



A PROFESSIONAL COURSE  
TO ENHANCE MORAL REASONING  
AND  
IMPROVE CRITICAL DECISION-MAKING  
IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION©

Prepared for  
**University of Prince Edward Island**  
**BusAdmin 482B**  
(*Winter '009*)

Prepared & Delivered by  
**E-sinc**  
**Glenn Wm. Sinclair, Inc.**  
Suite #1500, 10180 - 101 Street  
Edmonton, Alta., T5J 4K1  
**1-866-4 ethink (1-866-438-4465)**  
[gwsinclair@e-sinc.com](mailto:gwsinclair@e-sinc.com)

*Copyright 2009*

**INTRODUCTION to the SEMINAR**

*The Course*

OBJECTIVES:

- 1) *Assist the business administrator/manager/entrepreneur to recognize moral dilemmas and their impact in one's life and enhance the ability to deal effectively with problems of critical choice.*
- 2) *Introduce the business leader to the challenges of ethical decision-making leading to a more productive work environment.*
- 3) *Improve an leader's/administrator's/manager's recognition of the differences in stages of reasoning and the resultant impact on the way s/he might deal with staff, colleagues, clients and regulators*

*note #1:* For purposes of this course the terms *ethical* and *moral* will be interchangeable. It should also be noted that the purpose of this seminar is not to make you more moral or ethical but to enhance your ability to reason through moral/ethical problems!

*Professorial Overview*

**• Why I'm even interested in this stuff!?**

---

---

**• Why I teach it!?**

---

---

**• Where else I use it!?**

---

---

DEFINITION of PROFESSIONAL ETHICS (with apologies to Dr. Mark Wexler)

- *Professional ethics is the application of moral standards and ideas of the good life to the intentions, actions, technologies and goals/targets used in the professional world*

CONCEPT of APPLIED ETHICS (with further apologies to Dr. Mark Wexler)

- *Professional ethics in that particular branch of applied ethics which seeks to describe the moral standards in use in professional practices and to prescribe effective ways to change, raise or alter these moral standards.*

For those who say there is no time or place in the real world of business, industry and government for the study of ethics (i.e. leave it to all the *do-gooders*), let me ask you then:

- **why not start a business in baby stomping? (particularly for welfare babies)**
- **why not put every unemployed &/or developmentally challenged person to work in the army front lines?**
- **why not make all drugs and prostitution legal, like alcohol & gambling?**

## *The Participants*

(Individually)

Prepare a mini-bio (to turn in) which includes:

- name (underline or indicate how you prefer to be addressed)
- *e-mail* address
- why you are in the *School of Business*
- where are you on your learning journey?
- what you expect to get out of this course...

[see next page]

# E-sinc

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ E-Mail \_\_\_\_\_

who am I?

---

---

---

---

how have I come to enroll in this class?

---

---

---

---

where am I in my *learning journey*?

---

---

---

---

what contribution(s) can I make (or can my peers expect from me) in this class?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

[**note:** turn this page in to prof]

## **E-sinc**

(Roundtable)

- who are we as individuals?
- what do we bring to this class?
- *And, give one idea/characteristic/aspiration that you would like to be remembered for?*

---

**Dustin Arbeau**

---

**James Webster**

---

**Janna Vuozzo**

---

**Alicia Bremner**

---

**Lisa Bruce**

---

**Matthew Sullivan**

---

**Michael Smith**

---

**Kimberley Burt**

---

**Robert Chandler**

---

**Greg MacPhail**

---

**Kristin MacLeod**

---

**Helen Chow**

---

**Gillian Cooke**

---

**Kate MacDonald**

---

**Wayde Lewis**

---

**Tracy Corish**

---

**Chelsea Cudmore**

---

**Kenneth Lecky**

---

**Jordan Leard**

---

**Nourhan Darwish**

---

**Meredith Femino**

---

**Mandy Kremers**

---

**Rola Koraa**

---

**Lacey Hurry**

---

**Sun Young Kim**

## **MODULE ONE (1)...**

### *The Journey Begins...*

#### **I. STEP ONE: How well do we know ourselves?**

- A) Completion (and turning in) of HUG: some insight into philosophical consistency!
- B) Completion (and turning in) of D.I.T.: so what really is our stage of reasoning!!
- C) Turn in Mini-Bio as well...
- D) Don't forget to get the text: *Cowboy Ethics...*by James Owen

## II. CONSCIENCE as an AGENT in CONFLICT:

Does your conscience come into play when you have to make a major decision? Does this help or hinder the process? Should an organization have a guiding set of principles to help direct the manager? If so, will there be occasions when these principles are best bent or even set aside?

### CASE STUDY #1: *Sir Thomas More - Idealism and Public Service*

#### A. *Individual review of background material:*

Both the written material on Sir Thomas More (**Appendix A**) and the edited film: ***Conscience in Conflict*** (based on *A Man For All Seasons*)

#### B. *Small Group Discussion:*

[guidelines:

- (a) Appoint a **recorder**, who also serves as an observer of the process followed to obtain a solution [the recorder is reminded that at the beginning of the large group presentation, each recorder will turn in a written assessment (results) of the discussion indicating who talked most, who talked least, was consensus reached or was a solution imposed]
- (b) Does everyone get to participate?
- (c) Are all views considered?]

(1) Why do you think More took the approach he did? Describe your thoughts about the validity of his actions?

---

---

(2) Are you sympathetic to More? Was he following his conscience, or just being an *ego-maniac*?

---

---

(3) Consider Cromwell from the perspective of simply being a good administrator when he convinced Rich to lie in court, thus making sure the King's wish to get rid of More was accomplished: does this make his thinking acceptable? Describe your feelings about his actions?

---

---

---



## E-sinc

- (4) If you were guarding a person who was being unjustly convicted, would you even consider helping him to escape? Why do you take this position?

---

---

---

- (5) Taking the story from medieval times to the twenty-first (21<sup>st</sup>) century, consider whether the average professional manager is really able to follow her/his conscience most of the time? To what extent Is it even worthwhile trying to do this?

---

---

---

C. *Whole Class Presentations:*

[first of all, each recorder is to turn in the written assessments (results) of the discussion indicating who talked most, who talked least, was consensus reached or was a solution imposed]

(1) 

---

---

---

(2) 

---

---

---

(3) 

---

---

---

(4) 

---

---

---

(5) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(6) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(7) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

D. *Roundtable Discussion:*

Can we achieve consensus in our thinking?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

What is our over-riding perception of Sir Thomas More?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Would we have acted in the same fashion?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



## **E-sinc**

(1) How should the Chairman (Sasha) handle the application of Garry?

---

---

---

(2) What is the critical dilemma here?

---

---

---

(3) Is there another side to the argument? And if so, does it make any sense?

---

---

---

B. *Whole Class Presentations:*

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_

C. *Roundtable Discussion:* [Recorders: turn in reports]

**WHAT SHOULD SASHA DO?**

[do you personally agree with this decision? \_\_\_\_\_]

# E-sinc

## IV. The MORAL DILEMMA:

Let's rethink how we reason through the critical moments in our managerial decision-making:

- **when both choices are equally distasteful or desirable?**
- **do we see such moments as the beginnings of ethical dilemmas?**
- **do we believe there are more (and less) rational approaches that could be used?**
- **if there are tools that could assist, would we use them?**
- **and if so, would we want our subordinates also to have access to them?**

These questions help form the backdrop to this exercise. The entire course is oriented to analysis and application of a tool to enhance your capabilities to resolve the critical ethical dilemmas occurring in the managerial domain.

### A. *Introductory Brainstorm:*

What is a dilemma? How does one come to a decision when neither choice is acceptable? Or, when both are equally desirable? List all relevant components of what you think would be included in a definition of a *moral/ethical dilemma*.

