



School of Arts & Science
 HUMANITIES DEPARTMENT
 PHIL 330- 001
 Ethics in Business
 WINTER 2013

COURSE OUTLINE

The course description is online @ <http://camosun.ca/learn/calendar/current/web/phil.html>

⚡ Please note: the College electronically stores this outline for five (5) years only.
 It is **strongly recommended** you keep a copy of this outline with your academic records.
 You will need this outline for any future application/s for transfer credit/s to other colleges/universities.

1. Instructor Information

(a)	Instructor:	Megan Shelstad		
(b)	Office Hours:	after class as needed or by appointment		
(c)	Location:	TBA		
(d)	Phone:	370-3950	Alternative Phone:	
(e)	Email:	shelstad@camosun.bc.ca		

2. Intended Learning Outcomes

Upon completion of this course the student will be able to:

1. Summarize and evaluate central problems in business ethics.
2. Critically examine classical and contemporary solutions to these problems.
3. Make comparisons between various philosophical/ethical positions and have an overall sense of the history of ethics in general.
4. Take a philosophical/ethical position and support that position with good reasons (evidence).
5. Explain the relevance of ethics to everyday problems in business concerning beliefs and values, knowledge and justification.
6. Describe and critically assess specific cases and alternative solutions to contemporary ethical problems in business.

3. Required Materials

- (a) Texts: Shaw, W., Barry, V. & Panagiotou, S. 2010. *Moral Issues in Business*. 1st Cdn. ed. ThomsonWadsworth.

4. Course Content and Schedule

001 Interurban - Lectures: Wednesdays – 2:30 – 4:20 p.m. with 10 minute break **(CBA 101)**
 Seminars: Mondays: Group A – 2:30 – 3:20 p.m. Group B – 3:30 – 4:20 p.m. **(CBA 101)**

5. Basis of Student Assessment (Weighting)

- (a) Assignments: 20% - argument analysis essay (approx. 1000 - 1250 words), **returned at the final exam**
- (b) Quizzes: 10% - 6 quizzes (2% each, best 5, **no make-ups**)
- (c) Exams: 20% - midterm test
 30% - final test (**in the exam period**)
- (d) Other: 20% - seminar participation with case study or argument analysis homework (there are 11 seminars and you need to hand in 10 written seminar assignments; so you can miss 1 but there are **no make-ups**
 - use the “**TEMPLATE FOR CASE STUDY ANALYSIS**” included in this outline except where instructions say otherwise) **CHECK YOUR READING SCHEDULE**)

6. Grading System

(No changes are to be made to this section unless the Approved Course Description has been forwarded through the Education Council of Camosun College for approval.)

Standard Grading System (GPA)

Percentage	Grade	Description	Grade Point Equivalency
90-100	A+		9
85-89	A		8
80-84	A-		7
77-79	B+		6
73-76	B		5
70-72	B-		4
65-69	C+		3
60-64	C		2
50-59	D	Minimum level of achievement for which credit is granted; a course with a "D" grade cannot be used as a prerequisite.	1
0-49	F	Minimum level has not been achieved.	0

Temporary Grades

Temporary grades are assigned for specific circumstances and will convert to a final grade according to the grading scheme being used in the course. See Grading Policy E-1.5 at camosun.ca for information on conversion to final grades, and for additional information on student record and transcript notations.

Temporary Grade	Description
I	<i>Incomplete:</i> A temporary grade assigned when the requirements of a course have not yet been completed due to hardship or extenuating circumstances, such as illness or death in the family.
IP	<i>In progress:</i> A temporary grade assigned for courses that, due to design may require a further enrollment in the same course. No more than two IP grades will be assigned for the same course. (For these courses a final grade will be assigned to either the 3 rd course attempt or at the point of course completion.)
CW	<i>Compulsory Withdrawal:</i> A temporary grade assigned by a Dean when an instructor, after documenting the prescriptive strategies applied and consulting with peers, deems that a student is unsafe to self or others and must be removed from the lab, practicum, worksite, or field placement.

7. Recommended Materials or Services to Assist Students to Succeed Throughout the Course

LEARNING SUPPORT AND SERVICES FOR STUDENTS

There are a variety of services available for students to assist them throughout their learning. This information is available in the College calendar, at Student Services, or the College web site at camosun.ca.

