

***Let's Make Our Ethical Reasoning More Effective!***

*A Course Designed for ELLA*

SEMINAR DEVELOPER/LEADER:

**Dr. G.W. Sinclair**

**[gws@e-sinclair.com](mailto:gws@e-sinclair.com)**

**780.974.9220**

*(Outside of Edmonton: Toll-free 1-866-4-ethink  
which is 1-866-438-4465)*

*Suite #1700, Enbridge Centre*

*10175 - 101<sup>st</sup> Street*

*Edmonton, Alta., T5J 0H3*

### OVERVIEW

**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!.

**note #2:** There are three primary formats for holding discussions in the class: **round-table** — when each person (or team) provides comments, input &/or feedback in an orderly way, and at the invitation of the prof; **crossfire** — moderated within the group itself, comments and questions will go back and forth among the participants (the prof will only intervene if he determines too few are dominating the process); **conversation** — this is directed toward the prof, initiated by questions, queries or concerns raised by group members.

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

I tend to think along the same lines as my professional colleague Peggy Connolly:

*We are confronted on a daily basis with ethical dilemmas...Should a parent leave a sick child alone or stay at home with the child and risk losing the job that provides health insurance? Is it morally permissible to pay protection money to stay in business and provide for one's family? Is it ethically acceptable to create a child to be a donor for another? Whether deliberative or unconscious, satisfying or distressing, decisions about moral issues are ubiquitous in daily life, affecting choices & behaviour in public & private spheres...<sup>1</sup>*

*Intelligent, reasonable and deeply caring individuals hold diametrically opposing & mutually exclusive perspectives. We continue to be challenged to find ways to acknowledge others' perspectives respectfully, and to honour those who hold them, even when it is not possible to accommodate their positions...<sup>2</sup>*

*Despite the prevalence of ethical challenges in daily life, few people have had training in moral reasoning...Still, today, although students who enroll in ethics classes may be exposed to ethical theory, they may have limited opportunities for examining its practical application to the complexities of everyday moral situations...<sup>3</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ethics in Action: a Case-based Approach*, Connolly, Peggy et al, Wiley-Blackwell (2009) p.1

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid* p. 1 & 2

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid* p. 2

*Understanding moral issues is difficult. People often fail to recognize moral dilemmas and, when they do, are uncertain how to respond. No single set of ethical principles encompasses all the dimensions & complexities of moral challenges for all people in all places at all times...perceptions of & responses to ethical dilemmas may be skewed by the conflict between moral interests & self interest.<sup>4</sup>*

• **Why we are reading a novel during this course?**

*Wind Without Rain* will be on loan for the duration of this course – in a designated team you will read this assigned book<sup>5</sup> and together develop a response to the selected challenges related to the stages of ethical reasoning outlined below. Central to the story is a young professional (John) and his attempt to master a career he did not initially consider his preference; the ethical dilemmas though are not solely faced by John.

Challenge #1a: Provide a critical stage analysis of ethical reasoning of the central figure (John) plus the key leading personalities (i.e. his wife Mary, Angus McDonald, Mr. J.C. Bilbeau) and one [1] minor character (to be chosen by the team), complete with validation from the story.

&

Challenge #1b: Select three [3] ethical dilemmas critical to story and indicate how these could have been averted or more successfully resolved had the participants used different stages of ethical reasoning.

OR

Challenge #2: Compare and contrast the evolution of the central character's (John's) ethical reasoning by drawing on at least five [5] key moral dilemmas that he faces throughout the story and how the stages of the other character(s) involved in each dilemma contributed to or restricted his ethical development. Determine his stage of moral reasoning at the outset of the story and at the conclusion (and where it may have changed and/or shifted).

(NOTE: Reference to *Cowboy Ethics*, the Ethics Unwrapped series, and the professor's web-site can be helpful.)

---

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>5</sup> *Wind Without Rain* Dewdney, Selwyn McClelland and Stewart (1974) Toronto

**PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY!!**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ E-Mail

who am I/where have I come from?

---

---

---

---

where am I in my *learning journey*? & why?

---

---

---

---

what do I intend to do with the degree I hope to gain?

---

---

---

---

for now, what uniqueness(es) will I contribute to this course?

