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Abstract

The moral issues that occur for for-profit corporations are a unique function of many internal and external factors, including corporate policies, business regulations, and business governance’s economic and political system. Several possible theoretical frameworks prescribe behavioral norms and standards of conduct to companies, such as utilitarianism, deontological ethics, or virtue ethics. This study investigates whether Kantian moral philosophy can provide pragmatic solutions for developing a corporate code of conduct. We describe our examinations and share our findings in developing a semi-Kantian code of conduct for a large technology-based company that explains motivations for having a code of conduct and its development phases.
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1 Introduction

Capitalism is indeed a thriving economic and political system of production and distribution in which industries are controlled by the private sector for profit. In addition, globalization has doubled capitalism’s potentials and impacts in such a way that corporations can act on global scales. Accordingly, regardless of its development stage or size, every business does have several internal and external stakeholders. This enormous power of impact and indefinite financial and non-financial resources also bring massive and widespread responsibilities. Therefore, moral considerations and responsibilities, on the one hand, and corporate productivity and efficiency, on the other hand, dictate that all stakeholders should abide by specific rules, behavioral norms, and standards of actions [1, 2].

Capitalism respects corporate autonomy, agency, growth, and property right, just as liberalism appreciates human autonomy, agency, development, and property right. [3, 4]. Accordingly, creating an organizational culture based on human autonomy that promotes learning and growth is the focus of many corporations where employees are free to explore and experiment, make mistakes and learn, and evaluate new business opportunities. Several empirical studies confirm that workplace autonomy pays back through greater employee engagement, accountability, performance, productivity, sense of belonging, mutual trust, and sense of self-worth [5–11]. These components of contemporary corporations’ culture and work environment empower employees to proactively bring about innovative solutions for all business challenges, including corporate moral issues and social responsibilities. [12–16].

Business moral considerations are either triggered internally or enforced externally. The latter case is intertwined with rules imposed by the state, expectations created by society, and requirements of business viability that are put out by the business landscape. On the other hand, internally motivated corporate actions are shaped through the moral predispositions of corporate employees and their shareholders, corporate culture and its core values, corporate missions and visions, and corporate members’ perceptions of responsible business and corporate social responsibility. Considering the above-mentioned cultural elements of liberal capitalist corporations, one could straightforwardly observe that central
concepts in Kantian tradition resonate well with crucial elements of the contemporary corporate culture.

Kant asserts that the capacity to transcend our self-interest, our natural inclinations, and tendencies in order to act autonomously out of moral duty grants unconditional moral worth to our actions [17]. Correspondingly, as the currently accepted notion of corporate social responsibility implies, a responsible corporation benefits society and addresses negative impacts on stakeholders, including employees, society, and the natural environment. Moreover, the universal rule-based nature of Kantian ethics communicates well with the necessary rule-based context of business and trade requirements. In addition, in an ideal imaginary setup where Kantian ethics matches flawlessly with the corporation’s necessities, we expect flexibility of Kantian imperfect duties alongside the rigidity of its perfect duties to provide a proper foundation to promote corporate ideal moral values and virtues while enforcing the required rules and moral obligations.

Many corporations address moral issues through the enforcement of a corporate code of conduct. Any corporate code of conduct ought to pass several examinations to be authentically considered a Kantian code of ethics. A Kantian corporate code of conduct should reflect formulations of Kant’s categorical imperative and its corresponding moral virtues and vices. Thus, formulations of the universal law of nature, humanity, autonomy, and the kingdom of ends formulas alongside notions such as moral maxims, universalizability, means versus ends, human dignity, autonomy, personal growth and development, altruism, unconditional respect for human rationality and autonomy, abstention from deception and coercion ought to be ultimately reflected [17].

We follow Norman E. Bowie’s footsteps to explore further and investigate the feasibility of what he calls ”Kantian Capitalism” [18–21] in the contemporary work environment according to which good business is good ethics driven from Kantian ideology and value-system. In the following sections, we propose a semi-Kantian approach in developing a corporate code of conduct. We had implemented our approach in Cafebazar 1, a large technology-based corporation in Iran to gather feedback. This approach helps us empirically evaluate our strategy and proposal for creating a Kantian code of conduct and expand

---

1Cafebazaar Information Technology Group is an innovative business in the field of technology that is based in Iran, currently with more than 2k employees.
our understating of how morality and business interact in contemporary workplaces.

