

**BMA291/391  
Managerial Social  
Responsibility**

*Semester 2, 2009*

This unit will be offered in:

**Hobart & Launceston**

The lecturing team responsible will be:

**Dr Mark Wickham (Lecturer-in-Charge)**

Room: 312 (Hobart)

Phone: 6226 2159

Email: Mark.Wickham@utas.edu.au

**Dr Graeme Tonks**

Room: A243 (Launceston)

Phone: 6324 3498

Email: Graeme.Tonks@utas.edu.au

**<http://www.utas.edu.au/mgmt/student.htm>**

---

## Introduction to the Unit

Sound and effective management and leadership require not only financial and technical expertise but also ethical competency. This unit provides a focus on ethical decision-making, and in particular introduces a series of frameworks for discerning what is right and wrong in important areas of business practice. Ethical competency is the ability to, a) perceive the ethical implications of a situation, b) engage in sound ethical reasoning, and c) develop practical problem solving strategies.

### Enrolment in the unit

Unless there are exceptional circumstances, students should not enrol in BMA units after the end of week two of semester, as the School cannot guarantee:

- that any extra assistance will be provided by the teaching team in respect of work covered in the period before enrolment; and
- that penalties will not be applied for the late submission of any piece or pieces of assessment that were due during that period.

---

## Learning Outcomes

On completion of this unit, you should be able to:

- Identify and define four major theoretical frameworks that support ethical decision-making.
- Analyse a series of case study facts and identify the ethical dilemma that lies therein.
- Propose and justify your recommendations to overcome an ethical dilemma.
- Identify and discuss the major ethical issues facing contemporary business managers.

---

## Generic Graduate Attributes

The University has defined a set of generic graduate attributes (GGAs) that can be expected of all graduates (see <http://www.utas.edu.au/tl/policies/index.htm>). By undertaking this unit you should make progress in attaining the following attributes:

### Knowledge

- Students will become familiar with four theories of ethical decision-making.
- Through the use of case study material, students will demonstrate how ethical theory provides a basis for managerial decision-making.
- Students will explore the application of ethical theories in a number of issues concerning the rights and obligations of employers and employees, the protection of employees and consumers, and the responsibilities of organisations to the public at large.

### Communication Skills

- Students will be able to communicate, both orally and in writing, their ability to analyse case facts and present logical recommendations to overcome an ethical dilemma.
- Students will acquire and develop ethical competency in managerial decision-making and be able to explain the importance of this dimension to others.

### Problem Solving Skills

- Students will develop practical problem solving strategies in resolving ethical dilemmas.
- Students will become confident in introducing ethical considerations into managerial decision-making.

### Social Responsibility

- Students will be able to demonstrate ethical decision-making, with integrity and social responsibility as the key drivers of problem solving.

- Students will be able to explain to others the difference between acting ethically and the management of ethics in organisations, and be able to develop strategies for implementing ethical management in organisations.

---

## Prerequisites

BMA101 and appropriate base level for relevant major (e.g. BMA121, BMA181, BMA151); for another degree, successful completion of any 2 level 100 units (i.e. 25% of level 100).

---

## Texts

### Prescribed Texts

There is no prescribed text for this unit. See MyLO for access to the required readings in this unit.

### School Publications

Students must obtain the following electronic publications which are available from the School of Management website:

<http://www.utas.edu.au/mgmt/student.htm>

*Writing Assignments: A Guide*

*Referencing Style Manual*

---

## Recommended Reading

The publications listed below are highly recommended for further reading on the topics covered in the unit.

### Books

Beauchamp, T. & Bowie, N. 2001. *Ethical theory and business* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Carroll, A.B. & Bocholt, A.K. 2006. *Business and society: Ethics and stakeholder management* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Australia: Thomson.

De George, R.T. 2006. *Business ethics* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Desjardins, J.R. & McCall, J.J. 2005. *Contemporary issues in business ethics* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Victoria: Thomson.

Ferrell, O.C., Fraedrich, J. & Ferrell, L. 2005. *Business ethics, ethical decision making and cases* (6th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Fisher, C., & Lovell, A. 2003. *Business ethics and values*. Harlow: Prentice-Hall.