---

---

---

---

### B. *Small Group Discussion:*

Focus on establishing a mutually acceptable definition. Be prepared to make a presentation (maximum of 5 minutes) to the whole class.

---

---

---

---

# E-sinc

C. *Second Round: Pairing of Groups:*

- (i) Two (2) small groups will merge and attempt to combine their two (2) definitions (members of Group Seven (7) will be assigned to two (2) other groups)
  
- (ii) Each *set-of-paired groups* will then prepare to convince the other groups.

---

---

D. *Full Class Presentations:*

- (I) Each group will present and explain their definition.
  
- (ii) The monitors/critics will help evolve a single definition (including reviewing a previously *given* definition, noted below)

[One definition of an ethical dilemma — *A situation where an individual's personal integrity & judgment is challenged AND a choice must be made even though it is painful + the situation is uncertain (least adverse effect).*]

- (iii) Produce a collective consensus statement for use as a *working definition* for and throughout this Seminar (it can be a modified version of the above given definition or a considerably different statement).

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## **E-sinc**

### **V. SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT: *Additional Queries Part 1***

- A. In your small group you will prepare a **presentation** on one of the designated *queries*.
- B. You may be called upon to **critique** another group's presentation as well.

#### ***Query One***

*You have an irksome employee. He is tardy, often absent, produces rather substandard work, and continually create histrionic scenes calling attention to themselves as indispensable contributors. You have the opportunity to pass this employee over to another office within your company by writing a glowing recommendation. The employee in question is eager for the transfer as it will involve a raise in pay and increased responsibilities.*

***Do you temper your remarks, write a glowing letter, and rid yourself and your work group of this problem?***

---

---

---

---

---

---

#### ***Query Two***

*Your sister is a bio-chemist on holiday visiting you at your new resort at Brackley Beach wherein you have pour all your energy and wealth. An aspect of the operation of your large hotel has been the discover of curative hot springs which the Island Tourism Department has already begun to promote, and many new reservations are coming in for next summer. Being a TYPE A personality, your sister became bored and decide to test the water in the springs. She learns, much to her surprise, that it is very high in strontium, a mineral that has recently been suspected to raise the possibility of birth defects when in contact with the skin of pregnant women.*

***What do you do think she should do with her suspicions?***

---

---

---

---

---

---

## **E-sinc**

### ***Query Three***

*You are the daughter of a major developer in Charlottetown and are renting an apartment that is a condo of friend of your father's (this friend also is a member of city council). The complex has its own manager as most of the condos are rented out; he is a guy you don't like all that much. After having lived in the apartment for a few days, you start to have a problem with mice. You complain to the manager who immediately brings over traps and tries to determine how the mice are entering your pad. Happy that he is dealing with the situation, you are shocked when your neighbouring tenant(s) accuse(s) you of using your position to get your complaint dealt with. Unknown to you, they have been complaining for weeks & months to the manager about the same issue.*

*They accuse you of using connections and political influence to get your problem solved. Some are even threatening to go to the Guardian & CBC with the story. You are not interested in dragging your father's friend into a mess and you are really busy preparing for final exams...*

***What do you do? Where or how can this be most quickly brought to resolution?***

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

C. Presentations & Critiques...

(A) \_\_\_\_\_

---

(B) \_\_\_\_\_

---

(C) \_\_\_\_\_

---



**VI. The LOGICAL USE of LOGICAL REASONS***CASE STUDY #3: Home & Work - The Role Play*

Participants begin to examine the concept of attempting to use logical reasons to resolve a moral dilemma. Can such a process be usefully incorporated into such critical decision-making situations? Is there a better way to explain one's decision, even if others don't like the decision, so that one at least gains their respect for the decision?

***This situation involves Trina and Elliott, who were married in their final year as undergraduates at a local university.***

*After graduation (from a large Maritime university) Trina worked as a secretary for a major legal firm while Elliott went on to graduate school to complete his M.B.A. Elliott was very successful and received a scholarship that allowed him (after a total of four years) to also acquire a Ph.D. During this time they had one child, now two years of age. [Trina was away from work for less than two months at the time the child was born; there being no major e.i. benefits at the time.]*

*Now Elliott has been offered an opportunity to join a major national firm to help them straighten out a subsidiary located in a small town in southwestern Ontario. He is eager to accept it. However, Trina has applied and been accepted into law school at her alma mater and her employer is willing to keep her on part-time to help her cover her direct schooling costs.*

*...Trina argues that Elliott should give her the chance for an education now that he has completed his. She also reminds him that he has been offered a teaching position in the Business Administration program of the Technical Institute in their city and this would allow him to do some business consulting which could lead to other contacts in the future.*

*...Elliott says he plans to accept the out-of-province offer and that Trina can consider other career options including taking some graduate courses by distance education and during summer vacations. If Trina refuses to follow him, Elliott promises to file for divorce and seek custody of their two year old son...*

**What would you do if you were *Trina*? and, Why?**

## E-sinc

### A. *Small Group Activity:*

- (1) Re-read the Case Study to make sure all generally agreed on the basic facts themselves.
- (2) In each small group, the challenge is to role-play potential resolutions to this dilemma. **Go through the process at least three times, each time switching roles** to permit each participant to play at least two of three roles (i.e. Trina, Elliott and/or observer).

The role of *observer* is to note the positive strengths of the arguments presented by both Trina and Elliott. [In addition the observer should monitor the time; each round should take no more than seven minutes.]

- (3) After completing the role-play, the small group then develops a joint presentation for the large group and appoints a spokesperson. The presentation should concentrate on the major question (above).

### B. *Whole Class Presentations: (25 minutes)*

As each small group makes its presentation, note the solution it proposes and, whether or not you concur.

Group (i) solution \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Group (ii) solution \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Group (iii) solution \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Group (iv) solution \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Group (v) solution \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

[note your own preferred solution: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## MODULE TWO (2)...

### C. LECTURE: *Stages in our Critical Thinking*

[much of this is excerpted from Phi Delta Kappan, 1975]

#### The APPROACH

When we approach a dilemma and have to make a critical decision, we actually can approach the problem from a number of different levels. More importantly, different people will utilize different levels to resolve the same problem. Sometimes people will fail to resolve a mutual problem because they are operating at different levels and can't properly appreciate the other decision-maker's point of view. This *cognitive-developmental* approach was fully stated for the first time by John Dewey. The approach is called *cognitive* because it recognizes that moral education, like intellectual education, has its basis in stimulating the *active thinking* of the individual about moral issues and decisions. It is called *developmental* because it seems the aims of ethical reasoning is movement through moral stages. In other words, there are various and multiple levels.

#### *Cognitive/Developmental...*

A person can not get to moral action if s/he is incapable of moral thought. Do not ask yourself if you are being ethical in your decisions, if you are not first prepared to analyse the reasons that lead you to the decisions:

- *What is it that makes me think a particular decision is better?*
- *How does a critical decision most consistently get justified when I reflect back on it?*
- *Why do I think I am (or am not) facing an ethical dilemma?*

#### *Complexity...*

Now these stages do not dictate whether or not an individual is moral in the eyes of the critic, but rather indicate the level of complexity at which the individual is operating in terms of the way he reasons about ethical/moral dilemmas. The focus for development is on structure, not content.

## E-sinc

### *Dewey...*

Dewey argued for three levels of moral development:

- a) the *pre-moral* or *pre-conventional* level of behaviour motivated by biological and social impulses with results for morals;
- b) the *conventional* level of behaviour in which the individual accepts with little critical reflection the standards of his group;
- c) the *autonomous* level of behaviour in which conduct is guided by the individual thinking and judging for himself whether a purpose is good, and does not accept the standard of his group without reflection. John Dewey on Education: Selected Writings (New York: Random House, 1964).

Similar arguments for three levels were put forward by William McDougall, Leonard Hobbhouse and James Mark Baldwin.