2 Code of Conduct

We assume that having a responsible and accountable business requires a robust and responsible company culture. Therefore, a corporation, either as a legal entity or as a group of individuals who share common interests, could be held morally accountable through an agreement on implementing a corporate code of conduct. A robust code of conduct includes ethical principles, values, duties and responsibilities, the standard of conduct, and even disciplinary actions as a form of enforcement in which characterizes corporate culture, moral values, and behavioral expectation while setting corporate vision and mission, strategies, and policies in a specific frame.

Specific measures are required to ensure that the code of conduct is consistent with Kantian ethics. For instance, the kingdom of ends formula alongside with autonomy formula stresses out that all company members must personally approve, as lawgivers, every principle, standard, values, or disciplinary action that is included in the corporate code of ethics because of its own rational will, rather than any outside influence or outcomes. Each employee has a moral obligation to act upon principles that are deduced from the company code of conduct, that all members would autonomously accept as their rules of conduct. Accordingly, an explicit precondition of any Kantian corporate policy is a joint exercise of all corporate members, which implies a bottom-up approach in corporate policymaking.

Moreover, the humanity formula implies that all corporate policies should be developed to treat stakeholders as ends rather than a means to either business ends or a particular group of stakeholders’ interests. In an impartial process, each employee would only accept maxims that govern all company members justly without treating any group merely as a means to secure other group’s advantages. An intelligent approach for securing maximal compliance with Kantian requirements would be John Rawls hypothetical ”Veil of Ignorance,” according to which impartial decision making is maintained through denying decision-makers access to extra biasing information about who will benefit most or least from the available resources.[22]. However, in a realistic setup, each employee faces, both emotionally and rationally, conflicting motives of altruistic and egoistic moral consideration
when moral principles and values are weighed against each other.

As Kant strongly refutes all forms of consequentialism, we focus on the feasibility of virtue-based (value-based) and deontological-based moral phrasing in developing a corporate code of conduct. Based on deontological moral reasoning, actions are judged based on their compliance with the moral rules, whereas virtue-based moral reasoning states that that person or community determines the moral obligations to act. Accordingly, the rightness of an action is derived through the character of the agent. Therefore, the Kantian code of conduct’s propositions can be expressed, either in the form of rules-driven moral duties (e.g., to refrain from a particular action) or be expressed in the form of moral values or virtues (e.g., honesty or teamwork is valuable in our company) [23]. The former can be more comprehensive and provide corporate rules and policies in the form of dos and don’ts, while the latter can be expressed through examples and descriptions of role models or ideal corporate citizens [24].

A rule-based code of conduct provides reasons for action that leaves no room for discretion in deciding what exactly one must do and thus is highly enforceable. On the other hand, a value-based code of conduct is not an action-guiding document as identifying a circumstance where a value or virtue can be promoted an evaluative consideration, regardless of whether there are reasons to do specific actions about such a value. Moreover, compliance with specific rules can be judged straightforwardly, whereas compliance with a value or virtue might be ambiguously obscure. It is crucial, however, to note that empirical studies suggest that value-based codes of conduct are enforced, complied with, and promoted more favorably [25, 26]. Besides, in corporations with a dominant value-based code of conduct, corporate core values can be integrated into corporate visions, missions, and strategies, which also opens up a non-utilitarian perspective on corporate nature.

Kant defines the concept of virtue as the strength of the will to fulfill its duties despite obstacles. This definition gives us a sense of autonomy alongside the notions of positive and negative liberty. Therefore, to accommodate value-based moral propositions, one might appeal to those virtues and values that are traceable or reducible to these fundamental Kantian notions. Although Kant provides a formal structure of moral decision-making, regardless of the agent’s character, persistent personality traits can be attributed to define
a Kantian Personality (e.g., sincerity, authentic leadership, formal ethical predisposition, low relativism, democratic leadership, high level of tolerance) [27].