---

---

---

---

---

---

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

### Day 1: **Introduction**

*Are we susceptible to moral/ethical mismanagement in our live?*

(Included in this opening conversation will be an explanation of how I've come to find the question of *how do we get through the moment of critical choice?* vital to understanding *how we can get to better in our decision-making*. Using video vignettes, and working in small groups, participants will be afforded an opportunity to come up with their own example(s) of moral dilemmas. For more background on myself as professional and as professor, check out my *curriculum vitae* on my website: [www.e-sinclair.com](http://www.e-sinclair.com))

### Day 2: **In It To Win**

*Reflecting on how a religious and avowed ethical leader ended up in jail – The Jack Abramoff story.*

(The focus is on *sliding off the rails* and how easy that to happen, especially for people who see themselves as moral, upstanding individuals. The short video will provide the background to the conversation. Small group analysis combined with large group discussion will assess the likelihood of this happening in our own worlds of governance.)

- Examine the behaviour of Jack and determine where he made critical ethical failures and in assessing why you think he did that?
- Reflecting on Jack's behaviour, identify at least three [3] lessons you learned and explain how you would incorporate these lessons into your life to help ensure you choose a path towards *getting to better...*
- Looking beyond your own life, what does this story tell us that has broader applicability in your world?
- Is there anything from your reading of *Cowboy Ethics* that could have helped Jack remain on the *straight and narrow*?

### Day 3: **The Lecture**

*Have We Got the Cart Before the Horse?*

(Based on my paper I will introduce the concept of *ethical reasoning* and the theory of *stages in our moral reasoning* as first outlined by the late Harvard professor, Lawrence Kohlberg but viewing it all through the *Sinclair prism*. This paradigm will form much of the basis for the applied ethics analyses going forward. A handout giving the theory in schematic format will accompany the lecture to assist participants in understanding the paradigm and will serve as a compact reference point in future conversations. For a written background perspective go to the Research Section of my web-site: [www.e-sinclair.com/research](http://www.e-sinclair.com/research) and read the paper available in .pdf format – the D.I.T. will be made available for completing.)

#### Day 4: **Conscience in Conflict**

*Where does conscience fit within our ethical reasoning?*

(Following an edited video of *A Man For All Seasons*, the participants in small groups will attempt to apply the lecture to the analysis of the various stages/levels of ethical reasoning in the story.)

*Small Group Discussion:*

- Why do you think More took the approach he did? Describe your thoughts about the validity of his actions?
- Are you sympathetic to More? Was he following his conscience, or just being an *ego-maniac*?
- 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?
- 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?
- Taking the story from medieval times to the twenty-first (21<sup>st</sup>) century, consider whether the average person is really able to follow her/his conscience most of the time? To what extent is it even worthwhile trying to do this?

*Whole Class Presentations:*

#### Day 5: **A More Contemporary Case**

*Can we move from the abstract to the reality?*

(Continuing the process of Day 4 the participants will repeat the process after viewing a short video about an environmental problem that arises because a company moved a plant across an international border to get around government's environmental regulations.)

##### ***Incident at Morales...***<sup>6</sup>

This film involves a variety of ethical issues faced by a company that wants to quickly build a plant in order to develop a new chemical product to gain a competitive edge over the competition. Potential technical and ethical issues arise from choices of designs, including valves, piping, chemicals, etc. The process to develop the product is designed to be automated and controlled by computer software. The process also involves high pressures and temperatures as well as using chemicals that require special handling.

Because of environmental considerations related to the chemicals used in the process, the company decides to construct their plant in Mexico. Out of this decision arise technical, environmental, financial & safety problems that involve ethical issues.

The central figure, Fred, confronts a number of key moments of critical choice including the use of expensive controls from a company that has an inside connection at the firm, the introduction of environmental health controls that would actually be higher than local requirements, the purchase of pipes & connectors made from stainless steel or a high pressure alloy when marketing pressures require a slightly different product.<sup>7</sup> And perhaps there are cultural expectations as well?

---

<sup>6</sup> A film produced by the **National Institute for Engineering Ethics**, Texas Tech University, Lubbock Texas, 2005.

<sup>7</sup> This is summarized from the Study Guide provided with the above noted film.

