WORKING PAPER · ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR & CORPORATE GOVERNANCE · LEADERSHIP STUDIES

The Enron Collapse: Rightness Bias and Moral Disengagement in Corporate Governance

How Organizational Exceptionalism Disables Ethical Self-Correction

Author: Gökhan Gülatik | **Date:** July 2026 | **Paper No:** Working Paper No. 8

ABSTRACT

The collapse of Enron Corporation in December 2001 — at the time, the largest bankruptcy in US history — has been extensively analyzed as an accounting fraud and corporate governance failure. This paper reframes the Enron case through an organizational psychology lens, arguing that the fraud was downstream of a more fundamental leadership pathology: a rightness bias that systematically disabled the organization's capacity for ethical self-correction. Drawing on Keltner's power paradox theory, Ariely's research on moral disengagement, and Eurich's work on self-awareness in leadership, we trace how Enron's culture of self-designated exceptionalism — 'we are the smartest people in the room' — progressively eroded the ethical constraints that prevent organizations from treating rules as applicable only to others. The case offers a framework for understanding how high-performing organizations can become systematically immune to ethical feedback.

Keywords: Enron, rightness bias, moral disengagement, power paradox, organizational ego, corporate governance, leadership failure

1. INTRODUCTION

In 2000, Enron Corporation was Fortune magazine's seventh-largest company in the United States, with revenues exceeding $100 billion and a reputation as one of the most innovative enterprises in the energy sector. By December 2001, the company had filed for bankruptcy — at that time, the largest US corporate bankruptcy in history, with $63.4 billion in reported assets at the time of filing. The bankruptcy exposed the systematic falsification of Enron's financial position through an elaborate network of off-balance-sheet special purpose entities (SPEs) that had concealed billions in liabilities from investors and regulators. More than 20,000 employees ultimately lost their jobs as the company ceased operations; employee pension funds, heavily concentrated in Enron stock, were largely wiped out.

External auditor Arthur Andersen — whose consulting relationship with Enron had created structural conflicts of interest with its audit function — was indicted for obstruction of justice following the shredding of Enron-related documents. The 89-year-old firm, with 85,000 employees globally, effectively ceased to exist within months.

Enron is typically analyzed as a case study in accounting manipulation, regulatory failure, and board passivity. This paper argues that these proximate causes were themselves downstream of a more fundamental organizational pathology: a leadership culture characterized by what we term rightness bias — the systematic belief that one's own judgment, methods, and interests are exempt from the standards applicable to others. Understanding Enron through this lens illuminates failure patterns visible in organizations that share Enron's culture of self-designated exceptionalism, regardless of sector or scale.

2. THE SMARTEST GUYS IN THE ROOM: ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

Enron's organizational culture was explicitly built around an identity of intellectual exceptionalism. CEO Jeff Skilling, recruited from McKinsey & Company in 1990, implemented a performance management system — the 'rank and yank' model — that annually dismissed the bottom 15% of employees based on peer-rated performance evaluations. The system was designed to create a culture of relentless internal competition and continuous renewal.

Hiring was concentrated in graduates of elite MBA programmes, explicitly recruited with the message that Enron was not a conventional energy company but an intellectually superior entity operating on a different plane from its competitors. McLean and Elkind's (2003) exhaustive account of the company's rise and fall documents how this identity — 'we are different, we understand things others don't' — was not merely cultural rhetoric but a structural feature of how the organization processed information and made decisions.

The identity was reinforced by a remarkable run of apparent success. Through the 1990s, Enron's stock price rose dramatically; the company was praised by analysts, journalists, and regulators as a model of innovative corporate transformation. This external validation compounded internal confidence into something more systemic: the near-total insulation of the leadership group from the kind of external feedback that might have challenged the organization's self-conception.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Rightness Bias and the Limits of Ethical Self-Correction

The concept of rightness bias — the systematic tendency to treat one's own judgments, values, and interests as intrinsically correct and beyond the need for external validation — is a product of several interacting cognitive and social mechanisms. At the individual level, it is reinforced by confirmation bias: the tendency to seek, interpret, and recall information in ways that confirm pre-existing beliefs.

At the organizational level, rightness bias is amplified when the identity of the organization is explicitly constructed around intellectual exceptionalism. When 'we are different' becomes a core element of organizational identity — and when this identity is regularly validated by external success — the cognitive cost of self-correction rises dramatically. Acknowledging that a practice, strategy, or judgment is wrong requires revising not just a specific belief but the underlying self-conception from which that belief derives.

3.2 The Power Paradox and Ethical Exemption

Keltner's (2016) power paradox research demonstrates that high-power individuals systematically exhibit reduced empathic accuracy, diminished social sensitivity, and a tendency to apply different ethical standards to themselves than to others. The mechanism is consistent with the broader literature on moral licensing: previous success or virtue creates a subjective sense of credit that is then drawn upon to justify subsequent ethical compromises.

Enron's leadership exhibited this pattern with particular clarity. Skilling's later courtroom assertion that 'everything was legal and transparent' reflected a sincere belief — shared within the executive leadership group — that the organization's practices were legitimate because the people who designed them were sophisticated and understood them. The circularity of this reasoning was invisible to those inside it.

