

1. Is the profit motive essentially self-interested and as such does that make it immoral? Use the framework of utilitarianism to answer this question: (a) begin with the assumption that each individual's interests are morally valuable with the consequence that each should be allowed to pursue his/her own interests; (b) spell out the justification of morally limiting these individual pursuits where it is necessary to maximize the overall interests of the most people.

If you understand the profit motive as a person's attempt to maximize one's own personal gain, then it is essentially self-interested. Utilitarianism, as an ethical view, begins similarly by understanding each person's motivation in terms of one's own self interest and characterizes an individual's pursuit of self interest as having moral value. However, the notion of what is morally right is different and depends, according to utilitarianism, on the consequences of one's action with respect to the interests of others. In other words, pursuing my self-interest (which has moral value) may be immoral if it does not lead to the maximization of others' interests. Of course, this means that some pursuits of self-interest are immoral. With regard to the profit motive, this means that, on utilitarian grounds, pursuing the profit motive is immoral, if it does not lead to the maximization of the interests of others.

2. Please offer counterexamples to following claims: (a) 'x is a game iff x is a business,' and (b) 'x is a competition iff x is a game.'

To counterexample (a), there are lots of card games, like poker, or board games, like Monopoly, which are played, but these clearly are not businesses. To counterexample (b), the text uses the example of Darwinian competition in evolution which characterizes the survival of species as a competition in a certain environment for survival, but this is no game, as we would defined game as an including shared rules and a defined stopping point after which a person returns to his/her own life.

3. What considerations were offered in class to alter the claim that “responsibility requires personhood” to “responsibility only requires the ability to act.”

The first quote claims that personhood is a necessary condition for responsibility. To show that this is false, let's first look at a different, but related claim: personhood is sufficient for social responsibility. This sufficiency claim is incorrect. There are two types of counterexamples: desert island and quadriplegic cases. In both situations, either because of extreme isolation or inability, a person is unable to act in any socially responsible manner (in the first case, the person is not able to do anything which would effect others, and in the second case, the person is unable to act at all). In these situations, we excuse a person from any type of responsibility because the responsibility to do x requires the ability to do x. This means that if a person does not have the ability, then they do not have the responsibility. In conclusion, what seems to be the relevant necessary condition for social responsibility is having the ability to act. The above distinction may not make a difference if whatever has the ability to act is also a person. However, corporations have the ability to act, but are not persons. We can propose a couple of additional sufficient conditions as follows: if x has the ability to act and can receive benefits from society and can act to improve/damage society, then x has social responsibility. If this is true, then persons are not necessary for social responsibility. Both people and corporations, as well as governments, can have social responsibilities.

4. Part of Lennick's “business case” for ethics is the distinction between threshold and differentiating competencies. What is this distinction and how does Lennick use it to make his case? Also, summarize his more specific “business case” for ethics.

(From pp. 5 – 18) A business leader needs to have various cognitive and technical intelligence *threshold competencies*. This means that you are a good learner and have expertise about your particular business area. These competencies are necessary to have but they are not enough to make you stand out from others. To do so you need to have *differentiating competencies* and these are emotional (the ability to monitor one's own and other's emotions and use this information as a guide to your actions) and moral intelligence (awareness of moral principles and the ability to apply them to your own actions.)

Lennick's business case for ethics is that moral intelligence will positively distinguish you from others in your field, as well as will lead to sustainable business success, help you in the war for talent, and keep you from being morally stupid!

5. Lennick distinguishes emotional intelligence (EI) and moral intelligence (MI). In your own words, please illustrate the relation between EI and MI – is one sufficient or necessary for the other? How do these ideas relate to what Lennick calls sustainable and optimal performance?

EI is the ability to monitor one's own and other's emotions and use this information as a guide to your actions. MI is the awareness of moral principles and the ability to apply them to your own actions. Lennick claims that EI is necessary for MI, but not sufficient for it, because EI, alone, won't keep you from doing the wrong thing (see pp. 8-9). Both are very important, EI is important for obtaining an optimal performance, but Lennick believes that EI, alone, is not sufficient for long term consistent performance, MI is what is necessary for sustainable performance. (see pp. xxx-xxxi.)

6. Please outline Lennick's three boxes (and their contents) that express living in alignment. In class, which boxes did Lennick label ideality and reality? Please define alignment, list the qualities needed to help us stay in alignment, and the two typical ways in which misalignment can occur.

See p. 38 and the paragraph immediately after figure 3.1. See pp. 64-66, especially the paragraph after the bolded: **Staying Aligned**. On p. 68, is a description of the two typically ways of being misaligned.

7. Define Lennick's four universal principles, the behavioral competencies of each and the positive business consequences of each.

See p. 78, what is listed as "related moral competencies," he called behavioral competencies in class. The positive business consequences are trust, inspiration, retention, and innovation, respectively.

8. Outline the experiential triangle. How does this triangle illustrate what Lennick calls the power of the mind? Give some examples in which thoughts can change emotions and physiology. Of course, alignment depends on our accurate self awareness of our thoughts, emotions, and actions. Self awareness is also important in order to detect destructive emotions and moral viruses. Define and illustrate Lennick's 4 R's: recognition, reflect, reframe, and response by using his freeze frame exercise.

The experiential triangle is the relationship between thoughts, emotions, and behaviors. Thoughts can cause emotions (and vice versa). In class, we did two exercises of deliberately thinking of a positive and a negative memory in our past, and then being aware of the accompanying emotion arising within us. If we wish to remain in alignment, we need to be aware of our thoughts (moral viruses can arise within us) and emotions (destructive emotions can also arise within us). Lennick's 4 R's comprise a technique to aid us in being self aware of our thoughts and emotions. The first step is recognition: we need to be able to be aware of what we are thinking and feeling at any time. We have a tendency to go on "cruise control" and lose track of what we are actually thinking and feeling. The second step is reflection: is the result of the first step, i.e. an awareness of my actual thought and feelings, in alignment with my moral compass? The third step is reframe: if I am out of alignment, then I need to come up with some techniques in order to change my thoughts and/or feeling. The fourth step is response: to implement these changes.