There is no escaping that corporations are dominantly, or at least partly, motivated to seek profit. This fact should also be reflected in any corporate code of conduct; otherwise, any attempt to conceive an applicable code of conduct is doomed to failure. A perfect duty of seeking profit is conceivable in terms of a hypothetical promise between corporate members and shareholders according to which all members assure shareholders to pursue corporate interests and benefits as long as they are in an employment contract with the corporation [28]. This circumstance opens up an opportunity to incorporate moderate versions of the profit-maximizer principle and its associated motives with codes of conduct and corresponding moral motives.

A code of conduct can be formed through a diverse set of motivating reasons among which the following cases can be expressed: to promote core values, to set the right culture, to adjust corporate vision and a mission, to build a reputation in the market, to clarify the behavioral expectations, to address corporate social responsibility, to resolve internal moral and cultural conflicts, to build an accountable business, to reduce workplace challenges, and to increase engagement, well-being and performance [29]. However, it is often pursued by senior executives in response to either external or internal legal requirements or actual or potential business risks that naturally cause a top-down paternalistic approach in creating codes of conduct contrary to the Kantian point of view.

From the corporate perspective, as driven through senior and top-level managers’ job responsibilities and motivations, a code of conduct is desirable as long as corporate profitability will not get damaged gravely. However, this is not the case when job responsibilities and motivations of employees at the lower level of the corporate hierarchy are regarded. Each person prioritizes a different set of values or conducts principles because each individual faces specific variable contexts, including job responsibilities and objectives, manager and teammates’ expectations and needs, and work environment. For example, new employees might demand a high level of transparency to feel respected, included, and valued by tea. In contrast, senior managers might demand transparency to fulfill specific job responsibilities, according to which a transparent teamwork atmosphere is required to achieve
a high level of engagement, performance, and delivery. In another case, a team member may request a higher level of autonomy in order to face new challenges and to develop his or her capabilities, while managers might respect team members’ autonomy because communicating trust and respect is a behavioral expectation from corporate leaders.

Hence, corporate hierarchy inevitably requires all corporate codes of conduct to acknowledge that employees and managers might have different and, in cases conflicting motivations to act morally and to fulfill their moral duty. So, a practical code of conduct with particular moral and non-moral objectives must be comprehensible and accommodating for a wide range of audiences and their corresponding motives.

3 Development Phases

In the following sections, we describe our proposed approach in creating a corporate code of conduct, which includes determining who will be included in the creation of the company’s code of conduct and determining the code of conduct’s scope. This approach is necessary to ensure every stakeholder’s interests who might be affected are properly considered. Furthermore, it encompasses expectations from the company’s code of conduct that require an assessment of the current state of the company culture and envisioning the future ideal state of the corporate culture, responsibilities, and moral considerations.

We implemented our approach in a large technology-based corporation in Iran known as Cafebazaar. This method helps us empirically evaluate our strategy and proposal while providing authentic feedback for possible future refinements. This section can be skipped towards the discussion section 4.

3.1 Expectations & Scope

We consider a hybrid approach in policymaking rather than top-down or bottom-up strategies that might be paternalistic, selfish, or uncaring. Accordingly, the code of conduct’s scope of applicability and large-scale expectations from its enforcement are acquired through top-level and middle-level corporate managers who have more authority, power, and influence in the corporate hierarchy. Whereas, current corporate culture, its moral issues, future
ideal corporate culture, critical moral considerations, and overall corporate responsibilities
would be envisioned for the most part through subordinates at mid-level or low-level of the
corporate hierarchy.

Each person should be a lawgiver who determines moral laws not only for himself or
herself but for every corporate stakeholder. Thus, the corporate code of conduct must
capture and reflect every existing subculture. This diverse and somehow conflicting set
of norms and principles, motivations and expectations, behavioral patterns, and moral
considerations should be aggregated and incorporated into the corporate code of conduct.
Alignment of subcultures would bring strategic alignment, sense of unity, sense of owner-
ship, and harmony to the corporation that is not only proven to be instrumental in terms
of corporate performance but also morally valuable in terms of creating a collective notion
of corporate agency based on Kantian morality and personality traits.

