Inspira- Journal of Modern Management & Entrepreneurship (JMME)
(A National Multidisciplinary bi-lingual Quarterly Double Blind Open Access Peer Reviewed Refereed Journal)
ISSN : 2231–167X (Print), Impact Factor: (Cosmos: 7.866 & I2OR: 5.675) Volume 16, No. 03, July-September, 2026, pp. 287-297

The Culture of Pretence: When Organisational Values Differ from Everyday Workplace Behaviour

Prof. (Dr.) Sumedha Bajpai*

Head, School of Business & Management, Jaipur National University, Jaipur.

*Corresponding Author: sumedhab80@gmail.com

Citation: *Bajpai, S. (2026). The Culture of Pretence: When Organisational Values Differ from Everyday Workplace Behaviour. Journal of Modern Management & Entrepreneurship, 16(03), 287–297. https://doi.org/10.62823/JMME/16.03.9676*

ABSTRACT

Values like integrity, transparency, fairness, respect, inclusion, employee well-being and ethical leadership are now features of organisational identity that are increasingly stressed by organisations. They're being articulated in corporate/corporal vision statements, mission declarations, the code of conduct, human resource policies and leadership messages. But such formal declarations of commitment are not necessarily evident to workers in their daily work lives. It can be very easy for a large difference to occur between what organisations say they value and what employees experience as managers make decisions, maintain relationships, develop organisational systems and display leadership. This paper focuses on this area by considering the culture of pretence—the environment in an organisation in which formally stated values continue to be symbolically relevant, but are only occasionally manifested in practice. Based on the Organisational Culture Theory, Behavioural Integrity, Social Exchange Theory, Psychological Contract Theory and Organisational Justice Theory, the paper provides a conceptual backdrop to understand the relationship between value – behaviour incongruence and employee perceptions and turnover relations. It suggests that consistent communications between the organisation's promise and lived experience can lead to cynicism, distrust, a violation of the psychological contract, low organisational identification and low emotional connection. Based upon the aforementioned literature and practice, the paper suggests that there are five interrelated dimensions of the Organisational Value–Behaviour Congruence Framework: espoused organisational values, enacted organisational practices, perceived value–behaviour gaps, employee psychological responses and organisational outcomes. It also explores the importance of holding leaders accountable, allowing for employees to influence and make their voice heard and helping to narrow the divide between organisational rhetoric and reality. A comparative approach is used to draw out the meaning that can be derived from institutional structures, organisational hierarchy and workplace expectations concerning organisational inconsistencies when employees experience them. The paper adds to the current human resource management and organisational behaviour literature in two ways: it put value–behaviour alignment at the heart of organisational credibility, relational trust and sustainable workplace culture. It argues that organising values are not simply expressed in declarations but through their consistent representation in the everyday organising.

Keywords: *Organisational Culture, Organisational Hypocrisy, Espoused Values, Enacted Values, Behavioural Integrity, Employee Cynicism, Organisational Trust, Psychological Contract, Workplace Relationships, Organisational Justice.*

* *Copyright © 2026 by Author's and Licensed by Inspira. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work properly cited.*

Introduction

It is widely recognised that there is a strong link between organisational culture and employee behaviour, relationship with one another and organisational effectiveness. There's a lot of effort invested in organisations for stating purpose or vision and articulating value systems through mission statements and vision declarations. Honesty, fairness, accountability, transparency, collaboration, respect and employee well-being are often used as guiding principles in decision-making in organizations. They are meant to drive managerial behaviour, influence human resource (HR) policies and create a common ground-floor shared appreciation of appropriate behaviour in the workplace.

There is though a significant paradox about the way organisations work at present. Organisations' values often do not match with the behaviours employees experience at work. An organization can be open yet still conceal critical information, proclaim parity while dealing with bias, express care for employee health and save for, for example, overloading them, or guarantee respect while enforcing subordinates' disrespect, and so on. These inconsistencies establish a gap between the way one experiences and the way one conveys an organisations identity in its communication.

It is this phenomenon that gives rise to the culture of pretence which is the topic of this paper. This applies if organizations project a positive image both inside and out, via the sharing of desirable values, but don't consistently apply them when making decisions, by their leadership, or in their relationships with other people.