CAST of CHARACTERS:

<b>Fred</b>	Chemical Engineer hired by <i>Phaust</i> to design a plant to manufacture a new paint remover
<b>Wally</b>	Fred's supervisor at <i>Phaust</i>
<b>Chuck</b>	Vice-President of Engineering at <i>Phaust</i>
<b>Dominique</b>	Corporate Liaison from <i>Chemistré</i> (parent company in France) to <i>Phaust</i>
<b>Maria</b>	Fred's wife, a compliance litigator for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
<b>Hal</b>	Market Analyst at <i>Phaust</i>
<b>Jen</b>	Research Chemist at <i>Phaust</i>
<b>Peter</b>	Project Manager of the construction firm that builds the new plant in Morales
<b>Jake</b>	Plant Manager for the <i>SuisseChem</i> plant in Big Spring, Texas
<b>Manuel</b>	Plant Manager for the new <i>Phaust</i> plant in Morales, Nuevo Leon, Mexico

*Questions to Guide the Small Group Conversations about Incident at Morales*  
{all groups}

- Identify 4 key moments when ethical choices are made
- Comment on the extent to which Fred is a morally good person
- What better decisions could have been made to avert key ethical dilemma(s)?

{teams A & B}

- Would a Code of Conduct make any difference in this case?
- What questions do you perceive re ethical conduct around initial hiring of Fred? Were they handled in an appropriate manner?

{teams C & D}

- Considering Wally's *one rule* issue – what level(s) of moral reasoning seem to be in play here?
- Consider the ethical differences between inflating budget and providing contingency funds for budget? Identify the stages of moral reasoning involved?

{teams G & H}

- To what extent is there an ethical dilemma related to Chuck's brother-in-law being US rep for supplier of particular systems controls? What is your response to Wally's justification of this approach to purchasing?
- Why did Fred share his concerns with wife? Was this appropriate? Discuss his comments – *out of her jurisdiction, no concern to her?* What stages of moral reasoning did each person seem to exhibit?

{teams E & F}

- Was Wally justified in confronting Fred about the environmental meeting? Who should moderate this meeting and why?
- Did Fred act responsibly in lining evaporation ponds? What about specifying cheaper controls?

{teams I & J}

- How do you react to the management team stating that couplings become a maintenance issue? Is it appropriate to make decisions without including operations people?
- Although the chemical processing was supposed to be automatic, Fred, in concert with Wally and Manual, decided to let it be operated on a manual basis: How is this an ethical decision?

*Whole Class Presentations:*

**Day 6: Let's Look at Ourselves Again**

*What have we learned about our ability to reason through the moment of critical choice in our efforts to get to better?*

(Using video vignettes referencing Jack Abramoff, the participants will examine: Framing; Moral Equilibrium; Overconfidence Bias; Rationalizations; Role Morality; Self-serving Bias and come up with examples from own experiences.)

**Day 7: Gilbane Gold – Solving a Contemporary Problem of Economics vs. Environment**

*How do we balance the ethical challenges of living and working in community?*

(This is a two day exercise – Part I: participants will review the video case and begin working on a potential solution in their small groups – each group will examine the case from the perspective of one of the key players.)

*Questions to Guide the Team Presentations re **Gilbane Gold***

*Synopsis*<sup>8</sup>

*Gilbane Gold* is the name given to dried sludge from the Gilbane wastewater treatment plant. It is sold to farmers as a commercial fertilizer. The annual municipal revenue generated saves the average family about \$300 a year in taxes. Several years ago the city of Gilbane established limits on the discharge of heavy metals to the sewers in order to protect *Gilbane Gold* from the build-up of toxic materials that could end up in the farmer's soil. These limits are ten (10) times more restrictive than Federal limits. However, the limits are based on the concentration of the discharge with no restrictions on total weight of material discharged.

*Z CORP* is a computer components manufacturer, which discharges wastewater containing small amounts of lead and arsenic into the city sewer system. By the current city test standards, the discharge usually meets the allowable levels for heavy metals. However, a newer test, known only to *Z CORP* environmental people, shows the discharge exceeds the city test standards. An ethical dilemma arise within *Z CORP* concerning whether to advise the city of the newer test. Acceptance of the newer test

---

<sup>8</sup> Excerpted from the **Study Guide for *Gilbane Gold***, National Institute for Engineering Ethics, Texas Tech University (1989)

would require additional investment in clean-up equipment. **Tom Richards** is a *Z CORP* environmental engineering consultant who was fired for advocating the new test. Thereafter, **David Jackson**, an engineer working for *Z CORP*, *goes public* with his views. A television media investigation results.