Fritzche, D.J. 2005. *Business ethics: A global and managerial perspective* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Sydney: McGraw-Hill

Goodpaster, K.E., Nash, L.L. & de Bettignies, H. 2006. *Business ethics* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Sydney: McGraw-Hill.

- Hartley, R.F. 2005. *Business ethics: Mistakes and successes*. USA: Wiley.
- Hunt, R.W., Hunt, M.B. & Cox, B.G. 2005. *Ethics at work*. Australia: Pearson.
- Larmer, R.A. 2002. *Ethics in the workplace*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Australia: Wadsworth.
- Newton, L.H. & Lord, M.M. 2004. *Taking sides* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Pfeiffer, R.S. & Forsberg, R.P. 2005. *Ethics on the job* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Australia: Thomson.
- Pojman, L.P. 2006. *Ethics: Discovering right and wrong* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Australia: Thomson.
- Shaw, W. H. & Barry, V. 2004. *Moral issues in business* (9th ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Trevino, L.K. & Nelson, K.A. 2007. *Managing business ethics* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). USA: Wiley.
- Velasquez, M. G. 2006. *Business ethics concepts and cases*. (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Weiss, J.W. 2006. *Business ethics: A stakeholder and issues management approach* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Australia: Thomson South-Western.

## Journals and Periodicals

Apart from books, you will find it valuable to get into the practice of reading relevant articles from journals and periodicals (including newspapers and magazines).

*Business & Professional Ethics Journal*

*Business & Society*

*Business Ethics Quarterly*

*Business Ethics: a European Review*

*Journal of Business Ethics*

*Journal of Business Education*

---

## Flexible Learning: MyLO

MyLO software has been incorporated into the delivery of this unit to enhance the learning experience by providing access to up to date course materials and by allowing for online discussion through this web-based environment.

To access MyLO from your own computer you will need the appropriate software, and hardware to run that software. See **Learning Online** <http://uconnect.utas.edu.au/> for computer software you will need.

**Note:** Older computers may not have the hardware to run some of the required software applications. Contact your local IT support person or the Service Desk on 6226 1818 if you experience difficulties.

## Privacy Policy and Notice

The School of Management takes the utmost care to protect the privacy and security of your personal information and to ensure its accuracy.

If you have any concerns about your privacy in MyLO please contact the lecturer-in-charge of this unit or view

view the University of Tasmania MyLO Privacy Policy Statement available from the university website on <http://www.utas.edu.au/courseonline/privacy.htm>.

---

## Assessment

In order to pass this unit you must achieve an overall mark of at least 50 per cent of the total available marks. Details of each item of Coursework are provided in the Assignment Topics section.

Method of Assessment	Value	Due Date	Length*
<b>Coursework</b>			
Presentation and Peer-Evaluation activities	25	In tutorials Weeks 3, 4, 5, & 6	Group presentation (10 marks) PLUS 3 x peer evaluations (3 x 5 marks)
Assignment	25	Monday, September 28 <sup>th</sup> at 2pm (hard-copy AND electronic copy)	2500 words MAXIMUM
<b>Examination</b>	50	Exam Period	3 hours
Total Marks	100		

\* **Word Limit:** The word count includes such items as headings, in-text references, quotes and executive summaries. It **does not** include the reference list at the end of the assignment.

## Study Week

All undergraduate units offered by the School of Management are scheduled to include a Study Week. The dates for this Semester are shown in the attached Study Schedule.

The purpose of the Study Week is to allow students an opportunity to consolidate their studies thus far, and to research coming assignments.

## Examination

### *Format*

There will be a three-hour closed-book examination with a value of 50% at the completion of the semester. The examination will consist of a case study worth 20 marks and three essay questions from a choice of at least five, worth 10 marks each. The best preparation for the exam is consistent work throughout the semester, especially the tutorial exercises.

### *Scheduled date and place*

Your final examination for this unit will be held during the scheduled examination period as indicated by Student Administration in correspondence to you.

Examinations will normally be scheduled Monday to Saturday inclusive. Examinations may be held during the day or evening and students should consult the university information which will be made available towards the end of semester.

You are advised to make any necessary arrangements with employers now for time off during examination period to sit this examination. Your participation at the scheduled time is not negotiable unless there are exceptional circumstances.