### **WE DON'T OPERATE in a VACUUM!!**

The importance of even considering the ethical domain within this context of critical **decision-making is in part because (as Mosher points out) the manager does not operate in a vacuum**. Any organization is a constant source of interaction between all sorts of individuals. This in turn provides challenges that are bound to create dilemmas for the manager or for that matter, any professional who faces moments of critical choice as part of his/her daily work.

For example, *the manager (leader) must balance his responsibility for the organization's long term survival with his need to care and provide for his staff (particularly his management team), plus respond to the concerns of the community at large*. Attempting to respond to such diverse clients places the manager in situations where conflicting moral decisions will arise.

### ***Least Principle...***

Research (by Sergiovanni and others) has shown that all too often executives have tended to avoid value confrontations. Rather, they apply the principle of *least principle* to value conflict, dealing with it at the lowest level of abstraction possible. Value conflict is treated at the interpersonal level and on a one-to-one basis rather than at the organizational level. It may be inappropriate to claim such evidence shows that the administrator personally is at a very simple stage of development in his moral responsibility. But, it certainly seems reasonable to assert that such managerial individuals too often operate from inappropriate stages of ethical reasoning when dealing with other individuals.

If the manager had a better understanding of the complexities involved in ethical reasoning, s/he might then be in a position to more adequately deal with value confrontations as they arise in critical dilemmas in the decision-making process.

## STAGES THEORY

Within the **stages theory as developed by Kohlberg** it is important to realize that there is an implicit assumption that the higher levels are more complex. However this seminar is not a course on *civics* or on *moral philosophy*, but rather on the *development of a tool to help the executive better manage his team and the decision-making process*. Therefore it will not be assumed that the *higher stages* are *better*; however, the concept of *justice* will have significance throughout the discussions.

Let's examine this in some detail:

**Kohlberg took the basic three (3) levels and expanded them.<sup>1</sup>**

At the *pre-conventional level* he sees primarily the child: responsive to cultural rules and labels of good and bad, right or wrong, but interprets these labels either in terms of the physical or the hedonistic consequences of action (punishment/reward or exchange of favours) or in terms of the physical power of those who enunciate the rules and labels. **The level is divided into the following two stages:**

### PRE-CONVENTIONAL

**Stage One (1) — the punishment & obedience orientation.** The physical consequences of action determine its goodness or badness, regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences. Avoidance of punishment and unquestioning deference to power are valued in their own right, not in terms of respect for an underlying moral order supported by punishment and authority (the latter being Stage Four).

**Stage Two (2) — the instrumental-relativist orientation.** Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfies one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others. Human relations are viewed in terms like those of the marketplace.. Elements of fairness, of reciprocity, and of equal sharing are present, but they are always interpreted in a physical, pragmatic way. Reciprocity is a matter of *you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours*, not loyalty, gratitude or justice,

---

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted from *The Journal of Philosophy*, October 25, 1973

## E-sinc

The *conventional* level sees maintaining the expectations of the individual's family, group or nation as valuable in its own right, regardless of immediate and obvious consequences. The attitude is not only one of *conformity* to personal expectations and social order, but of loyalty to it, of actively *maintaining*, supporting and justifying the order, and of identifying with the persons or group involved in it. **At this level, there are the following two stages:**

### CONVENTIONAL

**Stage Three (3) — the interpersonal concordance or good boy/nice girl orientation.**

Good behaviour is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them. There is much conformity to stereotypical images of what is majority or *natural* behaviour. Behaviour is frequently judged by intention — *he means well* becomes important for the first time. One earns approval by being *nice*.

**Stage Four (4) — the law & order orientation.** There is orientation towards authority, fixed rules and the maintenance of the social order. Right behaviour consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social order for its own sake.

### POST-CONVENTIONAL

At the *post-conventional, autonomous* (or) *principled level*, there is a clear effort to define moral values and principles that have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles and apart from the individual's own identification with these groups. **This level also has two stages:**

**Stage Five (5) — the social-contract, legalistic orientation,** generally with utilitarian overtones. Right action tends to be defined in terms of general individual rights and standards which have been critically examined and agreed upon by the whole society. There is a clear awareness of the relativism of personal values and opinions and a corresponding emphasis upon procedure rules for reaching consensus. Aside from what is constitutionally and democratically agreed upon, the right is a matter of personal *values* and *opinion*. The result is an emphasis upon the *legal point of view*, but with an emphasis upon the possibility of changing law in terms of rational considerations of social utility (rather than freezing it in terms of Stage 4 *law & order*). Outside the legal realm, free agreement and contract is the binding element of obligation. This is the *official* morality of the government & constitution of the USA.

**Stage Six (6) — the universal-ethical-principle orientation.** Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen *ethical principles* appealing to logical comprehensiveness, universality and consistency. These principles are abstract and ethical (the *Golden Rule*, the categorical imperative); they are not concrete moral rules like the *Ten Commandments*. At heart, these are universal principles of *justice*, of the dignity of human beings as *individual persons*.

### *Dewey to Piaget to Kohlberg...*

While Dewey's work was theoretical, Jean Piaget began to carry out research on defining moral reasoning in children. **Kohlberg went further through longitudinal studies** (including a 20 year + study of Chicago area middle & working class boys) **as well as cross-cultural** (Turkish, Canadian, Israeli, Taiwanese, Honduran & Indian).

His work suggested the concept of stages which implies the following characteristics:

#### WHOLES

- stages are *structured wholes* or organized systems of thought; individuals are *consistent* in level of moral judgment;

#### INVARIANT

- stages form an *invariant sequence*, under all conditions except extreme trauma, movement is always forward, never backward; individuals never skip stages — movement is always up to the next stage;

#### HIERARCHICAL

- stages are *hierarchical integrations*, thinking at a higher stage includes or comprehends within it lower-stage thinking; there is a tendency to function at or prefer the highest stage possible.

The results indicated that more than 50% of an individual's thinking is always at one stage, with the remainder at the next adjacent stage (which he is leaving or which he is moving into). But to better understand moral stages, it is useful to clarify the connection to stage of logic or intelligence on the one hand and to moral behaviour on the other. Maturity of moral judgment is not highly correlated with IQ; cognitive development is important. Since moral reasoning clearly is reasoning, advanced moral reasoning depends upon advanced logical reasoning. The moral stages are *structures of moral judgment or moral reasoning* and must be distinguished from the *content* of moral judgment. A moral choice involves choosing between two (or more) values as they *conflict* in concrete situations of choice.

**The stage or structure of a person's moral judgment defines:**

- 1) what he finds valuable in each of these moral issues
- 2) why he finds it valuable

## JUDGMENT ≠ ACTION

**Mature moral judgment is not a sufficient condition for mature moral action. One cannot follow moral principles if one does not understand (or believe in) moral principles. However, one can reason in terms of principles and not live up to these principles.**

### *Moral Judgment*

Now, if maturity of moral reasoning is only one factor in moral behaviour, why does the cognitive-developmental approach to moral education focus so heavily upon moral reasoning?

For the following reasons:

- **moral judgment, while only one factor in moral behaviour, is the single most important or influential factor yet discovered in moral behaviour**
- **while other factors influence moral behaviour, moral judgment is the only distinctively *moral* factor in moral behaviour**
- **more judgment change is long-range and irreversible: a higher stage is never lost; moral behaviour as such is largely situational and reversible or *loseable* in new situations.**

### *Not Character Education*

This approach is not to be confused with **character education** wherein moral values are preached or taught in terms of what may be called the *bag of virtues*. And oft-times it is easy to get superficial consensus on such a *bag of virtues*. Character education and other forms of *indoctrinative* moral education have aimed at teaching values; but the detailed definitions used are relative — often defined by the very teachers who are teaching them.