Complicating the situation is the fact that *Z CORP* has just received a contract for five (5) times as many computer modules as they presently produce, albeit at a very thin profit margin. The increased production means five (5) times as much waste will be produced. The discharge concentration can be kept the same by adding five (5) times the amount of water, thus still meeting the existing city standards. The result, however, is that *Gilbane Gold* has five (5) times the amount of heavy metals in it as before. The *Z CORP* vice-president is opposed to changing the test standards as that would require additional investment in wastewater treatment equipment. This could cause *Z CORP* to lose money on the new contract. The VP contends that *Z CORP*'s responsibility is to provide jobs and a payroll and that the city should worry about the environment.

**Primary Questions (for all teams to consider)**

- Have any laws been broken? And, is this even relevant?
- What are the major ethical problems? Where are they linked to technical uncertainties?
- Where are the decision points (moments of critical choice) whereby the situation could have been resolved?
- When, in such moments, should you turn to your professional organization or at least to some of your professional colleagues?

*Background Thoughts* (for each team to reflect & utilize as necessary)<sup>9</sup>

The right course of action is usually clear when it is between *good & evil*. However, it is not unusual for decision-makers to find themselves forced to choose between competing *goods*, rather than between *good & evil*. This scenario brings together the competing *goods* of:

- protection of human health and the environment (regulation and the spirit vs. the letter of the law)
- the quality of life and the welfare of people (jobs & taxes)
- personal integrity (view of self & living up to personal standards)
- free enterprise (profitability and competition in an international marketplace)

*Key Players*

**David Jackson** (young environmental engineer at *Z CORP*)

**Maria Renato** (Channel 13 Reporter)

**Lloyd Bremen** (farmer, also former commissioner for environmental protection)

**Dr. Winslow Massin** (professor emeritus at *Hanover University, School of Engineering*)

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

**Phil Port** (head of *Z CORP*'s environmental affairs department)

**Tom Richards** (environmental engineering consultant)

**Diane Collins** (*Z CORP* Vice-President: in charge of plant)

**Frank Seeders** (*Z CORP* head of production)

### *Specific Challenges*

Each team will analyse the case from the point-of-view of a particular individual or organization. The final *cross-fire* will attempt to determine what the proper/best/preferred resolution ought to be (and the goal of all teams will be to get to a solution, without the need of an independent mediator). The team that does the most to work towards a resolution and (if different) the team that actually brings the *crossfire* to conclusion will receive a bonus of up to three [3] marks towards the final marks of each participant.

#### **GG-1: Maria Renato**, Channel 13 Investigator

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- explain your perception of the degree of fairness in the Channel 13 investigation?
- to what extent did all *sides* get adequate coverage?
- what level(s) of moral reasoning appear to be behind Maria's approach to the ethical challenges?
- in what ways did (or did not) Maria's work contribute to resolution of the major dilemma?

#### **GG-2: Professor Emeritus Winslow Massin**

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- assess the *helpfulness* as well as the *goodness* of the retired professor's comments & advice?
- discuss the validity of his view(s) extolling a compromise between development and production of new products and the resultant impact on the environment (and by implication, environmental health)
- should the fact he is retired be considered in weighing his value (& even whether he should have been invited for comment at all)?
- what should his advice have been to David?
- what is his seeming level of moral reasoning?

#### **GG-3: Lloyd Bremen** (farmer & former commissioner for environmental protection)

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- how proper is it for former officials to get involved in such events after they have retired?
- to what degree might he be a mediative force in this dispute as he both helped write the regulations and now, as a farmer, is a purchaser of Gilbane Gold?
- where might he be helpful to city officials in explaining the long term impacts of their decision-making in regards to encouraging industry while promoting Gilbane Gold?

**GG-4: Phil Port**, David Jackson's boss

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- where was Phil Port's primary allegiance?
- to what extent, and in what instances, could he have facilitated a resolution to the dilemma?
- do what degree is he responsible for resolving the problems *Z CORP* seem to be creating (in other words, is this an environmental challenge or a production challenge or somewhere else??)
- what seems to be his level(s) of moral reasoning?