**Note that you will be expected to sit the examination at your recorded study centre.**

### ***Supplementary Examination***

Except in special circumstances and on the recommendation of the lecturer-in-charge or the Head of School, a student who fails will not be granted a supplementary examination.

### **Special Consideration and Student Difficulties**

If a student is experiencing difficulties with their studies or assignments, have personal or life planning issues, disability or illness which may affect their course of study, they are advised to raise these with their lecturer in the first instance. Students may also contact the Student Adviser, who will be able to help in identifying the issues that need to be addressed, give general advice, assist by liaising with academic staff, as well as referring students to any relevant University-wide support services. The Student Adviser is located in room 318a in the Commerce Building in Hobart and is contactable by phone on 6226 1916. In Launceston the Student Adviser is located in room A168 in Building A and is contactable by phone on 6324 3312. There is also a range of University-wide support services available including Student Services, International Services and Learning Development. Please refer to the *Current Students* homepage at: <http://www.utas.edu.au/students/index.html>

Should a student require assistance in accessing the Library, visit their website for more information at <http://www.utas.edu.au/library/>

Students who have completed their examinations and who feel that they have been disadvantaged due to illness or other circumstances affecting their study, may fill out a form to request that their lecturer takes this into consideration when marking the examination. Forms should be submitted directly to the relevant school, accompanied by appropriate supporting documentation, as soon as possible after the completion of the examination. Granting of special consideration is at the discretion of the lecturer and school. The relevant form can be found at the following website:

[http://www.studentcentre.utas.edu.au/examinations\\_and\\_results/forms\\_files/index.htm#eits](http://www.studentcentre.utas.edu.au/examinations_and_results/forms_files/index.htm#eits)

Students with a non-English speaking background may be permitted to take a bilingual dictionary into an exam. This dictionary must not be annotated, that is, it must have no notes written in it. In order to use a bilingual dictionary students must request permission from the Student Centre.

---

## **Submission of Coursework**

### **Lodging Coursework**

All Coursework must have the School of Management Assignment Cover Sheet and Title Page attached, both of which are available as a blank template from the School of Management website:

<http://www.utas.edu.au/mgmt/student.htm>

**All assignments must include the tutor's name on the assignment Cover Sheets when they are handed in. If this is not done the assignment will not be accepted and therefore marked.**

Please remember that you are responsible for lodging your Coursework on or before the due date. We suggest you keep a copy. Even in the most 'perfect' of systems, items sometimes go astray.

Note that you may also be required to submit an electronic copy of your Coursework. More details of this will be given in Lectures.

*Hobart students:* Lodge in assignment box next to room 321, Commerce & Economics Building.

*Launceston students:* Lodge in assignment box beside room A170.

**All coursework must be handed in at 2.00 pm on the due date.**

## **Late Coursework**

### ***Written Work***

Extensions will only be granted on medical or compassionate grounds and will not be granted because of work or other commitments. Requests for extensions should be **made in writing** to the lecturer-in-charge prior to the due date. Medical certificates or other evidence must be attached and must contain information which justifies the extension sought.

Late assignments which have **not** been granted an extension will, at the lecturer's discretion, be penalised by deducting ten per cent of total marks for each full day overdue.

Assignments submitted more than six days late will normally not be accepted by the lecturer-in-charge.

### ***Tests***

Students who are unable to sit a test on medical or compassionate grounds (work or other commitments are not considered 'compassionate grounds') may request that they be permitted to submit alternative Coursework.

Please do not expect a special test to be held for you if you choose to go on holidays or undertake other activities on the scheduled date. If you do need to request alternative Coursework, you should do so in writing to the lecturer-in-charge prior to the due date. Medical certificates or other evidence must be attached and must contain information which justifies the request. The telephone number of the doctor should also be included.

## **Return of Coursework**

Coursework will be returned during classes or it can be collected from the lecturer's or tutor's room at nominated times; it will not be available from the School's offices.

## **Plagiarism**

Plagiarism is a form of cheating. It is taking and using someone else's thoughts, writings or inventions and representing them as your own, for example:

- using an author's words without putting them in quotation marks and citing the source;
- using an author's ideas without proper acknowledgment and citation; or
- copying another student's work.

**If you have any doubts about how to refer to the work of others in your assignments, please consult your lecturer or tutor** for relevant referencing guidelines, and the academic integrity resources on the web at <http://www.utas.edu.au/tl/supporting/academicintegrity/index.html>.