It's not necessarily that an organisation planned to fool employees; the culture of pretence can stem from a number of incidents. It can also result from poor management management, organizational pressures related to discrepancy between stated policies and day to day practice, lack of measures for accountability and competing organizational priorities. For instance, an organization can sincerely believe that they value employee development but still be keeping to the policy of promoting people more for their being around senior management than on an explicit basis on performance. That is, while it is fairly stated as a policy, the reality of the organisation might be different for employees.

This problem strip is not limited to being affected by the satisfaction among individual decision makers. Employees start to mistrust his or her leadership if the discrepancies in the promises are frequent and the practices don't match a leader's values. Overtime these can lead to loss of trust and grow cynicism and a lesser sense of organisation identity.

A difference between the statements and actions of organisations has been examined under the rubric of behavioural integrity. Behavioural integrity is the congruence between what managers say and do, especially in actions that are pledged and preset values (Simons 2002). It has since been proven to be relevant to employee trust, commitment and organisational outcomes (Simons et al., 2011; Simons et al., 2022).

In the Indian context, Gopinath et al. (2018) explored the difference between espoused and enacted organisation values and emphasised the crises of alignment that can arise if organisational values declared don't align with employee experience. In more recent studies Whysall and Kougiannou (2026) coined the term HR whitewashing to explore employee perceptions of symbolic HR policy pledges that are not substantiated through actual behavioural and structural change.

The present paper builds on these, and looks at the bigger organisational and relational implications of this mismatch between espoused values and the values that are shown in the day-to-day behaviours of work. It aims to provide answers to three core questions:

- Why do organisations experience a gap between their formally declared values and actual workplace behaviour?
- How does this inconsistency influence employee trust, cynicism and workplace relationships?
- What organisational and leadership mechanisms can transform declared values into consistently enacted organisational practices?

The paper develops an integrated conceptual framework and proposes theoretical relationships that can guide future research in Indian and international organisational settings.

Understanding the Culture of Pretence

- **Espoused Values versus Enacted Values**

Organisational values are principles and beliefs that help create organisational identity and behaviour. Organisational culture is discussed by Schein (2010) in terms of 'underlying assumptions', 'espoused beliefs and values' as well as 'visible organisational artefacts'. Explicit values are those that are communicated within an organisation stating what they value as important, while implicit values are reflected in the decisions, processes and interactions that occur within the organisation.

This is significant as organisational values are not seen by employees only through organisational communication. They understand them by the actions of supervisors, the fair treatment of promotion decisions, the fairness of allocation of opportunities, the treatment of colleagues and organisational response to employee's concerns.

For example, an organisation can have an open door policy and the people still don't come to talk to management as other problems were not taken up or were treated negatively before and they think it won't happen again. When the formal de facto openness is there, but the organisational culture in practice encourages non-communication.

Likewise, a message of diversity and inclusion can be communicated as a strategic goal for an organisation without influencing the recruitment, recognition and promotion of individuals through informal organisational networks and/or organisational preference. Over time, employees (even those who don't say it by the book) come to understand those behaviours that are actually rewarded.

Hence the culture of pretence when the symbolic representation of organisational values is separated from the implementation of such values.

- **Organisational Hypocrisy and Symbolic Commitments**

There is a very useful theory in the field of organisations, called organisational hypocrisy. In the school of thought of organisations there is a lens which is useful to dissect this phenomenon, called organisational hypocrisy. Brunsson (1989) provides a description of how organisations can know what to say, decide and do, perhaps more so when dealing with conflicting expectations within and from the organisation.

Organisations can pass on values that are socially desirable to remain legitimate, to obtain talent and to please stakeholders, Gain a favourable name. Making these commitments is not without challenges, however, such as financial (investment) and managerial authority (e.g. transfers to an existing organisational practice).

For instance, a firm can promote sustainability as a value in their values statement, but resort to practices and operations that go against it. Likewise, it can encourage workers to take ownership of their work while maintaining very centralised decision-making processes.

The paradox extends beyond CRM (corporate social responsibility). It's also present in day to day Human Resources Management. Equal opportunity, professional growth and job health policies might fail to be credible if management policies seem to stand in opposition.