### *Beyond Values Clarification*

Likewise, while it is a step forward, *values clarification* tends to stop at the point where awareness of values are elicited. The tendency is towards relativism where there is **no right answer**. The cognitive-developmental approach has an aim: stimulation of movement to the next stage of moral development (or at least an understanding and an appreciation of that next stage, as well as all the others).



## **E-sinc**

### *Important Conditions...*

In terms of moral discussion, the important conditions appear to be:

- exposure to the next higher stage of reasoning;
- exposure to situations posing problems and contradictions for the individual's current moral structure, leading to dissatisfaction with the current level;
- an atmosphere of interchange and dialogue combining the first two conditions, in which conflicting moral views are compared in an open manner.

Moshe Blatt conducted classroom discussions of conflict-laden hypothetical moral dilemmas and was able to show that moral discussion could raise moral stage. [see: Moshe Blatt & Lawrence Kohlberg, *Effects of Classroom Discussions upon Children's Level of Moral Judgment*.] But moral discussion and curriculum constitute only one portion of the conditions stimulating moral growth. Analysing the broader life environment, consideration must be given to the *moral atmosphere* of the home, school, the workplace environment and larger society.

### *The Dimensions...*

- The first (1<sup>st</sup>) basic dimension of social atmosphere is the **role-taking opportunities** it provides to better appreciate the point of view of others.
- The second (2<sup>nd</sup>) dimension of social atmosphere, more strictly moral, is the **level of justice** in the environment or institution.

The justice structure of an institution refers to the perceived rules or principles for distributing rewards, punishments, responsibilities and privileges among institutional members. This structure may exist or be perceived at any of the moral stages. As an example, a study of a traditional prison revealed that inmates perceived it as Stage 1, regardless of their own level. [see: Kohlberg, Scharf & Hickey, *The Justice Structure of the Prison: A Theory and Intervention in The Prison Journal*.]

Obedience to arbitrary command by power figures and punishment for disobedience were seen as the governing justice norms of the prison. A behaviour-modification prison using point rewards for conformity was perceived as a Stage 2 system of instrumental exchange. Inmates at Stage 3 or 4 perceived this institution as more fair than the traditional prison, but not as fair in their own terms.

These and other studies suggest that a higher level of institutional justice is a condition for individual development of a higher sense of justice. Some attempts have been made to proactively set up prisons complete with voting on rules and the opportunity to resolve conflicts through discussions of fairness and democratic voting in a community meeting. Other approaches have been centred in high schools where democratic decision-making was incorporated into dealing with real issues concerning drugs, stealing, disruptions and grading and the focus was on fairness. Oft-times the larger meetings were preceded by small-group moral discussion. Enhanced moral reasoning and improved moral development seemed to emerge.

Subsequent research by Sinclair [see *The Development of A Program in Moral Reasoning for Educational Administrators*, University of Alberta (Educational Administration), 1978] along with twenty-five (25) years of follow-up suggests that short term exposure to these concepts may not improve one's level of moral reasoning, but it definitely will increase one's sensitivity to the existence of the moral dilemma. Moreover, by providing the individual a deeper understanding of the **stages theory of moral/ethical development** it is possible to enhance the ability to deal with others involved in the same dilemma or more effectively manage the resolution of conflict among colleagues when their levels of moral reasoning are known.

**A central question remains:**

*does the learner (i.e. you) want to make better decisions when facing an ethical dilemma?*

## **E-sinc**

So, what are these stages and how do they interact? What does each level of moral reasoning contribute to the understanding of an approach to resolving the ethical dilemma? The six stages are as follows:

- (i) *punishment and obedience* - **fear**
- (ii) *the attempt to make a deal* - **you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours!**
- (iii) *let's try to get along* - **nice person image**
- (iv) *law and order* - **show me the rules!**
- (v) *social contract* - **I have an obligation to you**
- (vi) *universal principles* - **I believe!!**

[Review the accompanying *stages schematics*]

## **E-sinc**

Another way to explore this is to look at the stages in terms of the question of **the value of human life**. Here are examples of each stage of reasoning:

- Level 1 - *The value of human life is confused with the value of physical objects and is based on social status or physical attributes of the possessor.*
- Level 2 - *The value of human life is seen as instrumental to the satisfaction of the needs of its possessor, or of other persons.*
- Level 3 - *The value of human life is based on the empathy and affection of family members and others towards its possessor.*
- Level 4 - *Life is conceived as sacred in terms of its place in a categorical, moral, or religious order of rights and duties.*
- Level 5 - *Life is valuable in terms of its relation to community welfare and in terms of life being a universal right.*
- Level 6 - *Belief in the sacredness of human life as representing a universal human value of respect for the individual.*

**In what dimensions does this *schema* make sense?**

---

---

**Where is the potential for it within the health inspection world?**

---

---

## **E-sinc**

Once you become comfortable with the various stages and more adept at determining the levels at which others predominately operate from, then you can adjust the level(s) you choose to use when attempting to mediate or resolve a dilemma resulting primarily from the behaviour of others. However should you believe that your own behaviour and/or the thinking that supports it is inadequate or insufficient for the challenges/tasks at hand, then it is incumbent to refine your own level(s) of moral reasoning. If your present disposition is to use level four (4) reasoning, start to reformulate your arguments at a level five (5).

- **Does this make your decision-making better (in your view)?**  
\_\_\_\_\_
- **Is there more comfort with the rationale?**  
\_\_\_\_\_
- **Does the resultant action(s) more consistently match your thinking?**  
\_\_\_\_\_
- **Do you see an improved articulation of your approach to ethical dilemmas?**  
\_\_\_\_\_
- **Is the moral dilemma more easily recognized?**  
\_\_\_\_\_
- **Ought it to be more readily addressed?**  
\_\_\_\_\_
- **Do you think you would be more effective in moments of crisis?**  
\_\_\_\_\_

## E-sinc

### D. Roundtable Discussion:

- (1) Return to the case study of *Trina & Elliott*. Let's review the various presentations, reconsider the solutions proposed; and, if possible, try to determine the stage at which the arguments were predominately presented:

Group (i) possible stage(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Group (ii) possible stage(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Group (iii) possible stage(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Group (iv) possible stage(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Group (v) possible stage(s) \_\_\_\_\_

- (2) Review your own preferred solution.  
What is the stage level you think you are operating from?

\_\_\_\_\_

- (3) What level do you think you usually operate at/from when confronted with a critical dilemma in your professional responsibilities?

\_\_\_\_\_

- (4) Return to your small group that examined *A Man for All Seasons* in light of the **stages theory!**

What are the various stages the key characters appear to be reasoning at?

Do they act fairly consistently at the same stage(s)?

More \_\_\_\_\_ Alice \_\_\_\_\_ Rich \_\_\_\_\_

Cromwell \_\_\_\_\_ Norfolk \_\_\_\_\_ Margaret \_\_\_\_\_

- (5) *Roundtable*: What is the general consensus concerning these stages?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## VII. A Critical Analysis:

### A. CASE STUDY #7: *The Young Professional — Oh, to be idealistic again!!*

Consider this:

If, in the public/political process you (and/or your organization) don't abide by basic rules, then more precise rules get instituted which, in turn, leads to a greater need for interpretation. This leads to the addition of lawyers which increases costs and raises public notice. And, simultaneously, confidence in the public service begins another downward slide. Conversely though, it is not always politics that is misleading; sometimes the anti-political forces are similarly non-ethically focussed. The issue remains: (a) Do we really care? Or, are we doing this because we feel we have to (as part of helping our public professional image? And, (b) if we really care, how much will we devote to resolving ethical dilemmas and to what extent will we support the organization in increasing ethics as a profile?

It is important to recognize that in the process of reasoning through an ethical dilemma, the stages upon which a person predominately builds rational arguments to resolve that dilemma are most likely to be reflected in those situations that affect the individual immediately, **in the questions of home and work**. In order to enhance your ability to use logical reasons to resolve an ethical dilemma, consider these preliminary questions.