The intentional copying of someone else's work as one's own is a serious offence punishable by penalties that may range from a fine or deduction/cancellation of marks and, in the most serious of cases, to exclusion from a unit, a course or the University. Details of penalties that can be imposed are available in the Ordinance of Student Discipline—Part 3 Academic Misconduct, see <http://www.utas.edu.au/universitycouncil/legislation/ord9.pdf>

**The University reserves the right to submit (or to require you to submit) assignments to online plagiarism detection software, and might then retain a copy of the assignment on its database for the purpose of future plagiarism checking.**

## **Occupational health and safety (OH&S)**

The University is committed to providing a safe and secure teaching and learning environment. In addition to specific requirements of this unit you should refer to the University's policy at: [http://www.admin.utas.edu.au/hr/ohs/pol\\_proc/ohs.pdf](http://www.admin.utas.edu.au/hr/ohs/pol_proc/ohs.pdf)

---

# Tutorial Program

## Tutorial Questions for Discussion

Note that the tutorial program does not start until Week 2 of semester.

Tutors may also introduce additional case material from current events that will be specifically related to the issues raised by the cases selected from the text. Where possible, the additional case material will be posted to MyLO or distributed in the Tutorial. To gain the maximum benefit from the Tutorial program it is essential that you read the case material and prepare answers to the questions for discussion.

**NOTE: Due to the Group Presentations, the tutorial exercises in Weeks 3,4,5 and 6 will be covered in a special “workshop” session at the end of the lecture in those weeks\*\***

### *Week 2—Ethics and Business*

1. Read the article by Barrier (1998) and discuss the following statement: “In order to make money in highly competitive markets, businesses must act unethically in one way or another”.
2. Using the “Ethics toolkit for managers” on MyLO, identify the 10 myths about business ethics.
3. Using the “Ethical Relativism” reading on MyLO, define what is meant by the term “ethical relativism”? What are the arguments for and against this concept? Given these arguments, does the concept offer a useful guide to action?
4. Read the “Case of the Collapsed Mine”. What were the ethical obligations of the parties involved in the case? To what extent did they fulfil their ethical obligations?

### *Week 3—Utilitarianism*

#### *Group 1 Presentation and Peer-Review activity*

**\*\*Lecture Workshop Case: The Case of the Million-Dollar Decision (Available on MyLO)**

1. What was the ethical dilemma faced by the firm’s CEO in this case? Would the CEO’s decision to offer the payment simply be a good business decision under the circumstances?
2. Does it make any difference that such payments are an accepted practice in some parts of the world?
3. Who was harmed by the CEO’s payment? Who was helped by the payment?
4. Develop an Act Utilitarian analysis of this case. What course of action would an Act Utilitarian have recommended the CEO take? Would this recommendation be the same for a Rule Utilitarian?

### *Week 4—Deontological Ethics: Kantian Ethics*

#### *Group 2 Presentation and Peer-Review activity*

**\*\*Lecture Workshop Case: The Johnson Controls Case (Available on MyLO)**

1. What was the ethical dilemma faced by the firm in this case? How does the application of Kantianism (i.e. a deontological theory) differ from the application of a utilitarian theory to an ethical dilemma?
2. What self-imposed ethical laws (i.e. maxims) reflect the ethical dilemma choices in the case?
3. Define what is meant by ‘universalisable’, ‘respect for rational beings’, and ‘respect for autonomy’.
4. Which ethical dilemma choice would a Kantian recommend the company take in this case? By what criteria would they justify their recommendation?

## ***Week 5—Rights and Justice***

### ***Group 3 Presentation and Peer-Review activity***

***\*\*Lecture Workshop Cases: John Smith CEO & Karen's Dilemma (Available on MyLO)***

1. What was the ethical dilemma faced by the decision-maker in these cases?
2. Identify the groups affected by the company's actions. What claims to Rights (both positive and negative) might each of these groups had given the ethical dilemma choice to be made?
3. Using a Rights analysis, what course of action should the decision-maker have taken, given their ethical dilemma?
4. Define the five types of Justice that may be considered as part of an ethical analysis.
5. Using the principles of Distributive Justice, discuss how Rawl's 'Veil of Ignorance' might be used to guide the action of the decision-maker in this case.