This therefore can be read as a culture of pretend, where commitments to symbolic behaviour are easily seen rather than in-behaviour actions.

- **The Role of Managerial Behaviour**

Managers have a major influence in bringing organisations values to the workplace. Staff often view the trustworthiness of organisational values by the way their direct leaders and managers belong to the organisation.

According to Simons (2002) this perceived congruence between managerial words and actions is known as behavioural integrity. This alignment shapes fellow employees' trust in their leaders' credibility and reliability.

If the communication with employees is fair, yet the manager always favours certain staff members, some employees perceive a contradiction between the verbal and actual communication. In the same way, a leader that is pro-innovation and scolds employees for challenging tried and tested methods gives mixed messages regarding the organization's true agenda.

These inconsistency does harm especially as the manager represents the organisation. Their behavior speaks volumes about what values are of true significance and what ones are very symbolic.

Thus the pretence culture is not only the result of organizational communication failures. It is also a matter of accountability of leaders and consistency in their behaviour.

Theoretical Foundations

The proposed paper integrates five theoretical perspectives to explain the development and consequences of organisational value–behaviour incongruence.

- **Organisational Culture Theory**

The concept of declared values of the organisation and the underlying values in the unconscious or unwritten code of daily behaviour is the starting point in the categorisation of macro and micro values as is set out in Schein (2010).

An organisation can recognise and celebrate competition, but provide institutional support for partnership work. As time goes on, staff members start to understand that it's not working and that competition does not really align with the way things work in the organisation.

This view allows to understand why formal value statements are not sufficient for establishing organisational value. Values can be expressed in collective practices, in the behaviours and assumptions of leaders, making them meaningful in culture.

- **Behavioural Integrity Theory**

An explanation of the behavioural integrity is based on the perceived consistency of a person's word versus actions (Simons, 2002).

Organisational staff assess management's ability to follow through on promises, use standards in an even and efficient manner and shows the values they enforce.

High behavioural integrity is more likely to be interpreted as the credible nature of leadership when having high integrity.High behavioural integrity is more likely to be interpreted as the credibility of leadership when being high. At low levels, workers may doubt the management, and lose confidence in the use of promises made by the organisation.

This theory directly underlies the current research to look at the influence of managerial inconsistency on employee trust.

- **Social Exchange Theory**

Social Exchange Theory assumes that intra-organization relations are constructed through the exchange of support, justice and mutual commitments between people (Blau, 1964).

If an organisation expresses its intentions to respect, develop and keep employees happy, employees might see these intentions as part of their employment arrangement with the employer.

When the organisation keeps disappointing these expectations, the employees can see that the relationship is unequal. They might react by decreasing their effort (discretionary), they might hesitate to cooperate or become emotionally distant.

The culture of the pretence therefore can endanger the mutual base of organisational relationships.

- **Psychological Contract Theory**

According to Rousseau (1989) psychological contracts refer to employees' understandings of reciprocal commitments between employees and organisations.

Obligations may arise in recruitment conversations, assurances given by managers, contracting policies and as part of normal life at work.

For instance, staff can anticipate getting a fair chance of promotion, being respected and getting organisational support for this, which they were told when they were hired.

Psychological contract breach may occur within an organisation when there are conflicting requirements of organisational behaviour with the felt obligations.

These can lead to disappointment, mistrust and cynicism when they happen more than once. However, the atmosphere of 'pretence' can be viewed in the context of an organisation where employees and bosses live with a sense of 'pretence', which in turn can become a regular cause of the violation of the psychological contracts.

- **Organisational Justice Theory**

Organisational Justice Theory involves employees' perceptions of the fairness of decisions made on and interpersonal treatment within an organisation.

According to Colquitt (2001) there are important dimensions of organisational justice: distributive, procedural and interactional justice.

Though a company is formally treating all employees fairly, individual employees may be receiving unequal pay, not being promoted according to their talents, or not being treated with appropriate respect by the manager(s).

This discrepancy is relevant because the principles employees interpret are part of both explicit and implicit policies, and also because of the consistency which they observe in the company's actions on and off the job.