Through surveys and follow up one-on-one interviews, participants were directly asked
about their main expectations from the company’s code of conduct: whether the company
code of conduct should be more protective of the current company state or creator of the
future; whether it should promote moral and cultural values or brings about compliance;
pros and cons of having a corporate code of conduct; company’s central positive and neg-
ative values to be promoted and restricted; public accessibility of code of conduct; notion
of corporate social and environmental responsibility; desirable frame of employee privacy;
out of the office and out of hours misbehaviors; enforcement mechanisms and violation
policy; compliance with government’s regulations and laws; and applicability to partners
and competitors.

Consequently, several criteria were taken into account to analyze, prioritize, and aggre-
gate employee inputs, including repetition of a statement, enforcement difficulties, required
time to achieve desired objectives, compliance with laws, and dependency on disciplinary
actions.

3.2 Moral Assessment

The moral assessment approach is an internal process by which organizations can evalu-
ate elements of their workplace moral and cultural considerations. This process helps us
differentiate appropriately between the current company culture and the ideal desirable corporate culture. This process includes analyzing explicit or implicit behavioral expectations, moral considerations, responsibilities and duties, corporate strategies, visions and missions, core values, and existing subcultures. Our approach is inspired by the culture assessment method that is introduced here [30] by EH Schein.

A series of group meetings were held with selected groups of employees. A rich sampling is highly required in order to ensure inclusion of every subculture, including seniors and juniors, men and women, teams (e.g., sales, marketing, engineering, and human resources), every level of authority (e.g., team leaders, product managers, vice presidents, CEOs, and team-members). The facilitator starts by pointing to a commonly known company moral issue (e.g., a lack of commitment to product quality, a lack of mutual trust, a lack of respectful communication, disregards of environmental responsibilities) while engaging all session members to actively participate in the analysis of the current moral state, and in envisioning the future desirable moral state of the company. This method puts all individuals in a position of being a legislator of the moral norms of the entire company.

The three-layer model of culture [16] can be introduced to session members in order to help them extract underlying cultural and moral considerations of the corporation. Three proposed levels of culture are artifacts which include the structures, processes, and apparent events within the company; supporting values and moral considerations that are publicly expressed or supported in corporate strategy, vision and mission, motto, or core values; underlying assumptions that are usually unconscious and taken for granted moral and cultural considerations.

In cases of conflicting moral norms, values, or maxims, one should dig for underlying assumptions. Additionally, if our aim is a Kantian code of conduct, then a Kantian personality’s associated values and virtues should also be considered along with other moral values and maxims. The following core concepts can indicate this: autonomy, human dignity, ends versus means, and universality of principles. Moreover, perfect and imperfect duties of personal growth and development, helping others, avoiding deceit and coercion should comply with, ultimately.

For example, managers of a company might agree that a diverse team helps corporate
be more innovative, creative, and successful, while data shows recent corporate recruitment does not satisfy the diversity and inclusion requirements. Recruiting male candidates might be more economical and straightforward for the recruitment team than for female candidates. Here, the duty of maintaining diversity and inclusion was overridden by a profit-maximizer duty, according to which a corporation should develop the most cost-effective recruitment strategy. An important question here is why such principle of action, instead of alternative duties, are the criterion for employee or Company to conduct in such cases. Can we imagine a hypothetical circumstance where the recruitment team ignores, on deontological bases rather than utilitarian considerations, the profit-maximizer duty for the sake of diversity?

As examples of what employees may point out, one could consider the following cases: Not all product and team decisions are discussed thoroughly in the team; We value teamwork; The Company expects us to be responsive even out of business hours; “We do not respect our competitors; Managers do not value a proper healthy work-life balance; We are responsible towards our personal growth; Team leaders are responsible in helping team members to grow; We are responsible in helping their teammates to grow and develop their capabilities; Why we are not an environmentally responsible company; We are responsible in showing appropriate reactions towards social events; Here, we should primarily value company profitability and do not waste company resources on social and environmental issues; We do not fully value the time of our colleagues and managers.