- Can such a process be usefully incorporated into critical decision-making situations of the kind that face professionals such as ourselves?

---

---

---

- Is there a better way to explain one's decision, even if others don't like the decision, so that at least one gains their respect for that decision?

---

---

---

## E-sinc

While viewing the full length version of the rather intriguing movie *The Firm* be prepared to identify one major moral dilemma during the film: indicate the levels of moral reasoning used by the characters involved and whether or not the dilemma was resolved, and why!

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

As well, there are a number of scenes to pay particular attention to:

- Early in the story, during the recruiting of Mitch McDeere (Tom Cruise) the Managing Partner reveals how he knew what to offer: what is your first reaction to this information?

---

---

---

---

- When discussing the offer with his wife Abby, Mitch says *Did you ever think I'd make a six-figure salary?* — what was her reply, and what does that tell you about her?

---

---

---

---

- Why do you think the firm selected Avery (Gene Hackman) to be McDeere's mentor?

---

---

---

---



## E-sinc

- What did Abby mean when she said there is a difference between being upset and being scared? And, a little later, why did she reply to Mitch's *I want to give you everything you gave up*, with the comment: *Stop it! Just bring flowers?*

---

---

---

---

- The trip to the Cayman Islands comes early in the story, and the Islands play a recurring role throughout the story: does this have anything to do with Abby's earlier comment *It's not for me — it's not even for you!?* And, why do you think that Mitch would immediately go and visit his brother after returning for the first time?

---

---

---

---

- After the visit to Washington, Mitch then met with the *inner circle* at the firm: was this a form of confession? or Step One in coming to grips with the fact that *your life as you know it is OVER?*

---

---

---

---

- During the dinner scene on the day of the Bar Exam reception, Abby said: *You can't promise me anything anymore!* What did she mean and was she right? How valid was Mitch's comment: *I couldn't stand you not knowing?*

---

---

---

---

## E-sinc

- When the *inner circle* met with Avery after the discovery of the fact that Mitch had a brother who was a felon, what was the reasoning behind the need to have such information? Why wasn't Avery more concerned?

---

---

---

- When Mitch starts down his journey on the *over-billing problem*, what are his reasons? (And what stage level is he operating at?)

---

---

---

- What level of reasoning would say: *You did the cheating, I'm the one that feels guilty?*

---

---

---

- Avery's comments at the school yard (*I take rejection well*) and his little speech at the Hyatt in the Caymans tell you what about his reasoning stage level?

---

---

---

- How do you rationalize Mitch's breaking into the computer codes, printing the information, and then taking it out of the firm? And, then his brutal beating of the Security Boss (Wilfred Brimley)?

---

---

---

- Forgetting the rather interesting screenplay between the Chicago boys and Mitch, consider the reasoning apparent in Mitch's comments: is there any evidence of change in stage level? And if so, is it an example of growth or simply a shift?

---

---

---

## E-sinc

- What is your general assessment of the Senior Partner, Oliver Lambert (Hal Holbrook)? What stage level did he seem to reason at? Where did his emphasis on *family* fit in with all this? Where is his disconnect with *Cowboy Ethics*?

---

---

---

---

- What about Avery? Illustrate his level(s) of reasoning! Where did his recurring thoughts about marriage and his own love life fit in with all this?

---

---

---

---

- What stage(s) do you think Abby generally reasoned at? Illustrate:

---

---

---

- What stage(s) do you think Mitch generally reasoned at? Illustrate:

---

---

---

---

- What was the *ultimate ethical dilemma* for Mitch & Abby? And, what stages did they use to get through it?

---

---

---

---

## E-sinc

### B.. Roundtable

- What was the most believable aspect of *The Firm*? Why?

---

---

---

- What was the least credible aspect? Why?

---

---

---

- Is this entire approach to understanding and dealing with *ethical dilemmas* beginning to make sense?

---

---

- How might the reading of *Cowboy Ethics* have helped the characters in the Law Firm? In what way might we use both the book & our insights from the film to real-life situations in our own organizations and end up with results that are more productive and easier to deal with?

---

---

---

---

---

- Are there some problems that yet need to be sorted out?

---

---

- Have we the confidence to test out our skills and theories?

---

---

- ### C. Distribute the individual results of initial D.I.T. Any questions?

## E-sinc

### VIII. CREATIVITY vs. AUTHORITY in the PROFESSIONAL'S WORLD

A. CASE STUDY #4: *Plagiarism as an Issue in the Search for Creativity.*

**This incident involves a micro-economics course at the local university that has a reputation for being very difficult. It is an optional course. The professor is a veteran and his marking has not varied much in the past fifteen years: FIVE major papers MUST be written DURING the term [*emphasis mine*].**

**A student in her graduating year took this course and wrote the first four papers. When the time came to hand in the fifth paper, she had many other things to do in order to graduate. One of her friends had taken the course two years previously and still had her papers. The student asked her for one of the papers, rewrote a few parts of it and handed it in, believing that the professor would never remember a paper that had been written that long ago, especially since many students take the course. Needless to say, the professor recognized the paper and he even recalled the name of the student who had originally written it.**

(i) *Individual Brainstorming...*(10 minutes)

(a) What should the professor do? Why? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(b) Suppose the set punishment for plagiarism is expulsion from school. Should the professor consider the fact that the student is about to graduate?

Explain: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(c) Should the Department Head or Dean get involved? Explain why or why not?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(d) Is the student who loaned the paper guilty in some way?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(e) Would you see either of these students as employment risks?

Explain: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## E-sinc

(f) Would you want either of these students working on a research project for you?  
Explain: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(ii) *Small Group Analysis / Consensus-Seeking* [20 minutes]

Each group will do question (a) plus one additional assigned question and develop a response for presentation to the full class. [The presentation must involve all members of the group, and make use visual as well as audio communication. The presentation can not exceed three (3) minutes (but must be at least two minutes), questions/discussion will be curtailed after four (4) minutes.]

Group 4A: Dustin, Alicia, Lisa, Robert  
Group 4B: Helen, Gillian, Nourhan, Bryce, Meredith  
Group 4C: Tyson, Marc, Lacey, Sun  
Group 4D: Mandy, Wayde, Kate, Johnathan, Alana  
Group 4E: Mike, Matt, Janna, James

(iii) *Whole Class Presentations* (30 minutes)

Can you determine the level of reasoning used in each response? What is the evidence?

Group 4A \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Group 4B \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Group 4C \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Group 4D \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Group 4E \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## **E-sinc**

### B. CASE STUDY #5: *Your Way or the Boss'?*

**You are a junior auditor with a national Big Six (6) firm, conducting audits (working with a senior inspector) of work camps in remote wilderness areas. Remote means one (1) hours from any village, town or city, travelling *radio call* roads and predominant activities in the area are oil, gas and forestry operations. While you have not been to this particular work camp before, you are aware (from conversations with colleagues, etc.) there were previous issues surrounding the water source including reported illness from occupants of the camp.**

**After completing an audit of both the local books and the unloading dock (to compare records of logging trucks with the filings the company sends to the Ministry of Forestry), you both are invited to have lunch in the camp mess hall. Such an invitation to lunch is always made to any visitors to the camp. Although you do not suspect any motive behind the invitation, you hesitate to take up the offer. The senior inspector however accepts the invitation and serves himself from the wonderfully stocked table. What are your options?**

**You decide to go for a walk instead of having lunch. In talking to the Inspector on the way home, she states that it has always been the custom to do this and besides, in the past, she has actually written up another camp catered to by the same company.**

**Your spouse is indignant and recommends that in all future trips you take your own lunch with enough food for the Senior Inspector if necessary, and you inform her that this will be your practice.**

Individual Brainstorm....[10 minutes]

- what is the moral dilemma?

---

---

---

- what stage(s) are each of the key individuals at?

---

---

- what stage(s) are you most likely to develop a resolution?