Organisational justice thus offers a means by which value – behaviour inconsistency may have an impact on employee's attitude and working relationships.

Key Drivers of the Culture of Pretence

The culture of pretence may emerge through several interconnected organisational conditions.

- **The Pressure to Maintain a Positive Corporate Image**

Organisations exist in competitive agencies, where reputation, employer branding, and stakeholder justification is crucial. By doing so, they might highlight values that express social responsibility, ethical leadership and people-centred management.

But investing in reputation management endangers business communication becoming detached from organisational implementation when behaviour change is not the top concern.

That could be an organization which publicly touts itself as an employee-friendly company, yet has unduly high expectation on maximum workload and limited avenues for staff feedback.

The outcome is the loss of credibility in both the organisation's external image and internal experience.

We need to move past the option of managerial favouritism and selective accountability.We must phase-out managerial favouritism and selective accountability.

Managerial 'favours' is another significant contributor. While relationships and informal networks or managerial decisions can be a factor for opportunities and recognition, organizations can communicate equality and meritiousness.

The same applies to accountability, which can be used selectively. Where the consequences of errors are severe, they may only be seen as seriously misjudging themselves if the employee is at a lower level within the organisation, whereas the same error might have less serious consequences for the employee at the higher level.

This kind of activities may lead to the perception that organisational values are not being adhered to consistently.

A contradiction arises when two policies or ideas collide.An HR contradiction is when two policies or thoughts collide.

HR policies are tools through which values of organisations become operational.

However, sometimes there are inconsistencies when policies and practices send conflicting messages.

Flexible working can be integrated within an organisation, while salaries are paid for those who work onsite, but for longer periods of time. It can promote professional growth and training but do so mostly to the employees selected for such purposes.

Likewise, an Organization can establish formal grievance procedures but not make sure that an employee can actually access them, without receiving retribution.

Such paradoxes compromise the trustworthiness of HR plans and erode confidence over a company's real organization of priorities.

- **Weak Leadership Accountability**

There is an increased persistence of the culture of pretence when leaders are not accountable, as their behaviours counter organisational values.

Managers need to get a good message across, with a proper tone, while exhibiting disrespectful behaviour towards an employee without repercussion – but that is a slippery slope that eventually could result in an employee feeling that it's acceptable for a manager to be disrespectful.

Values of the organisation can only be believable at all levels, including senior level management.

The new goal is to normalise contradictory practices.The new target: normalise contradictory practices.

Conflicting behaviour, if seen repeatedly, can normalise organisational conflicts.

Staff can start to feel that favouritism, politics in the office, undue pressures and recognition being given to a few is accepted as part of life in an organisation.

This normalisation can be an especially detrimental one, as staff could lose dear to the fact that work values are seen in actual practice.

As time goes on, the culture of a perfunctory begins to infiltrate in the norms of the informal organisation.

Employee-Level Consequences: From Disappointment to Organisational Cynicism

The culture of pretence has repercussions which go beyond individual discontent. Frequent value-behaviour dissonance can have an impact on employees' psychological experiences, on their relations with others and on their organisation behaviour.

- **Loss of Family Trust in the Organisation**

Consistency, fairness and reliability in organisation decisions are the key factors to develop trust among employees.

If managers make repeated communications which do not result in action, employees may start to doubt the intention of the organisation.

Employers can do worse than to be openly working on a system that labour can see as being based on favouritism if an employee is repeatedly told that a promotion is available but the opportunity never arrives – then they don't trust the validity of the promotion process.

Such loss of confidence can effect communication, cooperation and acceptance of the company's decisions.

- **Employee Cynicism**

Organisational cynicism is an attitude of mind, feelings and thoughts towards the organisation that are negative.

Andersson (1996) reviews employee cynicism as the result of psychological contract violation, and argues that there is a link between violated expectations and employee mistrust.

If contradictions between organizational values and the actual practice are commonly observed by employees, they might lose faith in the message put out by the management.

The words "e empowering employees" read out at the start of a meeting might just be emptiness or a soundbite skimmed from a completed draft for the public relations office.The words “Empowering employees” in a statement could simply wash over the head of the Public Relations person as meaningless for the employee, and the new initiative on well-being may just be just a photo-op for the public relations person.