Previous statements can be categorized by the relationship in which they describe: It is about employee relation with the Company; It is about employee or company relation with the society; It is about employee relation with their jobs and works; It is about company relation with the government; it is about an employee relation with its colleagues; It is about employee’s relationship with his or her personal life; It is about company relation with the industry; It is about Company and employee relationships with customers and users; It is about the relation between the company products and employees; It is about the relation between the Company and natural environment. We are not going through all the details of our case study as they are not necessarily generalizable. However, a couple of highlights stated below might be informative for our readers.
“Expectations from an employee or manager should be clearly expressed“ (i.e. transparency and autonomy are valued), “Unfair growth and promotion opportunities should be addressed“ (i.e. personal development and equality are valued), “Non-transparent decision-making processes should be replaced with transparent procedures“ (i.e. transparency and inclusion is valued, democratic procedures are valued), “policy on maintaining a healthy work-life balance should be developed“ (i.e. meaningful work is valued, personal incentives are valued), “Company data and information should be accessible by all conditioned to a proper data protection policy and privacy policy“ (i.e. transparency is valued, user privacy is valued, corporate social responsibility is valued), “Unfair performance evaluations should be replaced with fair procedures“ (i.e. justice and fairness are valued), “not all tasks are engaging, meaningful, and challenging“ (i.e. meaningful work is valued), “Level of managers authority should be regulated“ (i.e. autonomy is valued, paternalism is not accepted), “Company should adequately react to society problems“ (i.e. corporate social responsibility is valued), “Company should consider using biodegradable material“ (i.e. environmental responsibility is valued), “Company should fully compile with all the national and international laws“ (i.e. compliance with laws are necessary), “Product decisions factors should include all stakeholders“ (i.e. corporate social responsibility is valued, exclusive profit-seeking is not valued).

At the final step, the scope of applicability and expectations from its enforcement should be incorporated with moral assessment sessions to draft the company’s code of conduct. A translation into English of Cafebazaar code of conduct can be found here in appendix A for further attention.

4 Discussion

There are several theoretical and practical challenges in developing, implementing, and enforcing a corporate code of conduct consistent with Kant’s theory of morality. For example, not all corporate desired virtues and values could be traced back into Kantian moral philosophy; Many of the Kantian moral duties responsibilities are too demanding for employers and employees to be complied with; To always act from duty as a motivating reason seems to be an untenable doctrine, especially in the context of capitalism; There
are conflicting duties in different levels of corporate hierarchy that lead to an incoherent and fragmented code of conduct; Every stakeholder, in a different context, has distinct motivating reasons to participate in the development, enforcement, and compliance with the corporate codes of conduct, so moral particularism might be a better choice to address business moral issues, rather than frameworks that are based on moral universalism.

Our case study suggests that employees at the lower levels of corporate hierarchy are purely motivated to create and maintain an ethical atmosphere at the workplace. They are motivated to hold themselves as corporate citizens and their company as a social institution morally responsible and accountable to all stakeholders, willing to take practical actions to address environmental and social issues. However, the nature of the motivation of corporate leaders, who are at the higher levels of the corporate hierarchy, were more inclined towards utilitarian incentives rather than deontological incentives. In other words, enforcement of such policies decreases the likelihood of moral conflicts, creates a socially favorable corporate brand, and improves corporate performance, in the long run, to name a few.

It should be noted that the overall success of corporations, in terms of profitability for shareholders, is currently the core job responsibility of senior executives. In contrast, employees at the lower levels of the corporate hierarchy develop a weaker sense of ownership towards the company while not being expected to be responsible towards the shareholders. Thus, the responsibility towards the interests of corporate shareholders is not a solid motivating reason for employees at the bottom of the corporate hierarchy. This tension between conflicting motivation, especially in a large corporation, can potentially conduce further conflicts and organizational fragmentation if not satisfactorily addressed. One approach to resolve this matter might be radical decentralization in corporate structure, according to which the top management delegates decision-making responsibilities and daily operations to middle and lower subordinates.