---

---

## E-sinc

*Small Group* [25 minutes] — same small groups as for Case #4

Prepare a *role play* which resolves the moral dilemma, answers the following questions and seems credible to your peers.

- What stages of reasoning are present here: Senior Inspector? Spouse?

---

---

- There is a similar field inspection coming in four days; how are you going to address the meal deal?

---

---

- Should you bring your spouse & boss together to collectively work through this? Explain.

---

---

- If not, why not? And what level is your rationale?

---

---

- If so, what stages would the most effective resolution happen at? And what would the final argument sound like?

---

---

- How effective & lasting will be your proposed resolution?

---

---

(ii) *Whole Class Presentation* [30 minutes]

Stages of Reasoning: Senior Inspector \_\_\_\_\_ Spouse \_\_\_\_\_

Preferred Solution

What? Why? How effective?

---

---



# E-sinc

## ***COWBOY ETHICS...*** *How do we see it? How do we tell it?*

Presentations will range between three (3) minutes for individuals and five (5) minutes for pairs or trios — these sessions should explain the chapter in a way that relates the story to the challenges that are faced today by a student in the School of Business. The presentation must be more than simply reading some notes: it must be animated, perhaps as a poem or song or skit or piece of art; and, it must create a learning moment. These sessions will be held during the first part of Day Seven (#7), the 24<sup>th</sup> of February.

### **Author's Note** [Johnathan]

---

---

### **Foreword** [Alicia]

---

---

### **A Personal Journey** [Helen, Sun, Matt]

---

---

### **Life on the Open Range** [Kate]

---

---

### **Living by the Code** [Bryce]

---

---

### **Chapter One (1)** [Gillian]

---

---

### **Chapter Two (2)** [Wayde]

---

---

### **Chapter Three (3)** [Mandy]

---

---

**Chapter Four (4)** [Janna, Dustin]

---

---

**Chapter Five (5)** [Tyson, Meredith]

---

---

**Chapter Six (6)** [James]

---

---

**Chapter Seven (7)** [Marc]

---

---

**Chapter Eight (8)** [Robert]

---

---

**Chapter Nine (9)** [Lacey]

---

---

**Chapter Ten (10)** [Mike]

---

---

**A Call to Action** [Alana, Lisa, Nourhan]

---

---

## Round-table:

What is general theme that all the presentations seem to be supporting &/or illustrating about *Cowboy Ethics*?

---

---

---

---

- What is was our first (1<sup>st</sup>) reaction to this book?

---

---

---

---

---

- What, upon reflection, seems to be the core message?

---

---

---

---

---

- What *stage(s)* are most evident?

---

---

---

---

---

- How realistic is this book as a guide to action as a *business grad*?

---

---

---

---

---

# E-sinc

## IX. HAVE WE GOT THE STAGES RIGHT *YET?*

A. CASE STUDY #6: *Earning Respect for Your Authority*  
[view the film **Authority & Rebellion** (30 minutes)]

### 1. SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS [30 minutes]

Group 6A: James, Johnathan, Lacey, Nourhan

Group 6B: Janna, Kate, Marc, Gillian, Alicia

Group 6C: Matt, Wayde, Tyson, Helen

Group 6D: Mike, Mandy, Meredith, Robert, Dustin

Group 6E: Alana, Sun, Bryce, Lisa

(a) At what *stage* does each of the major characters seem to think?

Captain Devriess (1<sup>st</sup> Capt) \_\_\_\_\_

Captain Queeg (2<sup>nd</sup> Capt/Bogart.) \_\_\_\_\_

Maryk (First (1<sup>st</sup>) Officer) \_\_\_\_\_

Keith (Young Off.) \_\_\_\_\_

Keefer (Fred MacM.) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) What is the evidence to support such assessments?

(Devriess, 1<sup>st</sup> Captain) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Queeg, 2<sup>nd</sup> Captain) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Maryk, 1<sup>st</sup> Officer) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

# E-sinc

(Keith, Young Jr. Officer) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Keefer / Fred MacMurray) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(c) How is the final dilemma resolved? What *stages* are apparent in the final scenes on the Bridge?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(d) (i) How do you view Captain Queeg's attitude towards rules & regulations? Does the fact a war is going on alter the validity of his statements?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(ii) What alternatives are there if you choose to disobey rules? How does one determine that a rule is unfair or unjust?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(iii) Do you agree with Keefer that any large institution, whether it be civilian or military in nature, must necessarily be run by people who don't ask questions?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## 2. ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION...

# E-sinc

## B. Mini-Review

- Stage 1:        **The fear of punishment** syndrome
- Stage 2:        *You Scratch My Back, Then  
I'll Scratch Your Back*
- Stage 3:        **Nice Person** (or, *I want to be liked*)
- Stage 4:        **Law and Order** (or, *Just give me the rules/norms*)
- Stage 5:        **Social Contract** (*The Golden Rule*)
- Stage 6:        The sense of **Principles as Moral Guides**

### **The Mini-Cases — *Can We Spot the Different Stages?***

Let us practice our ability to understand different levels in other people. We will watch five (5) separate vignettes or mini-stories of people who are facing a very critical decision. **We will try to determine the particular level of reasoning that is being used by each of the central individuals [name in bracket] and validate with reference(s) to the story.** It may be useful to note the levels of those people around them during the discussions as a way of checking if there is much chance of a real or lasting solution to the problem.

*{sit in your designated Small Group}*

- ▶ Segment 1 [Ken T.] \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

What about his sales buddy (on the boat)? \_\_\_\_\_

What about his new boss? \_\_\_\_\_

- ▶ Segment 2 [Tom W.] \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

What about his dinner friend? \_\_\_\_\_

What about his boss, Howard Heller? \_\_\_\_\_

# E-sinc

▶ Segment 3 [Anne D.] \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

What about her boss, Seth? \_\_\_\_\_

What about her husband? \_\_\_\_\_

▶ Segment 4 [Drew I.] \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

What about the head of sales? \_\_\_\_\_

What about the head of production? \_\_\_\_\_

▶ Segment 5 [Paul T.] \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

What about the General Manager? \_\_\_\_\_

What about his doctor? \_\_\_\_\_

Small Group Conferences: [opportunity to confirm or revise your analysis]

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Turn one (1) copy of your responses in to the prof... Keep one (1) for reference when the answers are given

Full Class Roundtable & Presentations:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

- C. Complete anonymously (and turn in) the *Interim Review* of the course...



# E-sinc

## X. GETTING IT RIGHT...

### A. Review CASE STUDY #8: *The Corporate Disappointment*

You work for a small company that looks very promising. After a few months of working there, you begin to realize the unethical activities that go on. Without these activities the company has but a small chance to survive and grow. The activities being carried out can harm the public.

You mention this to a few of your colleagues but they just shrug it off and seem to simply want to collect their pay cheque. However, to you it is very unsettling and you want to take action; but you are afraid it will result in the loss of a job. This job is very important to you because you are just starting out and need the money and the experience. If you continue to work you feel guilty, but if you leave you are on the streets! Should you blow the whistle on them — the company doesn't have an ombudsman to investigate such complaints.

#### **What do you do?**

***Jackson** (a professional colleague who works elsewhere) argues that you should only tell the authorities if you can get protection for whistleblowing and since there is no ombudsman or privacy commissioner, you should forget and just do your job...*

***Karen** (a friend from college days) reminds you that during your professional training you were given a Code of Conduct that spells out what should be the norms by which you make your decision(s). So what does the Code say? And are you going to be a professional about the situation?*

#### Small Group Discussion Points...

- Group 8A: Lacey, Marc, Sun, Tyson
- Group 8B: Mandy, Meredith, Wayde, Bryce, Kate
- Group 8C: Nourhan, Johnathan, Gillian, Alana
- Group 8D: Mike, Helen, Matt, Robert
- Group 8E: Lisa, Janna, Alicia, James, Dustin

#### • How can this be most quickly brought to resolution?

---

---

#### • Will this be most effective? and lasting?

---

---

# E-sinc

- What *stages of reasoning* seem to be most helpful to getting to solution?