When people start to doubt that actions taken by the organisation are likely to have a positive effect, cynicism spreads for good reason.

- **Psychological Contract Violation**

Staff make expectations about fairness, support, development and treatment from the organisation.

If there is constant incongruence between what is expected of an organisation in terms of organisational behaviour and what it actually acts upon, the employees may consider that the organisation has failed in its duties.

This may lead to dissatisfaction, frustration and a loss of faith in the working arrangement.

Importantly, the implications can not necessarily be instant resignation. While employees aren't leaving the organisation they are giving emotionally less, and contributing less to the organization.

- **Reduced Employee Voice**

If concerns are not shared, employees are less likely to communicate concerns when they believe that the organisation is not a place of openness and participation.

For instance, it can this organization suggest that they share their ideas, but simply overlook important input if it isn't and chalk up disagreement as a disloyalty.

These kinds of experiences can make participation happen differently than formal labour voice arrangements, causing a deficit in employee voice and participation.

As a result, workers might select not to speak up because they don't want to risk fallout from the management or out of regard for their career.

- **Emotional Detachment and Low Work Attachment**

If employees lose faith in organisational values then they may feel lack of association with the organisation.

They may work through their jobs and fulfill duties but show a decreased willingness to engage in non-work activities.

Employees' identification with the organisation may also be weak, as it is problematic to associate oneself with values which are not exercised in the actual organisation.

Although the organisation may still be their place of work, the espoused identity need not be their lived identity.

Proposed Conceptual Framework: Organisational Value–Behaviour Congruence Framework

This paper introduces the Organisational Value–Behaviour Congruence Framework (OVBCF) on the basis of the theoretical discussion.

The framework theorises about the culture of pretence as a process in which gaps between the values in the organization and the behaviour manifest in the organization result in perceptions and psychological responses among employees that then are reflected in organizational outcomes.

The Five Touchpoints are Part of One Framework

- **Stage 1: Espoused Organisational Values**

These include formally-approved statements covering integrity, fairness, transparency, inclusion, respect, employee well being, and accountability.

- **Stage 2: Enacted Organisational Behaviour**

This stage is characterised by the way in which organisational values are communicated through daily managerial, HR, leadership, recognition and interpersonal activities.

- **Stage 3: the perceived value–behaviour gap is felt.**

Participants reflect on their own experiences in their organisation and their announced organisation commitments. Value–behaviour incongruence takes place when these experiences keep occurring that are in contrast with formal commitment.

- **Stage 4: Employee Psychological Responses**

The perceived gap can lead to distrust within the organisation, Cynicism, violation of psychological contract and lowered PSS.

- **Stage 5: Organisational Outcomes**

These psychological reactions can impact employee voice, organisational identification, co-operation, discretionary efforts, retention intentions and relationships within the workplace.

Three elements of good organisation (accountability of leaders, transparency, and employee voice) are also identified as important features of the framework. Such mechanisms could promote a connection between value–behaviour and diminish adverse counterproductive organisational inconsistencies.

The model proposed is presented below.

Research Propositions

The conceptual framework generates the following research propositions:

- **Proposition 1:** A greater perceived gap between espoused organisational values and enacted organisational practices is positively associated with employee perceptions of organisational hypocrisy.
- **Proposition 2:** Perceived organisational hypocrisy is negatively associated with employee trust and positively associated with organisational cynicism.
- **Proposition 3:** Employee perceptions of organisational justice mediate the relationship between value–behaviour incongruence and organisational trust.
- **Proposition 4:** Psychological contract violation mediates the relationship between perceived organisational hypocrisy and employee emotional disengagement.
- **Proposition 5:** Leadership behavioural integrity moderates the relationship between espoused organisational values and enacted organisational behaviour, such that greater behavioural integrity strengthens perceived value–behaviour alignment.
- **Proposition 6:** Employee voice mechanisms and organisational transparency reduce the negative relationship between perceived value–behaviour incongruence and employee trust.
- **Proposition 7:** The relationship between perceived organisational hypocrisy and employee cynicism varies across organisational and institutional contexts, including differences in hierarchy, employee expectations and accountability systems.