## ***Week 6—Corporate Social Responsibility***

### ***Group 4 Presentation and Peer-Review activity***

***\*\*Lecture Workshop Case: The Killing of Kitty Genovese (Required reading #9)***

1. Describe Friedman's 'profit maximising perspective' on the social responsibility of corporations.
2. Describe Freeman's 'stakeholder perspective' on the social responsibility of corporations.
3. What are the limitations of Friedman and Freeman's perspectives? Are they particularly useful for practising managers?
4. Using the article by Hinkley (2007) describe the 'Moral Minimum' perspective of corporate social responsibility.
5. What is the Kew Garden's Principal? In what ways is it useful in guiding the social responsibility of corporations?

## ***Week 7—School of Management Study Week***

## ***Week 8—Corporate Governance, Trade Secrets and Conflicts of Interest***

***Case: The Boesky, Milken and an Insider Trading Case (Available on MyLO)***

1. What was the ethical dilemma in the case? Do you believe that Boesky acted ethically or unethically? Justify your answer.
2. According to Byrne et al (2002), identify the most important ethical issues surrounding corporate governance.
3. Define the notion of a 'Trade Secret'. When can information or knowledge be justifiably claimed as a 'trade secret' by a firm? What strategies might you adopt to protect your firm's trade secrets?
4. What are some ethically permissible methods of gathering competitor intelligence? What are some ethically prohibited methods of gathering competitor intelligence? What are the differences between the two?
5. Define the notion of a "Conflict of Interest". What are the potential ethical dilemmas that might arise from having a conflict of interest in the workplace, and what strategies might you consider employing to avoid them?

## ***Week 9—Safety, Risk and Environmental Protection***

***Case: The McDonald's Polystyrene Case (Available on MyLO)***

1. What was the ethical dilemma faced by McDonald's in this case?

2. Did McDonald's achieve the aim of 'doing no avoidable harm' to the environment when they made their decision to stop using Polystyrene packaging? Were there other forms of 'harm' that McDonald's avoided instead?
3. Using the major theories of ethics, what do you believe constitutes acceptable levels of safety and risk for (a) products, (b) production processes, and (c) environmental management?
4. Imagine that you are the manager of a firm whose production processes generate toxic waste. How might you use the ethical theories in your determination of an 'ethical level' of pollution?

### ***Week 10 – Whistle-Blowing***

#### ***Case: The Ford Pinto Case (Available on MyLO – Utilitarianism Case)***

1. What was the ethical dilemma faced by the engineers in the Ford Pinto Case?
2. Outline the 'loyalty' argument against whistle blowing. Did the engineers at Ford have any opportunity to blow the whistle internally?
3. By what criteria is a person ethically *permitted* (i.e. if they want to) to blow the whistle?
4. By what criteria is a person ethically *obligated* (i.e. they have no choice but) to blow the whistle?
5. Using the article by Zellner, Anderson & Cohn (2002), discuss what processes a firm might adopt to minimise the likelihood that its employees will externally blow the whistle?

### ***Week 11—Marketing, Truth and Advertising***

#### ***Case: The Nestle Infant Formula Case (Available on MyLO)***

1. What was the ethical dilemma faced by the management of Nestle in this case?
2. Can Nestlé's marketing strategy be justified under any of the ethical theories studied in this unit? Given your answer, were consumers ethically obligated to join the boycott on Nestlé's products?
3. What ethical issues might arise for each of the Basic Four Ps of the marketing mix (i.e. Product, Price, Place, and Promotion)?
4. Using the article by Richardson & McCord (2000), discuss the link between ethics, trust and firm performance. Discuss what you feel are the most important implications of this inter-relationship for managers.

### ***Week 12—Worker's Rights: Employment, Wages, and Unions PLUS OH&S***

#### ***Case: The Contentious Issue of Drug testing in the Workplace (Available on MyLO)***

1. What is/are the ethical dilemma(s) inherent to the case? What recommendations would each of the ethical theories have for the resolution of the ethical dilemma?
2. Do employees have a 'right to strike' against their employer? Using the ethical theories, determine when a strike action is ethically justified.
3. Identify the four major groups that are relevant to any strike consideration. Provide a discussion as to how they are relevant.
4. Are employee unions ethically justifiable? Explain your answer using the major ethical theories.