STUDENT CONDUCT POLICY

There is a Student Conduct Policy **which includes plagiarism**. It is the student's responsibility to become familiar with the content of this policy. The policy is available in each School Administration Office, at Student Services, and the College web site in the Policy Section.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AS APPROPRIATE OR AS REQUIRED

Phil 330-001 Reading Schedule (from the class text) to be done BEFORE class
(schedule subject to change if necessary, quizzes will be on previous week's material)

- Week 1 (Jan. 7, 9): *Seminar: Introduction and exercise*
Lecture: Introduction to ethics and the philosophical approach
- Week 2 (Jan. 14, 16): *Seminar: Case 8.4, "Ethically dubious practices" (295) answer the questions at the end of the case except for question 2.*
Lecture: , QUIZ 1, Ch. 1 – The Nature of Morality
- Week 3 (Jan. 21, 23): *Seminar: Case 1.1 "Made in USA Can - dumped elsewhere" (20) case study template*
Lecture: Ch. 1 cont'd. Kohlberg, arguments (lecture, not in text)
- Week 4 (Jan. 28, 30): *Seminar: Argument analysis: Solomon (23), USE OUTLINE GUIDE ****
Lecture: QUIZ 2, Ch. 2 – Normative Theories of Ethics
- Week 5 (Feb. 4, 6): *Seminar: Case 2.1 "The Ford Pinto" (64) case study template*
Lecture: QUIZ 3 (marked in class), Ch. 2 cont'd.
- **FAMILY DAY - MONDAY FEB. 11 - NO SEMINAR**
- Week 6 (Feb. 13): ** MIDTERM TEST ** (Intro, ch. 1 and 2, Solomon and arguments)
- Week 7 (Feb. 18, 20): *Seminar: Case 9.3 "Facial Discrimination" (328)*
answer the questions at the end of the case
Lecture: 3 fallacies, Ch. 3 – Justice & Economic Distribution
- Week 8 (Feb. 25, 27): *Seminar: Case 11.1 "Poverty and Pollution" (408)*
answer the questions at the end of the case
Lecture: QUIZ 4, 2 fallacies, Ch. 3 cont'd.
- Week 9 (Mar. 4, 6): *Seminar: Case 4.1 "Licensing and laissez-faire" (127)*
answer the questions at the end of the case
Lecture: 3 fallacies, Ch. 4 – The Nature of Capitalism
- **CHOOSE YOUR ESSAY ARTICLE AND PREPARE ARGUMENT ANALYSIS OUTLINE FOR MONDAY**
- Week 10 (Mar. 11, 13): *Seminar: group work period, **ARGUMENT ANALYSIS OUTLINE***
Lecture: QUIZ 5, 3 fallacies, Ch. 4 cont'd.
- Week 11 (Mar. 18, 20): *Seminar: Case 4.3 "Immigrant workers in Canada" (130)*
answer the questions at the end of the case
Lecture: 3 fallacies, Schumacher (134)
- Week 12 (Mar. 25, 27): *Seminar: Case 4.2 "Hucksters in the classroom" (129)*
answer the questions at the end of the case
Lecture: QUIZ 6, 2 fallacies, Ch. 5 – Corporations
- **EASTER MONDAY - MONDAY APR. 1 - NO SEMINAR**
- ** ARGUMENT ANALYSIS ESSAY DUE APR. 3 IN CLASS (returned at the final exam)**
- Week 13 (Apr. 3): Lecture: Ch. 5 cont'd., Cassidy (174)
- Week 14 (Apr. 8, 10): *Seminar: Case 7.1 "Testing for Honesty" (247)*
answer the questions at the end of the case
Lecture: general review (esp. fallacies) and loose ends
- **FINAL EXAM (Ch. 3, 4 and 5 including Schumacher, Cassidy and Logic notes) in exam period**

TEMPLATES FOR CASE STUDIES and ARGUMENT ANALYSIS

A). CASE STUDIES - Manuel Velasquez' 7-Step model for evaluating and resolving an actual or potential moral problem

1. What are the relevant facts?
 2. What are the ethical issues?
 3. Who are the primary stakeholders?
 4. What are the possible alternatives?
 5. What are the ethics of the alternatives?
 6. What are the practical constraints?
 7. What action(s) should be taken?
-

B). Argument analysis outline (summary and evaluation)

1. What is the author's main point(s)?
2. What main reasons (premises) does the author offer in support of the main point? Are these good reasons? Why? Are these reasons relevant to the author's conclusion? Be specific when answering these questions.
3. What evidence is offered in support of those reasons (premises)? Is the evidence good? Why? Is the evidence relevant to the author's reasons and/or conclusion? Be specific when answering these questions.
4. Does the author's argument(s) depend on specific principles? What are they (again, be specific)?
5. Does the author's argument(s) depend on any key beliefs or assumptions? Are these assumptions warranted or unwarranted? Explain why (again, be specific)?
6. What objections can you think of (use the textbook) to the author's claims or arguments? Are they good objections? Are they relevant?