These propositions provide a foundation for subsequent empirical testing and comparative research.

Comparative Indian and Global Organisational Perspective

While the nature of the cultural element of pretence may change depending on institutional arrangements, managerial structures, and employee expectations, the culture of pretence is relevant in any organisational setting.

- **The Indian Organisational Context**

Indian organizations work in various institutional and cultural contexts. Organisational values might be shaped by traditional hierarchical structures, the importance of seniority in the organization, relationship-based professional networks and different goals of younger staff members.

For instance, an organisation could officially encourage staff to be engaged in decision-making but have it done by a small group of staff. Staff are encouraged to voice viewpoints but will not contest authority.

Both, too, organisations can be communicating policies about merit-based promotion, and the opportunities within organisations are informal and may be shaped by preferences of managers.

This can be especially stark when organisations work towards adopting and formalising a new style of "managerialism" alongside current ideas of transparency, inclusion and employees' empowerment.

In this context, Indian organisations offer a worthwhile forum for understanding the relationship of perceived value–behaviour alignment with respect to the roles of hierarchy, relational expectation and managerial accountability.

These ideas are complemented by the work of Gopinath et al. (2018) who do add one important aspect to the debate, namely the nature of espoused and enacted organisational values and their impacts on the organisations' members.

- **Global Organisational Context**

The same issues exist all over the world (but perhaps institutional and cultural differences).

There are numerous examples of diversity and equality or sustainability, ethics and employee well-being commitments that are made on a global level by multinational corporations. There may be different interpretations and implementation of these commitments at subsidiary/ department, national/nonsubordinate level.

For instance, a multinational company can work on employee empowerment as reflected in its policies, and be highly centralized within specific regional operations.

For example, an organisation can make public statements about its diversity objectives, while its staff does not benefit from equal access to opportunities to advance to leadership positions nor are its voices heard in senior leadership positions.

A recent contribution is the research by Whysall and Kougiannou (2026) that considers the concept of HR whitewashing from employee perspectives, whereby there is a gap between organisational values, HR policies and day to day practice in UK organisations.

The comparative aspect shows then that there is no exclusively national dimension to the sense of organisational hypocrisy. Instead, its expressions, may be different with different leadership practices and institutional pressures and employee expectations in organisational structures.

Implications for Human Resource Management and Organisational Leadership

The proposed framework suggests that organisations must move beyond communicating desirable values and establish systems that ensure their consistent enactment.

- **Transforming Values into Observable Behaviour**

Values should be translated to clearly defined behavioural expectations.

Respect, for instance, is an organisational value so managers should actively listen to others, communicate professionally and fairly with others, give non-discriminatory feedback etc., etc.

Likewise, promotion should be based on transparency, along with criteria for employee evaluation and communication about changes in the organisation.

The true value of a policy lies in the extent to which staff can identify it in their day to day decisions.

- **Leadership Accountability and Behavioural Integrity**

Organisations need to consider ensuring that leaders are assessed on their ability to demonstrate values of the organisation as well as financial and operational performance.

Employees' comments can be used in leadership appraisals, managerial decision making, and the keeping of promises, or the nature of working relationships.

Facing intimidation or favouritism to meet performance targets is not an effective way of being the representative of an organisation that purports to value dignity and fairness.

- **Ensure HR Policies align to Organisational Commitments**

HR teams should question periodically their processes and practices around recruitment, performance administration, compensation, promotion, learning and grievance and check if they conform with formally declared values.

An organisation that communicates equal opportunity, for instance, needs to consider the fairness of training and promotion opportunities and leadership development.

In this, HR must not only oversee formalities, but serve as a protectors of the credibility and consistency of actions of the organisation.

- **Empowers Employee Voice and Transparency**

Staff need safe and accessible means to communicate difference between values and experience.

Having channels for confidential feedback, staff listening sessions, and independent grievance processes along with transparent communication can help prevent negative patterns from developing in the workplace.

Feedback mechanisms, however, have to result in perceivable corrective action. Creating a culture of pretence is fostered by asking employees for their input and without engaging with their thoughts.

To create an authentic organisational culture.