In our case study, corporate altruistic actions towards society and the environment are now permitted to be carried out, if and only if such actions align with the company’s business objectives and strategies. In other words, corporate managers prefer to fulfill their job responsibilities and moral duties simultaneously by elevating products quality, creating high-quality job opportunities, improving customer support, and being highly transparent
with the company’s clients. This fact highlights why it is much harder to discover non-utilitarian motivating reasons within top-level corporate executives. Such motives create tensions and conflicts between their duties as corporate manager and their responsibilities as moral agents of society. In contrast to this group, non-utilitarian incentives to engage directly in social deficiencies were powerfully motivating for mid-level and bottom-level company members.

Furthermore, a couple of moral considerations that employees proposed were neither practical nor easily enforceable. For example, an ideal state of diversity or equal opportunity for growth and development cannot immediately be provided for all corporate members. Corporate resources are limited. Hence, prioritization of goals, strategies, and objectives in the distribution of resources is exceptionally vital. Effective distribution of resources ought to be so that available resources are distributed justly across all corporate departments and members. However, seeking profit forces the corporation to allocate its resources through the most cost-effective strategies to achieve healthy growth and secure a safe profit margin.

Another potential issue in Kantian policy-making is picking up paternalistic approaches in development or enforcement phases. In our case, managers might misuse codes of conduct to take more control over employee autonomy and conduct, directly in the workplace or indirectly outside of the company in cyberspaces or social media. They could consciously or unconsciously utilize such levers with non-ethical intentions to secure their power and impose corporate wills over individuals with a low level of authority and autonomy. According to Kant’s moral philosophy, human beings might never be treated as a means to an end. Thus, if corporations want to respect humanity by applying Kantian ethics principles, seeking profit as a sacred corporate motive and responsibility ought to be highly flexible and overridable by other moral duties, especially in cases of conflicts with Kantian perfect duties.

Many of the moral duties and responsibilities in companies’ codes of conduct comply with the Kantian theory of morality. However, they may not be efficient and applicable in the current setup of capitalistic work environments, where seeking profit is an existential incentive and purpose. This tension is another manifestation of the fundamental criticism.
of business ethics that moral frameworks, especially Kantian deontological ethics in which all forms of utilitarian motives are rejected, are not flexible and pragmatic to be utilized by those corporations that greed for profit and resources to grow and exploit. In other words, universally strict rules of conduct are not easily applicable in the agile, fast-changing, highly competitive, and unpredictable contemporary business environment.

Moreover, it is surprising that no one has ever attempted to reconstruct an authentically Kantian theory of human rights or human virtues. Again, this indicates that Kantian ethics might not be a proper framework to address all moral issues appropriately within the contemporary business environment. Kant’s virtue theory exclusively emphasizes rationality and autonomy. It is thus uncertain whether Kantian ethics can provide an inclusive theoretical ground addressing every necessary vice, virtue, and value in a present-day business environment.

There also exists one more fundamental tension between Kantian ethics, as a theory of morality, and corporations, as influential institutions within the political system of society. A corporation, with its classic definition, is a teleological institution that operates with the explicit purpose of generating profit and value for its shareholders or, in the recent definition, for all stakeholders. In contrast, Kantian ethics is a formal deontological framework entirely muted about an agent’s action and its purpose. Thus, as long as corporations are managed through a teleological perspective, Kantian ethics might not be proper for resolving corporations’ moral issues. In recent decades, corporations have been strongly blamed for their absolute focus on the profit-maximization principle at the expense of other stakeholders’ benefits. New corporate models suggest that pursuit of profit can either be replaced by the pursuit of doing good or can simultaneously coexist with having a morally responsible business [28, 31–33].

In short, either a teleological or utilitarian theory of morality should be applied and integrated with corporate governance, or corporations should adopt some form of deontological approaches as an essential part of their strategic management and somehow drop the sacred profit-maximizer principle.
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A Cafebazaar Code of Conduct Highlights