**GG-5: Tom Richards**, Consultant

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- assess Tom's ethical conduct with respect to David Jackson?
- ...with respect to *Z CORP*, especially the environmental affairs department?
- ...with respect to Channel 13?
- what seems to be his level(s) of moral reasoning?

**GG-6: Senior Z CORP Management** (basically **Diane & Frank**)

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- assess their conduct from the perspective of a *Z CORP* shareholder / a city taxpayer / a Gilbane Gold user
- what are their primary responsibilities — what are they being paid to do?
- what would be the advantages & disadvantages if they had pursued a policy of *maximum protection of the environment, whatever the cost*?
- because the company is meeting (or comes close to) the letter of the existing discharge law, to what extent does it have a greater responsibility to meet the philosophy or objective behind this law, which is currently flawed because it does not limit the mass of pollutants discharged or require the most advanced analytical technology in measuring toxic substances?

**GG-7: David Jackson**, the young environmental engineer

in addition to the primary questions noted above...

- what all might David have done during the development / evolution of this dilemma that could have averted it?
- what is your assessment of whether he should have *gone public* or *blown the whistle*?
- assess his decision to tell Channel 13 his side of the story *off the record* & how is *Z CORP* likely to react?
- what is the advice the *Z CORP* lawyer is likely to give?
- what advice would you give?

**GG-8: The Moderators**, (these individuals DO NOT appear in the video)

The challenge of the Moderators will be to help facilitate, as necessary (or as opportunity arise), the group coming to a consensus answer... The Moderators are not to run the cross-fire or even attempt to direct it; rather when either an impass or a seemingly solution seems near, they can make suggestions to either individuals or the group as to possible ways to resolve the issue.

**GG-9: The Peer Reviewers**, (these individuals DO NOT appear in the video, will not sit in the circle or participate in the resolution process)

This group will assist the professor in rating each team as to its efforts to get to solution while maintaining, for a time at least, their initial position.

Day 8: **Gilbane Gold** – (*cont'd*)

*How do we balance the ethical challenges of living and working in community?*

(Part II: each team puts forward their solution in a *crossfire* format – all participants try to get to mutual agreement on the dilemma the case has raised).

*Initial Presentations* [Team Seating will form a large oval – all but GG-9 facing each other]

**GG-3: Lloyd Bremen** (farmer & former commissioner for environmental protection)

**GG-7: David Jackson**, the young environmental engineer

**GG-5: Tom Richards**, Consultant

**GG-6: Senior Z CORP Management** (primarily **Diane & Frank**)

**GG-4: Phil Port**, David Jackson's boss

**GG-2: Professor Emeritus Winslow Massin**

**GG-1: Maria Renato**, Channel 13 Investigator

*Cross-fire...*      ***Who is right? Who makes the most sense? What ought to be the final outcome? How can we all get there?***

Remember: The *cross-fire* attempts to determine what the proper/best/preferred resolution ought to be (and **the goal of all teams will be to get to a solution**, without the need of an independent mediator). The team that does the most to work towards a resolution and (if different) the team that actually brings the *crossfire* to conclusion will receive a bonus of up to three [3] marks towards the final marks of each participant.

Day 9: **Henry's Daughters**<sup>10</sup>...

*What are some of the other key ethical challenges critical choice might encounter?*

(This also is a two day exercise – the first day participants will review a new video case and begin to explore such issues as *conflict of interest*, *gender* issues, *intellectual property* issues and problems around *privacy*. It also touches on some of the issues raised in *Ethics Unwrapped & Cowboy Ethics*.)

---

<sup>10</sup> Film produced by the National Institute for Engineering Ethics, Edward Whitacre College of Engineering, Texas Tech University (2010).

- *Henry*, sixty-five [65] is a retired but still well-connected automobile executive and sometime lobbyist. He is involved in an academia-industry-government smart highway design called **Sanshands**. The intent is to design & develop an automated highway/auto control system to take over driving from individuals within their cars.
- *Laura*, twenty-nine [29] is Henry's older daughter, a professional engineer working as project manager on **Sanshands**. Her recommendations will be considered prior to final adoption of the preferred research project.
- *Julie*, twenty-one [21] is Henry's younger daughter, is working as an intern with **Outocar** which is one of two organizations chosen to develop the test pilots (the other firm, **GuideMe**, has retained Henry as a consultant).

