Can Ethics be taught?
- Socrates or Wall Street Journal?
- Moral perception and moral judgements influence behavior.
- Dramatic changes occur in young adults in their 20s and 30s
  - Basic problem-solving strategies used to deal with ethical issues.
  - Linked to fundamental changes in how a person perceives society and his or her role in society.
  - Extent of change is associated with the number of years of formal education (college or professional school).

Can Ethics Be Taught?
- How is it taught?
- Alternatives?
  - Moral operating system:

Ethical “Skills”
- Moral Blindness (discernment)
- Moral Imagination (openness)
  - Ability to develop multiple alternatives
- Moral Reasoning (logic – fidelity of analysis)
- Have the “will” to “do the right thing.”

1. Shows inconsistencies between expressed emotions and body language.
2. Tells numerous lies—which are denied.
3. Appears bigger than life and has a charismatic personality.
4. Has a spotty employment history.
5. Says things that are cold and callous, and then says, “I was just kidding . . .” (probably after seeing your reaction).
6. Acts remorseless in circumstances that normally require an apology.
7. Is irresponsible about paying bills.
8. Talks about impressive, unrealistic plans for the future.
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10. Frequently blames others for mistakes.
11. Expects much more from relationships than others are willing to give in return (materially and emotionally).
12. Is secretive about the past.
13. Refuses to answer e-mails or says very little in writing (having learned that e-mails can later be used against one).
14. Repeatedly cheats in relationships for excitement and the challenge.
15. Is secretive about career and source of income (understandable if you are working for the CIA - which, by the way, does not exclude one from being a psychopath).
16. Is described by others as laid back, cool, unruffled, an android.
17. Has a rap sheet (has been arrested).

Question 1: I do not care what motivates other people; I judge them solely on the basis of what they do.
- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Question 2: When I am trying to decide what the right thing to do is, I look at the consequences of the various alternatives open to me.
- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Question 3: The right thing to do is whatever is best for everyone.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral / undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

Question 4: We should look at the overall consequences of our actions in each and every case.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral / undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

Question 5: If someone tries to do the right thing but it works out badly, they still deserve moral credit for trying.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral / undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

Question 6: What is the most important thing in life?
   - Pleasure
   - Happiness
   - Ideas such as truth and beauty
   - Having your preferences satisfied

How do you see right and wrong?

Ethical Philosophies vs. Reasoning

Philosophy

Teleology
- (Actions / Consequences)
  vs
- Deontology
  - (Actions – ONLY)
    vs
- Virtues
  - (Actor – ONLY)

Reasoning

- Utility
  vs
- Justice
  vs
- Rights
  vs
- Care

Philosophy to Frameworks

- **Absolute**
  - Deontology
    - Ethics of Duty [action] (Ethical laws)
      - Principles willed into Universal laws
      - Treat people as ends (not means)
  - Virtues (Aristotle)
    - Higher levels of CMD
    - Ethics of Character

- **Relative**
  - Utilitarianism (Bentham & Mills)
    - Ethics of consequences
  - Virtues (Aristotle)
    - Lower levels of CMD
    - Ethics of Character

Philosophical Foundations

- Teleological (design & purpose)
  - Results (consequences) oriented
    - Actions have no intrinsic ethical character (acquire moral status from their consequences) or
  - Deontological (obligation)
    - Act oriented
      - Actions are inherently right or wrong (e.g., lying, cheating, stealing)
  - Character (nature of individual)
    - Standards of conduct / behavior
**Ethics: Analytic Framework**

- **Consequences**
  - Concerned with goals, outcomes (consequences)
  - Maximum good, minimum harm
  - Cost-Benefit approach

- **Rules-Based**
  - Emphasis on duty, moral obligation
  - Concerned with "oughts"

- **Values/Character**
  - Emphasizes differing standards of conduct
  - Espouses observing "local" standards

- **Utilitarianism**
  - Best for the most
  - Produce the most net utility

- **Categorical Imperative**
  - Respect for individuals (as ends, not means to an end)
  - Apply criteria consistently
  - If roles reversed; would you want same decision?

- **Fundamentalism**
  - No one above authority of rule
  - Context prevails

- **Relativism**
  - No one "right" way
  - Circumstances prevail

**Methods of Reasoning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Critical Determining Factor</th>
<th>An Action is Ethical when...</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>Comparing benefits and costs</td>
<td>Net benefits exceed costs</td>
<td>Difficult to measure some human and social costs; majority may disregard the rights of the minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>Respecting entitlements</td>
<td>Basic human rights are respected</td>
<td>Difficult to balance conflicting rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Distributing fair shares</td>
<td>Benefits and costs are fairly distributed</td>
<td>Difficult to measure benefits and costs; lack of agreement on fair shares (fair may not be equal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Honoring relationships</td>
<td>The involved party is given due consideration</td>
<td>Requires situational ethics; Difficult to justify under any of the other frameworks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The information ethics matrix**

values and rights in electronic environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rights values</th>
<th>right to read</th>
<th>right to write</th>
<th>right to learn</th>
<th>right to communicate</th>
<th>right to filter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>autonomy</td>
<td>development, self-determination</td>
<td>participation, open access</td>
<td>development, information competence</td>
<td>deliberative democracy, privacy, data protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusiveness</td>
<td>information for all</td>
<td>participation</td>
<td>education for all</td>
<td>collaboration, knowledge sharing, self-determination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>justice</td>
<td>free access</td>
<td>knowledge sharing</td>
<td>education for all</td>
<td>inter-generational access, no censorship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability</td>
<td>open access</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>life-long learning</td>
<td>information ecology, information control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>