### ***Week 13—Worker's Rights & Duties within a Firm AND Discrimination, Affirmative Action & Reverse Discrimination***

#### ***Case 1: Drug and Polygraph Testing at Company X (Available on MyLO)***

1. What is the ethical dilemma inherent to the case? What recommendations would each of the ethical theories have for the resolution of the ethical dilemma?
2. Using the article by Weston (2001), identify the ethically justifiable rights employees and employers have in the employment relationship.

3. Define what is meant by 'worker loyalty'. Describe where an employer's expectation of loyalty is ethically justifiable. Describe when it might not be.

***Case 2: The Weber Case (Available on MyLO)***

1. What is the ethical dilemma inherent to the case? What recommendations would each of the ethical theories have for the resolution of the ethical dilemma?
2. Differentiate between functional and dysfunctional discrimination. Why do we need to make this distinction?
3. What are the arguments for and against affirmative action? How might you go about introducing an ethically justifiable affirmative action programme in your company?

---

## Assignment Topics

### Group Presentation + Peer Evaluation assessment activity

- Due Date:* In tutorials Weeks 3, 4, 5, & 6
- Length:* 30 minutes (maximum)
- Value:* 10 marks for the presenting group;  
5 marks for each of the student's THREE peer evaluations (i.e. 15 marks).  
The combined group presentation and peer evaluation assessment is worth 25 marks.

Students are required to form groups in their tutorials for the presentation/peer-evaluation assessment tasks. The presentation task will be worth 10 marks, and will be performed in Weeks 3, 4, 5, and 6 with the content assessed by their tutor. Students witnessing the presentation series are required to perform THREE (3) peer-evaluations worth 5 marks each. The peer evaluations are to be handed in *at the end of the tutorial session* and will be assessed by the tutor. Students are therefore required to present once in a group (for 10 marks) and peer-evaluate individually three times (for a total of 15 marks). **NOTE: Students may hand in any written work they wish as part of their peer evaluations - including work prepared in advance of the tutorial session.**

Students that are unable to complete the presentation or peer-evaluation tasks on medical or compassionate grounds (work or other commitments are **not** considered 'compassionate grounds') may request that they be permitted to submit alternative coursework.

It is expected that students undertaking the peer-evaluation exercise will be able to assess the presenting group in terms of the questions provided below.

#### *Topic for Group One: Utilitarianism*

Download the Utilitarianism Case from the unit's MyLO page, and use it as the basis for your tutorial presentation.

**TASK:** Define the elements of the Utilitarian theory of ethical obligation. In your definition, be sure to outline the steps required when attempting to undertake an effective Utilitarian analysis. Using the case available on MyLO, provide a Utilitarian analysis of the 'Ford Pinto - An amazing true story' case study. Detail and justify the decision you would make (as an Act Utilitarian) in this case.

Questions for peer-evaluation:

1. Did the group correctly define the Utilitarian theory of ethical obligation?
  - (a) Discuss the extent to which their definition was accurate and complete.
  - (b) Were there any other considerations the group could have included?
2. Did the group explain the steps in the application of Utilitarianism to an ethical dilemma?
  - (a) Were the steps correctly identified?
  - (b) Were there any important points not covered by the group? What were they?
3. Did the group apply Utilitarianism to the case study in an accurate and effective manner?
  - (a) Did the group omit any important issues? What were they?
  - (b) Did the group present any interesting facts you think were insightful?
4. Did the group present a logical and ethically justifiable set of recommendations to the ethical dilemma they faced in this case?
  - (a) Were the recommendations logical given the group's presentation of the facts?
  - (b) What additional recommendations would you have included?

### ***Topic for Group Two: Kantianism***

Download the Kantianism Study from the unit's MyLO page, and use it as the basis for your tutorial presentation.

**TASK:** Define the elements of the Kantian theory of ethical obligation. In your definition, be sure to outline the steps required when attempting to undertake an effective Kantian analysis. Using the case available on MyLO, provide a Kantian analysis of the 'Termination of a Work Colleague and Friend' case study. Detail and justify the decision you would make (as a Kantian) in this case.