• Trust is our presupposed attitude towards company members.
  – We demonstrate this trust by sharing information our coworkers might need. Trust creates responsibility, so we expect information to be shared responsibly, only with affected and involved members.
  – We aim to build an acceptable level of transparency in all corporate processes such as our decision-making, evaluations, recruitment, and promotion to build and maintain trust among company members.
  – By creating an atmosphere of collaboration and mutual trust, we provide the conditions in which everyone’s capabilities, creativity, and abilities can grow and develop. We are responsible for the growth and development of our capabilities and knowledge as well as our colleagues.
  – Effective communication increases individuals and teams’ collaboration and productivity, promotes learning and developments, and prevents mistakes and misunderstandings. Giving and receiving healthy feedback is one of our key strategies in building effective communication, and laying the groundwork for strengthening our skills.
  – We delegate our responsibilities to our team members without prejudice and bias, only by taking into account the competency of individuals. Along with the delegation, we transfer the knowledge, experience, and authority that are required.
  – We protect company facilities by effective application of company’s resources in order to increase investor confidence and trust.
  – If we use company facilities for personal matters, we do so in a way that does not interfere with our own or others’ job responsibilities or performance and does not lead to harm to the company’s interests.

• Honesty, non-discriminatory behavior, and respect are our behavioral expectations.
  – We do not accept discrimination based on gender, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, and marital status. In case of any discrimination, we report such incidents to our managers immediately.
  – It is our right to grow and develop our capabilities in an environment of respect justly without prejudice to gender, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, marital status, education, or special relationships.
  – We always treat our colleagues with respect. This attitude not only includes his or her beliefs and personality traits but also includes time, goals, profession, and work activities.
– We do not tolerate any form of harassment in our workplace, and we deal with such incidents decisively.

– We proactively try to take advantage of all opportunities that arise to help each other grow and develop in his or her career. Helping teammates has higher priority over out-of-team contributions.

• We welcome diversity for the sake of long-term growth.

  – Having diverse experiences and knowledge leads to overall growth. By recruiting and retaining a diverse set of employees, we create a favorable condition for sustainable growth and maximum utilization of society’s potential and talents.

  – In order to grow and gain satisfaction, people have different needs from their workplace. These requirements are met in several ways, such as choosing different career paths, the possibility of changing teams, and learning and development opportunities.

    – We value the impact, growth, and effort of individuals, but at the same time profitability of the enterprise is of prime importance.

    – Physical and mental health of us is essential. Each of us is responsible for maintaining a healthy work-life balance.

    – We seek constructive, respectful, professional, and supportive cooperation with domestic and foreign businesses to share knowledge and learn new experiences.

    – We are concerned about the growth of our society. We utilize our power to make a positive impact on our society. We oppose any political activity in the name of our company.

• We make ambitions and agile decisions and learn from our mistakes.

  – We are not afraid to make mistakes. We decide ambitiously while considering all the risks.

  – By evaluating our priorities, we utilize the smartest and most effective solutions instead of doing the most work.

    – We share and utilize the experience and knowledge gained in producing a product in other products and teams.

    – We take responsibility for our mistakes and learn from them by analyzing them and transferring experience to other teams and products.

    – We are responsible for efficiently providing employees with facilities, equipment, and knowledge needed in their jobs.

• We make decisions and make products that we find worthy for ourselves.
– Our decisions align with improving our services and products, our company interests, and our core values. We increase the effectiveness of our decisions by clarifying expectations, trusting each other, and continuous learning.

– The decision-making, in our company, is based on the information, knowledge, and experiences of the responsible, involved people. Every decision ultimately has an accountable person.

– The decision-making process should be communicated transparently, in a timely and appropriate manner, with affected people. We create an acceptable level of transparency under business conditions and legal requirements.

– Our goal is to produce valuable, quality and effective products. We are pioneers in providing constructive feedback in order to improve our services and products.

– In product-related decisions, we consider the company’s overall interests, product success, quality, control and evaluation mechanisms, product social impact, and user needs.

– We all share the success of the company. The contribution of all of us is valuable in the success of products and providing better services to our clients.

– We value the independence of teams and consider it one of the main factors for the growth and development of the company. This independence and freedom of action lead to the long-term growth of individuals and teams when combined with the responsibility of team members. All the team members are responsible for the success or failure of the team’s missions.

– Alignment of decisions is of great importance. We achieve alignment in different parts of the company by creating effective communication between the teams and departments and sharing knowledge.

– The client’s and the user’s trust in the company’s products and services is one of our significant assets. We avoid doing actions that damage our users’ trust.

– Maintaining and expanding honest communication with our users and clients is one of our top priorities.
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