---

---

- What would *Cowboy Ethics* say about this situation? And what might be the solution it would most support?

---

---

---

---

---

- How realistic do you think this might be?

---

---

---

- Prepare a *role play* that demonstrates the solution (& the appropriate *stages reasoning*) most reasonable...

---

---

---

---

---

## Whole Class Presentations

- (a) What stage(s) does each group seem to be operating at?

- Group \_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

- Group \_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

• Group \_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

• Group \_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

• Group \_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

(b) Do the different orientations come up with different solutions?

---

---

---

(c) Are the solutions believable? Why/why not?

---

---

---

**B. The Business Leader & the ETHICAL DILEMMA**

*More practising to be effective...*

In order to help prepare for the final *presentation(s)* (and thus the final exam) time now will be devoted to working through the role-plays based on *cases* to be provided... Each group has the option of actually role-playing their case in order to better describe it!

*Reviewing Our Own Recommended Cases...*

Participants will review the various *dilemmas/case studies* prepared and presented by/to the class. [Teams: **Orange-3, Orange-2, Red One, Yellow, Green Plus (+), Multi-maybe** / all will be designated at the outset to this exercise]

Step 1:

Each will be reviewed, studied & analysed (including determining if it can reasonably be presented in the four (4) to seven (7) minute time frame of the *final exam*), and then ranked (as to believability and ease of role-playing).

---

---

---

---

Step 2:

Each group will be prepared to defend its order/ranking

---

---

---

---

Step 3:

Each group will then rank the top three (3) *cases* that they would like to try to present for their final presentation (i.e. final exam) and submit these to the prof for adjudication.

---

---

---

---

---

## E-sinc

### XI. PHILOSOPHICAL CONSISTENCY

#### A. *Some Theoretical Background*

Another aspect of making morally adequate decisions is the degree of consistency we bring to our thought process. There are at least five major frameworks or *schools of thought* in the discipline of philosophy:

***Idealism, Realism, Neo-Thomism, Experimentalism (pragmatism), Existentialism***

#### (1) IDEALISM

First of all, it is in opposition to *realism* and is generally considered to be **objective** (although there are some *subjective idealists*). *Idealism* holds that the mind is active in knowing (it can carry out interpretation). Ideas are NOT images but universal meanings: it insists upon the reality of the external world.

**All knowledge** (according, at least, to *objective idealism*) **is a matter of interpretation:** *when we say we hear an automobile, it is clear we do not really hear an auto but a sound which we interpret as the sound of a car.* A native of Africa who had never seen or heard a car, couldn't make such an assertion.

Knowledge is equivalent to a system of meanings whereby what is given is expanded in meaning. Consistency and comprehensiveness are the proper criteria. No given can be adequately interpreted by any single idea but only by a system of ideas & these ideas will have relations to other ideas or systems of ideas.

*Idealism* is committed to the assumption of the **absolute nature of truth** while denying that any person or group of persons has even attained it.

#### (2) REALISM

One of the big names in the development of this branch of philosophy is John Locke. Knowledge is not concerned directly with things but with **the images of things or ideas** (you don't actually see a tree!!).

*Realism* assumes truth is absolute in the sense that true statements may be made independent of the interests or preferences of the individuals making the assertions and that different people faced with the same object have to make similar statements about it. *A statement is either TRUE or FALSE.*

*Modern realism* maintains the externality and **independence of the external object.** Knowledge is meaningless unless it is construed as knowledge of external objects. It accepts the doctrine of *absolute truth* (some problem exists with *ideas*).

The *realist* insists that the scientist accepts as a fact the existence of a world external to him and independent of his interest in it.

### (3) NEO-THOMISM

Thomism evolves in part from the thinking of Aristotle: the *intellectual grasping of the nature of things*. Distinguish between philosophy (*what the thing is*) and empirical science (*the relation between things*); the nature of a thing is revealed to us through its properties.

*Qualities are ultimate: therefore, cannot be defined! Final Cause = God.* If final cause is supreme then efficient causality is unimportant. It provides hope to life (makes it enduring). Mind is different from body.

*Neo-Thomism* stresses the immanent teleology, the natural end of each individual and the obligation to realize his possibilities, the attainment of the full & harmonious life. There is a purpose to everything and that purpose begins and ends with God.

### (4) EXPERIMENTALISM (*Pragmatism*)

Efficient causality: find out **how** things happen rather than reflecting on **why** they happen. This approach to philosophical thinking involves **doing** and not **contemplating**: it makes the thinker a worker and not a spectator. It refuses to divorce theory from action.

The **task of the thinker** is not to find ultimate and permanent standards, but **to see solutions** to the problems that beset society and help to frame the ideals or goals that are proper for it.

All ideals are relative to the nature and needs of specific societies and only such ideas may properly be called valuable or values for that society. May or may not relate or be valuable to another society. Facts are manipulated and controlled in ways that lead to the solution of specific problems.

### (5) EXISTENTIALISM

**Values may be considered relative to individuals** — each person decides for him/herself what is good and bad. Kierkegaard, a *Christian existentialist* considered human pride as a barrier to salvation and stressed the importance of being humbled to a recognition of one's impotence and complete dependence on God. The proper mood in the contemplation of human life is anxiety.

Others have defined *existentialism* as humans being *condemned to be free*. A human never really is, but is always in the process of becoming: *one is constituted by one's own actions*. One is not born a hero, but becomes a hero by performing heroic acts; similarly not born a coward, but becomes a coward by performing cowardly acts.

## E-sinc

There is neither help nor a rule outside the individual: *each is his/her own standard*. All moral judgments are relative to individuals.

B. *Individual Consistency:*

Review of **HUG's** *Philosophical Consistency* assessment. Reflect on your scores as to where you thought you might fit within the various *schools of thought* in philosophy, and where you actually do fit:

---

---

---

*Idealism, Realism, Neo-Thomism, Experimentalism (pragmatism), Existentialism*  
Questions? Re-Interpretations?

---

---

C. *Next Task...*

The small groups for *WALL STREET* are formed by people more or less of the same orientation re consistency: when you are working in your small group next session consider these questions (and be prepared to discuss with the full class):

- **in what ways does (or does not) this appear to make any difference?**

---

---

---

- **is any difference positive or negative?**

---

---

---

- **do you sense any similarities or other connections with *stage(s) of reasoning*?**

---

---

---

# E-sinc

WS - 1 [Alicia, Mandy, Kate, Johnathan]

---

---

---

WS - 2 [Lisa, Robert, Nourhan, Tyson]

---

---

---

WS - 3 [Dustin, Gillian, Meredith, Marc]

---

---

---

WS - 4 [Lacey, Mike, Alana, Janna]

---

---

---

WS - 5 [Bryce, Wayde, James]

---

---

---

WS - 6 [Helen, Sun, Matt]

---

---

---



**XII PREPARATIONS for the FINAL ROLE PLAYS**

*Explanation of the Purpose*

The **final role play** is a large part of the final examination process. It will be acted out according to the *Stages* as the small group thinks they are best designed/developed. It is expected that the scenario will start out with a variety of *Stages* in evidence and then, slowly at least one (1) role will begin the process of re-stating the case at different stage(s) so that the various other characters will begin to move towards a common *stage* and thus to resolution. This must be in a realistic fashion, so if there are several roles, it is reasonable to expect that one (1) might not move, and yet there will be resolution because the others came to agreed, and the non-convergent person is then, **not** part of the solution.

Even if the basic case does not call for as many roles as are in the group, it will be important that each group member play a role ---- developing/portraying a particular stage [but, as noted, not all may be part of the solution — however, if they are not, it must be because of the *stage* they remained at]!