Questions for peer-evaluation:

1. Did the group correctly define the Kantian theory of ethical obligation?
  - (a) Discuss the extent to which their definition was accurate and complete.
  - (b) Were there any other considerations the group could have included?
2. Did the group explain the steps in the application of Kantianism to an ethical dilemma?
  - (a) Were the steps correctly identified?
  - (b) Were there any important points not covered by the group? What were they?
3. Did the group apply Kantianism to the case study in an accurate and effective manner?
  - (a) Did the group omit any important issues? What were they?
  - (b) Did the group present any interesting facts you think were insightful?
4. Did the group present a logical and ethically justifiable set of recommendations to the ethical dilemma faced by the decision-maker in this case?
  - (a) Were the recommendations logical given the group's presentation of the facts?
  - (b) What additional recommendations would you have included?

### ***Topic for Group Three: Rights***

Download the Rights Case from the unit's MyLO page, and use it as the basis for your tutorial presentation.

**TASK:** Define the elements of the Rights theory of ethical action. In your definition, be sure to outline the steps required when attempting to undertake an effective Rights analysis. Using the case available on MyLO, provide a Rights analysis of the 'Contentious Issue of Smoking versus Non-Smoking' case. Detail and justify the decision you would make (as an Ethical Rights activist) in this case.

Questions for peer-evaluation:

1. Did the group correctly define the Rights theory of ethics?
  - (a) Discuss the extent to which their definition was accurate and complete.
  - (b) Were there any other considerations the group could have included?
2. Did the group explain the steps in the application of Rights to an ethical dilemma?
  - (a) Were the steps correctly identified?
  - (b) Were there any important points not covered by the group? What were they?
3. Did the group apply Rights theory to the case study in an accurate and effective manner?
  - (a) Did the group omit any important issues? What were they?
  - (b) Did the group present any interesting facts you think were insightful?
4. Did the group present a logical and ethically justifiable set of recommendations to the ethical dilemma faced by the decision-maker in this case?
  - (a) Were the recommendations logical given the group's presentation of the facts?
  - (c) What additional recommendations would you have included?

### ***Topic for Group Four: Justice***

Download the Justice Case from the unit's MyLO page, and use it as the basis for your tutorial presentation.

**TASK:** Define the elements of the Distributive Justice theory of ethical action. In your definition, be sure to outline the steps required when attempting to undertake an effective Distributive Justice analysis. Using the case available on MyLO, provide a Distributive Justice analysis of the 'Case of the Plant Relocation'. Detail and justify the decision you would make (as a Distributive Justice activist) in this case.

Questions for peer-evaluation:

1. Did the group correctly define the Distributive Justice theory of ethics?
  - (a) Discuss the extent to which their definition was accurate and complete.
  - (b) Were there any other considerations the group could have included?
2. Did the group explain the steps in the application of Distributive Justice to an ethical dilemma?
  - (a) Were the steps correctly identified?
  - (b) Were there any important points not covered by the group? What were they?
3. Did the group apply Distributive Justice to the case study in an accurate and effective manner?
  - (a) Did the group omit any important issues? What were they?
  - (b) Did the group present any interesting facts you think were insightful?
4. Did the group present a logical and ethically justifiable set of recommendations to the ethical dilemma faced by the decision-maker in this case?
  - (a) Were the recommendations logical given the group's presentation of the facts?
  - (b) What additional recommendations would you have included?

**BMA2/391 Group Mark Allocation Adjustment**

---

Your group’s presentation will be marked out of a score of 10. This document allows you to provide feedback as to *what percentage* of that mark you believe each individual member of your group should receive. Note: all members will receive 100% of the group’s mark unless this form is submitted to your tutor.

If you feel that a group member has not contributed equally, please place a value of between 0% and 100% next to that group member’s name that reflects their level of input.

The mark that students receive from their group’s presentation will equal:

**(The group’s overall score) multiplied by (the individual’s average “contribution score”).**

For example...Group A consists of John, Adam, Mary, and Jane. Their tutor awarded the group a score of 8/10 for their presentation. Because John and Jane did not contribute equally, Adam and Mary both filled in the Mark Adjustment form. After speaking to John and Jane about their input, their tutor altered the marks allocated as follows:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Group’s Overall Score</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>% Contribution</b>	<b>Student’s Score</b>
John	8	x	50%	4
Adam	8	x	100%	8
Mary	8	x	100%	8
Jane	8	x	75%	6

In the section provided below, please write the names of your fellow group members and *the percentage of the score you believe that individual deserves*.