The two [2] sisters live together and often talk about their work. As the story unfolds they both see disconcerting actions/activities including excessive influence by **GuideMe** on the key decision-makers and plagiarism by co-workers. Pressures build within government towards choosing **GuideMe** which prompts allegations from **Outocar** that lead to a state senate ethics commission hearing. Two [2] key witnesses are *Laura* and *Henry*.

This story highlights ethical issues encountered by the characters, such as professional relationships, conflicts of interest, favouritism, confidentiality of proprietary info, sexual harassment, and individual privacy. The individuals disagree over the tradeoffs between technical performance, safety, reliability, sustainability, flexibility and cost. They also find that political and social factors can influence technical decisions.

Several ethical observations to note...

- ethics is an integral and explicit component of ordinary technical and business decision-making...
- technically competent, ethically sensitive, reasonable people may have different perspectives on an ethical issue, and can disagree when faced with complex ethical issues...
- negotiations resolve some of the conflicts but others remain unresolved – ethical problems should be resolved by rational methods...
- codes of ethics and guidance from licensing boards can be helpful in resolving ethical challenges...
- it is sometimes necessary to make decisions under pressure with incomplete data, insufficient time and inadequate information

{All Groups}

- What are the first dilemma(s) you see emerging?
- Identify the two (2) biggest ethical decisions that need(ed) to be made regarding the first [1<sup>st</sup>] dilemma you recognize...
- Upon reflection, at the conclusion of the story, what was the real moral problem, and where did it start?
- What were the good decisions that were made? And why?
- Give an example of three [3] moral failings *Ethics Unbounded*...

{HD-4, HD-5, HD-6, HD-8, HD-9}

- Regarding the two [2] sisters, there are numerous questions that could be raised but consider these in particular: *was it ethical for Henry to pull strings to get Julie her internship?* and, *was Laura given the project because of her professional talents + work ethic or because of Henry's connections?* (And if so, would this raise a conflict of interest issue?) plus *the cake eating scene* raises what ethical issues?

{HD-1, HD-2, HD-3, HD-7}

- Relate the comments, *keep it in the family, don't rock the boat, and it's just normal business* to the overall ethical challenge(S) of Henry & his daughters
- From your assigned character, and from that person's perspective how would you have done things differently?
  - HD-1 & 9 – Laura
  - HD-2 & 8 – Julie
  - HD-3 – Jeff
  - HD-4 & 6 – Henry
  - HD-5 – Senator Bob
  - HD-7 – Barry

{HD-1, HD-4, HD-7}

- **professional issues:** *to what extent should you consider political factors and social impacts in your decision-making? And, should Laura have said something about Marty's treatment of Warren like she did about the ogling of Julie?*

{HD-2, HD-5, HD-8}

- **conflict of interest:** *to what degree was it appropriate for Henry and his daughters to work on the same project, but for different parties? Should Senator Bob have recused himself from the investigative committee?*

{HD-3, HD-6, HD-9}

- **gender issues:** *does the appropriate response to sexual harassment depend on the setting – e.g. whether one is in a situation with one's peers vs. with one's supervisor vs. dealing with a client? Are sexist comments disguised as jokes acceptable? Is it ever permissible for an employee of one gender to put their hand on the shoulder of another employee or compliment an employee of the other gender?*

{HD-1, HD-3, HD-5, HD-7, HD-9}

- **intellectual property issues:** *what is proprietary information? How should you decide whether to share some of your information from work when you get home?*

{HD-2, HD-4, HD-6, HD-8}

- **privacy issues:** as a matter of interest, *does tracking vehicle location cause a violation of privacy? If you knew an individual was illegally dumping environmentally unhealthy waste and a neighbour was willing to attach a GPS device to his truck, to what extent would you use the resultant information to track him down and catch him in the act?*

{All Groups}

Provide an assessment of the following characters as to the stage(s) of moral reasoning that they seemed to primarily use:

Henry (father) \_\_\_\_\_ Laura (older sibling) \_\_\_\_\_ Julie (younger sib) \_\_\_\_\_

Senator Bob \_\_\_\_\_ Jeff (DOT Chief) \_\_\_\_\_ Barry (Outocar) \_\_\_\_\_

Warren (DOT engineer – Black) \_\_\_\_\_ Marty (DOT engineer – Latino) \_\_\_\_\_

Day 10: **Henry's Daughters** (*cont'd*)

*What are some of the other key ethical challenges critical choice might encounter?*

(In small groups the participants will present their findings on the relationship between their assigned issue and the value of stages theory in the resolution of any ethical dilemmas arising within their moral issue.)