Upon completion of the *acting out of the role play* the rest of the class will attempt to assess the performance by indicating at what stage each character predominately reasoned. The professor will correlate the peer scores with that laid out (to him) by the presenting team prior to the presentation!!

Each presentation should last approximately six (6) minutes [no less than five (5) or more than nine (9) — marks will be deducted at one (1) per fifteen (/15) seconds if the time is short; if the presentation goes beyond maximum time, marks will be deducted at the rate of one (1) per fifteen (/15) seconds to ten (10) minutes and then one (1) mark per thirty (/30) seconds until eleven (11) seconds [at this point the group will be asked to sit down]!!

Questions / Reactions...???

---

---

---

# E-sinc

## XIII BUSINESS & ETHICS: WALL STREET...

*[A study in the development of stage(s) in moral reasoning...]*

Even though this film is over twenty (20) years old, it seems eerily contemporary. The focus of our analysis is on *Bud Fox* (**Charlie Sheen**), the young stock-broker who wants desperately to make it *big* on Wall Street... We are going to watch his *moral development* throughout the story, and see how the *ethical reasoning* of those around him influence his development (or lack thereof).

The key characters to watch [and track/determine their *stage(s)*] include...

- His *Dad* (**Martin Sheen**)
- *Lou*, the senior stockbroker (**Hal Holbrook**)
- His lawyer buddy (**Spader**)
- His girl friend, *Darielle* (**Daryl Hannah**)
- Gekko's nemesis, *Sir Larry Weldman* (**Terrence Stamp**)
- *Gordon Gekko*, the money maker (**Michael Douglas**)

Early in the story, Bud has conversations with two (2) older men, Lou (the senior stockbroker: *stick to the fundamentals*) and his Dad (about the FAA report). What **stages** are evident in each...?

---

---

---

---

Do you see a moral dilemma emerging?

---

---

When Bud comes to work and tells his fellow broker that he *bagged the elephant* and then shortly thereafter Gekko talks about lots & lots of perq's (along with Bud's comment: *very nice club, Mr. Gekko*) — discuss the **stage(s) of reasoning** at play...

---

---

---

---



## E-sinc

- *Piece of cake...* [scene at his lawyer buddy's office]

---

---

---

---

- *One (1) trade away from the boot!* [his colleague when the old man gets fired]

---

---

---

---

- *You're on a roll...enjoy it while it last, 'cause it never does* [Lou]

---

---

---

---

What's the decorating of the apartment all about? And where is *Darielle* coming from in her earlier discussion about art? What are the **stage(s)** at play between *Bud & her*, here and later?

---

---

---

---

---

---

Determine the significance in terms of ethical reasoning in the rather interesting conversation between *Gekko & Darielle*, which includes these lines...

***Don't far too far...he hasn't been around the block*** [and] ***Gordon, you're really twisted...***

---

---

---

---

## E-sinc

The seminal scene [that rings true about events in recent months too] occurs at the stockholders meeting for Teldar...analyse *Gekko's* moral reasoning: ***Greed is good...greed works...clarifies***

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Continue this assessment by examining the BlueSky deal...

---

---

---

---

And what do we learn about *Bud's father* in the elevator scene: ***I don't do to sleep with a whore, I don't wake up with a whore...and that's how I live with myself..?***

---

---

---

---

And then these comments by *Gekko*...

- ***it's all about bucks...the rest is conversation***
- ***the illusion has become real***
- ***I create nothing — I own***

---

---

---

---

## E-sinc

Why, in terms of **stage(s)** of moral reasoning, does *Darielle* say as she is about to depart: *you don't want to throw it all away...?*

---

---

---

---

What **stage(s)** are evident in the hospital scene with his *Dad*? Is there a shift appearing in *Bud's level(s)*?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Discuss *Lou's* final speech in terms of its **stage(s)** and its impact on the moral growth of *Bud*: *money makes you do things...when a (person) looks into the abyss and nothing looks back, (that's when) he find his character...and that keeps him from the abyss...*

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



# E-sinc

## XII(b) PREPARATIONS for the *FINAL ROLE PLAYS* (con'td)

### XIV FINAL EXAMS / ASSESSMENTS / PRESENTATIONS / ROUNDTABLES / CONCLUSIONS

- (a) Review the procedures: no group is to exceed seven (7) minutes, yet no less than four (4) in the **Role Play**; the initial stages should be obvious enough for observers to be able to gain a true understanding of where each character is coming from... The conclusion, may or may not result in resolution, BUT the stages at the conclusion must be understandable and reasonable (i.e. believable, given the resolution or lack thereof)...
- (b) Each group will review the other groups' presentations and notes perceived stages and at the conclusion of each presentation, turn in two (2) scoring sheets to the professor. Note, there may be more role(s) than characters, but within each group, each participant must have some role.

• First (1<sup>st</sup>) Presentation:

**Group WWW: *Wealth vs. Loyalty***

Stages at Outset

Role A ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role B ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Role C ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role D ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Role E ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Stage(s) at/during Transition

---

---

---

---

Stages at Conclusion

Role A ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role B ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Role C ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role D ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_



# E-sinc

Role E ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Was there Resolution? And why? Why not?

---

---

---

---

- Complete *Sargent Shriver Analysis/Review*

- Second (2<sup>nd</sup>) Presentation:

**Group XXX: *Wealth vs. Loyalty***

Stages at Outset

Role A ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role B ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Role C ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role D ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Role E ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Stage(s) at/during Transition

---

---

---

---

Stages at Conclusion

Role A ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role B ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Role C ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role D ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Role E ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Was there Resolution? And why? Why not?

**E-sinc**

---

---

---

---

- Complete D.I.T. Assessment Form

# E-sinc

- Third (3<sup>rd</sup>) Presentation:

**Group YYY: Retail Sales Promotion(s)**

## Stages at Outset

Role A ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role B ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_\_

Role C ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role D ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_\_

Role E ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_\_

## Stage(s) at/during Transition

---

---

---

---

## Stages at Conclusion

Role A ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role B ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_\_

Role C ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role D ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_\_

Role E ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_\_

Was there Resolution? And why? Why not?

---

---

---

---

- Complete UPEI Course Evaluation Form

## **E-sinc**

- Fourth (4<sup>th</sup>) Presentation:

### **Group UUU: *The SideBar Challenge***

Stages at Outset

Role A ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role B ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Role C ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role D ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Stage(s) at/during Transition

---

---

---

---

Stages at Conclusion

Role A ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role B ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Role C ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role D ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Was there Resolution? And why? Why not?

---

---

---

---

- Complete Self Evaluation Form

- Fifth (5<sup>th</sup>) Presentation:

### **Group VVV: *To Work or Maybe Not to...***

Stages at Outset

Role A ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role B ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

# E-sinc

Role C ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Stage(s) at/during Transition

---

---

---

---

Role A ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role B ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Role C ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Was there Resolution? And why? Why not?

---

---

---

---

• Complete Peer Evaluation Form

• Sixth (6<sup>th</sup>) Presentation:

**Group ZZZ:** *The Advertising Dilemma...*

Stages at Outset

Role A ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role B ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Role C ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Stage(s) at/during Transition

---

---

---

---

# E-sinc

## Stages at Conclusion

Role A ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_ Role B ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Role C ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) Stage \_\_\_\_

Was there Resolution? And why? Why not?

---

---

---

---

- Complete Prof's Course Critique

Each group fill in (and then turns in) two (2) copies of their analysis of each group's Role Play

### XV. And in conclusion...

- *How does each of us feel about this approach to addressing the matter of **critical choice** in our work?*

---

---

---

---

- *Does it appear to be an effective to recognize and deal with **ethical dilemmas**?*

---

---

---

- *Are we going to try it out?*

---

---

---

- *Good luck & don't be a stranger...*