**Student Name**

**% Contribution**

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

**Signed:**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

---

## Assignment Topics

### Assignment: Case Research and Analysis

*Due Date:* Monday, September 28<sup>th</sup> at 2pm.

Students are required to submit their Major Assignment in both hard copy (as per normal procedure) and as an electronic document via the Turn-it-In software program on MyLO.

*Length:* 2500 words MAXIMUM (NOTE: there is no 10% leeway)

*Value:* 25 marks

#### ***The Yahoo! Human Rights Case***

In 2007, 'Yahoo' was put on trial for its alleged compliance in violating the human rights of its customers in China. Your task is to research the facts underpinning the "Yahoo! Human Rights" case, and to provide a written report\* detailing your ethical analysis of the case.

**OR**

#### ***The Microsoft "Windows Vista ® Capable" Case***

In 2007, the Microsoft Corporation was forced to defend itself against claims that its "Windows Vista ® Capable" marketing strategy was misleading and deceptive. Your task is to research the facts underpinning the "Windows Vista ® Capable" case, and to provide a written report\* detailing your ethical analysis of the case.

**OR**

#### ***The Merck & Co "Hit List" Case***

In 2009, the Merck Corporation were forced to defend themselves in the Federal Court against charges that they "planned to neutralise or discredited doctors and academics that criticised the anti-arthritis drug it produced". Your task is to research the facts underpinning the "Merck & Co Hit List" case, and to provide a written report\* detailing your ethical analysis of the case.

\*Your report must include a discussion of the following:

1. Describe the facts you feel underpinned the case. Be sure to include an account of the ethical assumptions and values of the major stakeholders in this case.
2. Who was the decision-maker in the case, and what conflicting demands did they have to accommodate?
3. What was the initial *ethical dilemma* faced by the decision-maker in this case?
4. Using the Utilitarian, Kantian, Rights, and Distributive Justice approaches to ethical decision-making, provide an analysis of the ethical dilemma.
5. Present and justify the final recommendation you would have made to the decision-maker in this case had they asked you for advice on how to resolve their initial ethical dilemma.

NOTE: You **are not** required to define any of the ethical theories in your assignment. You are required, however, to fully reference the case facts you report in your assignment.



SIGNED: \_\_\_\_\_

## Study Schedule

Semester 2, 2009

Week	Date of Lecture	Required Readings (all on MyLO)	Topic	Due Dates
1	15 July	Required Readings #1 and 2	Introduction: Ethics and Business	
2	22 July	Required Reading #3	Utilitarianism	
3	29 July	Required Reading #4	Kantian ethics + Utilitarianism Workshop	Group 1 Presentation
4	5 August	Required Readings #5 and 6	Ethical Rights and Justice + Kantianism Workshop	Group 2 Presentation
5	12 August	Required Readings #7, 8 and 9	Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) + Rights/Justice Workshop	Group 3 Presentation
6	19 August	Required Readings #10, 11, 12, 13 and 14	Corporate governance, Trade Secrets and Conflicts of Interest + CSR Workshop	Group 4 Presentation
7	26 August		<i>School of Management Study Week</i>	No lecture or tutorials held during this week
Mid-Semester Break 1 September —7 September				
8	9 September	Required Readings #15, 16, 17 and 18	Safety, Risk and Environmental Protection	
9	16 September	Required Readings #19, 20, and 21	Whistle Blowing	
10	23 September	Required Readings #22 and 23	Marketing, Truth and Advertising	
11	30 September	Required readings #24 and 25	Worker's Rights: Employment, Wages and Unions PLUS OH&S	Assignment Due, Monday 28 <sup>th</sup> September at 2pm.
12	7 October	Required Reading #26 and 27	Privacy at Work: Rights, Duties and Obligations	
13	14 October	Required Readings #28 and 29	Discrimination, Affirmative Action and Reverse Discrimination PLUS Unit Review	
A Calendar/Study Planner showing dates is available from School of Management website at <a href="http://www.utas.edu.au/mgmt/student.htm">http://www.utas.edu.au/mgmt/student.htm</a> .				