Authentic organisation culture involves consistency from the messages sent out by organisations, leadership actions, and employee experiences.

The key for organisations is to realise that trust is built over a period of time, not occasional motivational messages or corporate initiatives.

Fairness is practiced even when it is difficult, accountability is enforced throughout the organization and there is no loss of dignity in working life in front of anyone.

Future Research Directions

Further research in a number of areas in the proposed framework is possible.

First, empirical studies can be used to develop and/or validate an incongruence between perceived organisational value and behaviour. This research might help in distinguishing between discrepancies in leadership behaviour, employee treatment, HR policies, and employee communication in the organisation.

Second, comparison between Indian organizations with selected international context can be investigated. The role of organisational hierarchy, power distance, institutional accountability, and employee expectations on perception and implications of organisational hypocrisy can be explored in these studies.

Thirdly, longitudinal studies could investigate the trend of employee cynicism and distrust over time based on repeated experiences with inconsistencies.

Fourth, in the context of qualitative research, it could utilize interview, focus group and organisational case studies to explore the personal experiences that employees have of organisational contradictions.

Lastly, studies should be conducted to determine if the leadership behavioural integrity and the transparency of an organization, or effective employee voice mechanisms, minimize disadvantageous effects of value–behaviour incongruence.

A most promising area of research might be exploring if employees grew more cynical of organisations that regularly discuss staff-centred values but do not show them during challenging organisational decisions – e.g. restructuring, workload distribution, promotion, etc.

Conclusion

There is more to an organisation's culture than mission statements, corporate values or formal human resource policies. This real essence is manifested in your normal personal attitudes, managerial choices and relationships with people.

The goal of this paper is to present the concept of culture of pretence as a lens to examine between what is valued at the organizational level and what is felt by employees at the organizational level. There is an argument that the inconsistencies that occur over and over again can erode trust, cause cynisms, not meet employee expectations and have a negative impact on workplace relationships.

The suggested framework Organisational Value – Behaviour Congruence holds that the realignment of behaviour with value is a key factor towards the credibility and sustainability of the workplace culture. The framework brings together organisational culture, behavioural integrity, social exchange, psychological contracts and organisational justice, to create a foundation for the creation of organisational contradictions and its impact on employee experiences.

The discussion also stresses the need to consider some of these processes in other institutional and cultural settings. Through studying the diverse hierarchical and relational structures of Indian organisations, as well as the enduring questions of commitment in practice, the book provides engaging examples of the intersection of formal organisational commitments with everyday managerial practice. Additional perspectives on the impact of institutional arrangements, leadership systems and corporate governance are provided by international organisations.

In the end, it isn't about writing consistently that organisations are committed to integrity, fairness, inclusion and employee wellness, but actually showing that by communicating it to people over and over. They build up credibility when the employees are constantly living out these values consistently.

References

1. Andersson, L. M. (1996). Employee cynicism: An examination using a contract violation framework. Human Relations, 49(11), 1395–1418. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679604901102
2. Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. John Wiley & Sons.
3. Brunsson, N. (1989). The organization of hypocrisy: Talk, decisions and actions in organizations. John Wiley & Sons.
4. Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 386–400. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386
5. Gopinath, M., Nair, A., & Thangaraj, V. (2018). Espoused and enacted values in an organization: Workforce implications. Vision, 22(4), 395–403. https://doi.org/10.1177/0258042X18797757
6. Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. Academy of Management Review, 25(4), 706–725. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3707697
7. Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 2, 121–139. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01384942
8. Schein, E. H. (2010). Organizational culture and leadership (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
9. Simons, T. (2002). Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' words and deeds as a research focus. Organization Science, 13(1), 18–35. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.1.18.543
10. Simons, T., Tomlinson, E. C., & Leroy, H. (2011). Research on behavioral integrity: A promising construct for positive organizational scholarship. In K. S. Cameron & G. M. Spreitzer (Eds.), The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship (pp. 325–339). Oxford University Press.
11. Simons, T., Leroy, H., Collewaert, V., & Masschelein, S. (2022). Revisiting behavioral integrity: Progress and new directions after 20 years. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 9, 365–389. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-062016

❑❑❑