3.3 Moral Disengagement: The Incremental Architecture of Fraud

Ariely's (2008) research on dishonesty consistently finds that large-scale frauds rarely originate in a single moment of conscious decision to cheat. They originate in small, rationalisable deviations — each of which establishes a new reference point that makes the next deviation appear incremental rather than qualitative.

Enron's accounting manipulation followed this pattern precisely. The first SPE structures were technically within the boundaries of accounting rules, as interpreted by advisors with strong incentives to validate them. Each subsequent structure was rationalized by reference to the prior ones: 'we've always done this, it's been reviewed and approved.' By the time the structures had become a mechanism for concealing billions in liabilities from investors, no single actor in the organization had made a decision to commit fraud — each had merely approved what seemed like a small incremental extension of established practice.

4. THE COMPLIANCE CAPTURE OF OVERSIGHT FUNCTIONS

A distinctive feature of the Enron case is the degree to which external oversight functions were progressively captured by the organization's rightness culture. Arthur Andersen's dual role as auditor and management consultant — generating substantial consulting fees from Enron in addition to its audit fees — created structural conflicts that compromised audit independence.

More fundamentally, however, the capture operated at the level of belief. Andersen partners working on the Enron account were immersed in the organizational culture and came to share its interpretation of its own accounting structures. The board's audit committee, similarly, was presented with information framed in terms that made the SPE structures appear legitimate.

Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman's (1995) integrative model of organizational trust is relevant here: trust is built on assessments of ability, benevolence, and integrity. When a highly sophisticated organization consistently presents its practices as both legal and innovative, those whose role is oversight face significant social and epistemic pressure to defer to the organization's self-assessment — particularly when the organization's prior track record appears to validate its capabilities.

5. OUTCOMES AND INSTITUTIONAL LEGACY

The immediate consequences of Enron's collapse were severe. More than 20,000 employees ultimately lost their jobs as the company ceased operations; employee retirement savings, concentrated in Enron stock, were decimated. Shareholders lost billions. The reputational damage to the accounting profession was profound: Arthur Andersen's collapse eliminated one of the five largest global audit firms.

The legislative response was swift. The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, enacted within eight months of Enron's bankruptcy filing, introduced sweeping reforms to corporate governance, financial disclosure, and auditor independence. CEO Jeff Skilling was convicted of fraud and conspiracy in 2006 and sentenced to 24 years in federal prison (later reduced to approximately 14 years; he was released in 2019). CFO Andrew Fastow pled guilty and received a six-year sentence.

The institutional legacy of Enron extends beyond regulatory reform. The case established a reference point for understanding how organizational culture can disable the mechanisms that would otherwise prevent catastrophic failure — not through overt corruption of individuals but through the construction of a collective worldview in which the failure to act unethically becomes genuinely inconceivable.

6. KEY LESSONS FOR LEADERSHIP PRACTICE

Exceptionalism as a risk factor. Organizational cultures that explicitly construct their identity around intellectual superiority or industry-leading innovation create structural conditions for rightness bias. The belief that 'we understand things others don't' disables precisely the external-reference mechanisms that enable ethical self-correction.

The incremental ethics audit. Ariely's research suggests that ethical erosion is typically incremental and below conscious threshold. Periodic structured review of practices that are rationalized as 'we've always done this' — particularly in high-pressure financial environments — provides a counterweight to the normalization of progressive deviation.

Independence as a structural requirement. The Enron case illustrates how financial and reputational dependencies compromise oversight functions even when the individuals involved maintain a sincere belief in their independence. Structural separation of consulting and audit functions, and meaningful rotation of board members, are not merely regulatory formalities but essential mechanisms for maintaining genuine external perspective.

Dissent as competitive advantage. The rank-and-yank system that Enron used to maintain its culture of excellence simultaneously eliminated the internal dissent that might have identified the organization's trajectory before it became irreversible. Organizations that reward agreement and penalize dissent optimize for short-term cohesion at the cost of long-term ethical and strategic resilience.

7. CONCLUSION

The Enron case is not, at its core, a story about dishonest people who built a criminal enterprise. It is a story about how an organizational culture systematically constructed around the belief in its own exceptionalism disabled the mechanisms that would otherwise prevent catastrophic ethical failure. The specific mechanisms — rightness bias, power paradox, moral disengagement — are not unique to Enron; they are predictable features of organizations that combine high commercial success, explicit exceptionalism identity, and the progressive capture of oversight functions.

For leaders seeking to build organizations resistant to this failure pattern, the Enron case suggests that the antidote is not ethical compliance programs or regulatory oversight alone — it is the cultivation of organizational cultures in which disagreement is structurally protected, external perspectives are genuinely integrated, and the belief 'we might be wrong' is treated not as a sign of weakness but as the foundation of sustainable organizational health.

REFERENCES

Ariely, D. (2008). *Predictably irrational: The hidden forces that shape our decisions*. HarperCollins.

Eurich, T. (2017). *Insight: Why we're not as self-aware as we think*. Crown Business.

Keltner, D. (2016). *The power paradox: How we gain and lose influence*. Penguin Press.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 709–734.

McLean, B., & Elkind, P. (2003). *The smartest guys in the room: The amazing rise and scandalous fall of Enron*. Portfolio.

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.

Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*(3), 193–209.