PHILOSOPHY 330 CRITICAL ESSAY

This essay is worth **25%** of your final mark. It will be **4 pages minimum to 5 pages maximum (approx.), double-spaced.**

DUE DATE: APRIL 3, 2013 (IN CLASS)
LATE PENALTY: 2% PER DAY, INCLUDING WEEKENDS

MAKE A COPY OF YOUR PAPER AND SUBMIT THE ORIGINAL.
DO NOT SUBMIT FINAL PAPERS BY EMAIL.
NO PLASTIC COVERS OR COVER SHEETS, PLEASE.

Steps to follow:

Choose **ONE ARTICLE** (not a case) from our textbook that we have not done in class (**The 3 articles that we are doing in class are Solomon, Schumacher and Cassidy**). It is probably best to choose according to your particular interests, although you ought to be able to do this assignment on any topic. I'd like to know what topic you have chosen as soon as you decide (although you can change your mind down the road if you think that's best). It would be useful to decide what ethical theory or theories you intend to apply by that time as well.

Prepare an outline using the argument analysis outline guide on the previous page of this course outline. You will be given a seminar group work period to bring that in to discuss with others.

Critically analyze the piece(s) you've chosen according to the ethical theories we've studied following the guidelines below. Your paper should be carefully written with attention paid to precise use of language including word usage, spelling, and grammar. **You should present your view(s) with care, offering reasons in support of your claims and arguments against competing claims.** Clarity is highly prized. Your essay should reflect your own thinking in light of the readings and theories you've chosen, but should not be simply unsupported opinion. **You should not do any outside research.**

Your essay will have **two** elements, an **exposition** and a **critique**. It is not necessary (or even recommended) to keep these separate. You can present the view and analyze it at the same time.

Exposition

This is where you show that you understand the position taken in the articles/theories you have chosen and the specifics of any case you might use to illustrate your points. Consider the following:

- 1) What is the **main point(s)** (conclusion) the author is trying to make?
- 2) What **reasons/claims** (premises) are offered to support the conclusion?
- 3) Do any of these reasons rest on underlying **assumptions** that could be contentious or problematic in some way?
- 4) What **key concepts** are important to your author's position?

Critique

This is where you show what positive and negative insights you have had about what you've read. **NOTE:** A critique does not have to focus on negative aspects (what is wrong, in your opinion, with the author's arguments or position) although it may. Consider the following:

- 1) Are premises/reasons **relevant** to the conclusion (are they talking about the same thing, for example)?
- 2) Are the premises, taken together, **sufficient** to prove the truth of the conclusion?
- 3) Do the premises seem reasonable (likely **true**)?
- 4) Are concepts defined in problematic ways (too broad, too narrow, unhelpful,...)?
- 5) Is the persuasiveness of the view undermined in any way?
- 6) What aspects of the view do you **agree/disagree** with and why?
- 7) Can you think of any **counterexamples**?
- 8) How might the view be **improved** or strengthened?

Familiarize yourself with the College's policy regarding plagiarism, which is taking the ideas or writings of another person and presenting them as your own. You should provide adequate reference to the sources of the ideas and words you borrow and include a bibliography. There is a citation guide attached to the Humanities' website. Use the style format you are most comfortable with (MLA or APA).

GENERAL STRUCTURE OF A WRITTEN CRITIQUE

1. Introduction: provide a brief introduction indicating what view (or aspect of a view) you are going to focus on and why you think it is interesting or important to have this focus, what your own view will be on the matter, and the steps you plan to take in offering support for your position.

2. Body: The body of the paper should include an **exposition** of the view(s) that you are reflecting upon, your evaluation of the views as they stand, your contribution to the views, and your suggestions as to how the views might be improved (**critique**). This is the main, most important, portion of the paper. Demonstrate that you understand the view in question and that you've thought long and hard about its implications.

3. Conclusion: provide a brief summary of the most important points that you have made, together with the 'conclusions' you have drawn in the body of the paper.

General suggestions: use a style manual; be concise and clear; try to be "fair" to the views you are analyzing; limit your use of quotes; if it's appropriate to write in the first person, do so rather than use awkward constructions such as "It will be shown that"; offer reasons for any claim that others might find contentious (avoid phrases such as "It is obvious that..."); start with an outline; write a rough draft.

There are many writing and style manuals around, including some addressing writing for philosophy specifically. If you go to the internet for these resources, make sure the source is reputable; a Canadian university or college site is probably best.

Also, don't ignore the Writing Centre's resources if you need them.

PHILOSOPHY 330 – LOGIC NOTES

DEFINITIONS

Statement – a sentence with a truth-value (true or false).

Argument – a set of statements one of which (the conclusion) allegedly follows from the others (the premises).

An argument is **deductive** if the conclusion follows **necessarily** (that is, if the premises are true the conclusion **must** be true).

Deductive arguments are evaluated as **valid** (the structure is such that if the premises are true the conclusion **must** be true – necessarily) and **sound** (the argument is valid **and** the premises are true).

