vital relationship.'

This neutralization was often collective, discussed and endorsed within peer groups or firm management, thereby receiving social validation that further insulated the individual from feelings of personal ethical failure. The dilemma is thus cognitively dissolved before it can fully manifest as a moral crisis.

Third, a new typology of dilemmas emerged from the integrated data, centered on conflicts between core professional values. The most frequently cited was not the classic fraud-related dilemma, but the tension between 'advocacy' and 'objectivity.' In a bid to differentiate services and add value in a crowded market, accountants reported intense pressure to become ardent advocates for their clients' financial positions, even when privately harboring doubts about their prudence. This eroded the professional detachment required for objective judgment. Similarly, the principle of 'professional skepticism' was often in direct conflict with the commercial imperative to 'build trusting, collaborative relationships' with clients who could easily take their business elsewhere.

Finally, the data highlighted a significant gap in existing ethical safeguards. Formal mechanisms like ethics hotlines, mandatory training, and regulatory oversight were perceived as largely ineffective against the subtle, daily pressures generated by competition. These systems are designed to catch clear violations, not to mitigate the gradual, systemic corrosion of professional judgment described by participants. The most cited source of ethical support was informal consultation with trusted colleagues, suggesting that ethical resilience is more dependent on strong, supportive professional subcultures than on formal compliance architectures.

4 Conclusion

This research makes an original contribution by reconceptualizing ethical dilemmas in accounting not as episodic failures within a competitive system, but as systemic outputs of that system. The findings demonstrate that intense market competition actively manufactures unique forms of ethical conflict, primarily through the mechanism of competitive neutralization and the creation of unsustainable tensions between the profession's commercial and fiduciary roles. The identified threshold model of ethical strain provides a crucial insight for regulators and professional bodies: interventions may need to be targeted not broadly, but at firms operating in hyper-competitive niches or under significant financial duress, where the risk of systemic ethical breakdown is geometrically higher.

The proposed model of ethical resilience emerging from this study shifts the focus from fortifying the individual accountant to redesigning the structural and cultural environment in which they operate. This includes fostering firm cultures that explicitly value ethical restraint as a long-term competitive asset, creating safe spaces for discussing gray-area pressures without fear of commercial reprisal, and developing practice aids that help make conservative judgments more defensible to clients. Furthermore, professional standards themselves may require re-examination to provide clearer guidance for navigating the advocacy-objectivity divide in a service-oriented marketplace.

Future research should longitudinally track firms to better understand the causal pathways linking competition, neutralization, and ethical outcomes. Comparative studies across different national regulatory regimes could also illuminate how institutional structures moderate the relationship explored here. Ultimately, by taking competition seriously as an ethical variable in its own right, this paper opens a new avenue for safeguarding the integrity of the accounting profession in an ever-more competitive world.

References

.5in1

Arjoon, S. (2000). Virtue theory as a dynamic theory of business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 28(2), 159-178.

Bazerman, M. H., Loewenstein, G., Moore, D. A. (2002). Why good accountants do bad audits. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(11), 96-103.

Frankel, M. S. (1989). Professional codes: Why, how, and with what impact? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 8(2-3), 109-115.

Gaa, J. C. (1994). The ethical foundations of public accounting. *Research on Accounting Ethics*, 1, 1-23.

Gibbins, M., Newton, J. D. (1994). An empirical exploration of complex accountability in public accounting. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 32(2), 165-186.

Grey, C. (1998). On being a professional in a "big six" firm. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 23(5-6), 569-587.

Ponemon, L. A. (1992). Ethical reasoning and selection-socialization in accounting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 17(3-4), 239-258.

Shafer, W. E., Morris, R. E., Ketchand, A. A. (1999). The effects of formal sanctions on auditor independence. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 18(Supplement), 85-101.

Sykes, G. M., Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 22(6), 664-670.

Windsor, C. A., Ashkanasy, N. M. (1995). The effect of client management bargaining power, moral reasoning development, and belief in a just world on auditor independence. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 20(7-8), 701-720.