- Give at least one [1] example of a similarity between one [1] of these characters and *Jack Abramoff*.

Day 11: Cowboy Ethics...

*When does a former Wall Street executive say something worthwhile about ethics?*

(Participants will have been given a reading assignment over the weekend to at least skim through *Cowboy Ethics* to determine the value of this book to the challenge of *getting to better* – along with viewing a couple short video vignettes, the class will analyse what Owen, the author is really saying.)

*The questions to guide the reading...*

In the Author's Introduction James Owen makes the following comments:

*If ever we have needed heroes, we need them now. I'm not talking about comic-book warriors with superhuman powers, or the magazine-cover denizens who flaunt their celebrity and wealth – we've got a surfeit of those. What's in short supply are authentic, real-life heroes who remind us of our potential to be heroic ourselves.*

*We may be living a so-called ordinary life. Yet even as we move through the rhythms of our daily tasks, we still hope we can find that reservoir of courage, determination, and nobility we really need when life puts us to the test. We want to know, when all is said and done, that we are not ordinary at all.*

- What is Owen getting at?

On pg. 7 Owen makes these comments:

*Cowboys also remind us that the best things in life aren't things at all... He goes on to say: Many research studies have shown that, beyond a basic comfort level, more money doesn't make people happier. Happiness has much more to do with the joys of family, friends, and doing work we find to be meaningful, regardless of the status or paycheck attached.*

- Interpret these comments in terms both of your reading of the book and your own life at this point in your journey.
- What strikes you as most cogent in the section on the Four-Legged Stool?

Regarding ***The CODE of the WEST***:

- To what extent does this make sense? Explain...
- If the era of the ***real cowboy*** only lasted a generation or so, why have the traditions and creed endured?
- Which of the codes would you start with if you were having a conversation with your grandchild or a great-niece or -nephew?

*Upon further reflection...*

- Who would you give this book to, and why?
- What will you do with this book after the course is finished?

Day 12: After Cowboy Ethics...

*How do we resolve an ethical dilemma of our own ilk?*

(Along with viewing a couple more short video vignettes, small groups will tackle different cases with the intent of determining a strategy by which they could resolve the central dilemma through *stages theory* and a *role play*.)

Day 13: **Authority & Rebellion**

*When is it okay to go against the norms/rules of your specific community?*

(To help prepare for the role play, the class will see their final video case wherein they will analyse the stages of the main characters and how that impacts the story.)

*Questions to Guide the Small Group Conversations about Authority & Rebellion*

- At what *stage* does each of the major characters seem to think?  
Captain Devriess (1<sup>st</sup> Capt.) \_\_\_\_\_  
Captain Queeg (Bogart) \_\_\_\_\_  
Maryk (First Off.) \_\_\_\_\_  
Keith (Young Off.) \_\_\_\_\_  
Keefer (Fred MacM.) \_\_\_\_\_
- What is the evidence to support such assessments?
- How is the final dilemma resolved? What *stages* are apparent in the final scenes on the Bridge?
- 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?
- What alternatives are there if you choose to disobey rules? How does one determine that a rule is unfair or unjust?
- 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?

*Whole Class Presentations:*

Day 14: Preparation Day...

*Can we simply demonstrate our ability to analyse/assess ethical reasoning in others?*

(Each team will work on their collective analysis of *Wind Without Rain* in preparation for the final Roundtable conversations)

Day 15: Presentation Day...

*Yes we can, and we will, demonstrate our ethical reasoning assessments!*

(In a Roundtable format, each team will present their responses to the challenges outlined at the beginning of the course that guided their reading and the requisite analysis of the stages of moral reasoning evident in/throughout the book.)