An argument is **inductive** if the conclusion follows **probably** from the premises. Some types of inductive arguments are 1) **statistical** 2) arguments from **analogy** (making a claim about something you don't know based on its similarity to something you do know) 3) arguments from **example** (making a claim about a whole class of things based on one or more individual cases).

Inductive arguments are evaluated as **weak** or **strong** and **cogent** (premises are **relevant**, **reliable** and **sufficient**).

INFORMAL FALLACIES – errors in reasoning

These alleged “arguments” are fallacious because they misuse language and mislead us.

Appeal to the majority – arguing that because something is popular it is true or good.

Begging the question (circular) – implicitly using your conclusion as a premise.

False alternatives or false dilemma – excluding relevant possibilities.

Complex (“loaded”) question – posing a question/issue in such a way that a person cannot agree or disagree without committing to some other claim you wish to promote.

Ad personem (ad hominem), “to the person” – using a negative trait of a speaker or their circumstances as evidence that their statement is false or their argument is weak.

Straw person (man) – trying to refute one proposition by arguing against another or characterizing the opposing view in such a way that it's easy to refute.

Slippery slope – distorts the opposing view by claiming that the view has inevitable “bad” consequences.

Appeal to tradition – arguing that because something has been done a certain way for a long time it shouldn't be changed.

Half-truth – leaving out relevant facts, lifting out of context.

Appeal to ignorance – arguing that a claim is true because it has not been proven false.

Appeal to pity – using an emotional appeal to argue for the truth of a claim.

Hasty generalization – using individual characteristics and applying them to the “whole,” for example, stereotyping.

Appeal to force – based on threat or coercion.

Appeal to authority – testimonial evidence used when credibility or expertise has not been established.

Post hoc ergo propter hoc (“after this therefore because of this”) – inferring a cause from a temporal connection.

Equivocation – using the same word/term/phrase but with two different meanings.

Philosophy 330 – Diagnostic survey

Your Name: _____ Your program area: _____

1. Would you rather work for a company (A) that welcomed input from employees and allowed you to speak your mind at meetings, etc. or at a company (B) that has a more “top-down” approach where employees are expected to follow the direction of the leader or employer and only offer input through indirect channels?

2. A toy puck and a hockey stick cost \$1.10 in total. The stick costs \$1 more than the puck. How much does the puck cost?

3. Name someone that you admire a great deal for their moral character or behaviour (famous or not). Why do you admire this person? (try not to choose your parents)

4. Is ethics fundamentally different for the business world than it is for other areas of life? Why or why not?

5. Are there some things that are absolutely morally wrong no matter what? Name one.

6. Name a behaviour that you think is unethical but not illegal.

7. Approximately how much annual income do you need to be happy? (numerical estimate) Why?

8. Is everyone's morality just as good as everyone else's? Why or why not?

9. What would you do if your boss told you to do something you thought was unethical? Can you think of an example?

10. Should there be limits on CEO's salaries? Why or why not?

11. What do you want most for your children's lives? (if you have them, if you plan on having them or, if you don't plan on having children, use your imagination)

12. If it takes five machines five minutes to make five widgets, how long would it take 100 machines to make 100 widgets?

13. What sorts of things (if any) would you include as part of the "common good"?

14. Does morality only apply to human beings? Why or why not? If not, what else does it apply to?

15. What is a "code of ethics"? Why do companies and institutions have them?

16. Are people naturally morally good or does it have to be learned?

17. Can an atheist (one who does not believe in a divine supernatural being) live a moral life? How?

18. What general "rule" do you use when you are faced with a moral decision?

19. What qualities do you admire in a business leader?

20. There are three toy blocks stacked up. The top one is green and the bottom one is red. Is there a green block directly on top of a non-green one? a) yes b) no or c) cannot be determined.

21. If you have an apple pie to feed to 4 hungry children, what is the best way to divide it up? Why?

22. What are some of the things you value?

23. What do you think is the most important ethical issue in business today? Why?

24. Which of the following films have you seen and/or which would you like to see as part of our studies?

Black Gold (about Starbucks) ___ SEEN ___ LIKE TO

Inside Job (about the financial crisis) ___ SEEN ___ LIKE TO

The Corporation ___ SEEN ___ LIKE TO

Enron: The Smartest Guys in the Room ___ SEEN ___ LIKE TO

Startup.com (about the dot.com bubble) ___ SEEN ___ LIKE TO

Maxed Out (about the credit crisis) ___ SEEN ___ LIKE TO

Wal Mart: The High Cost of Low Price ___ SEEN ___ LIKE TO

Hot Coffee (about product liability, litigation) ___ SEEN ___ LIKE TO

Are there any other films you think it would be useful for the class to see?