

## **Should Organizations Be Expected to Be Ethical?**

Susan Sapsed

Independent Healthcare Consultant

Bedfordshire, UK

### **Abstract**

This paper explores how ethical principles have provided the basis for several concepts which underpin employment, corporation and many other types of establishments today. It broadens personal and commercial priorities far outside conventional business which have only aimed at making a profit and satisfying their shareholders. Unfortunately there appears to be no universal agreement regarding the underlying principles of ethics, no absolute criterion or controls, or no fixed and firm reference points (Hinman, 2012; Chapman, 2015). This is thought-provoking when considering how important ethics has become in contemporary life and society. Chapman (2015) continues by saying that ethical behaviour is a comparative judgement as well as a personal one therefore we cannot enforce one society's principles onto another society who may have different ideologies (La Follette, 2007). So after investigating the question the answer is based on the interpretation of ethics.

### **What Do We Mean by Ethical Principles Work?**

These principles are divided into two main fields non-consequential and consequential. Non-consequentialist is usually referred to as Deontology (or Formalism). This word is derived from Greek and means 'duty' (Andrew, 2006). Therefore, it can be said to be derived from principles which have developed slowly from many resources such as religion and cultures. Kant subscribed to the belief that veracity is related to certain perpetual, intellectual and constant principles that people apply to all ethical problems (Altman, 2011).

Deontologists consider that they are not just negotiators who ask for sought-after ends, but react to the acts of others. Beauchamp and Childless (2013) consider this principles embraces autonomy, beneficence, justice and non-maleficence which respect people's confidentiality, privacy, and competency. Therefore, according to Beauchamp and Childless (2013) an act is

not considered by its results, but whether it is seen to be right or wrong according to the moral code which would see it as agreeing or rejecting. The principle is concerned solely on the motives of an action rather than its consequences. Jehovah's Witnesses frequently use these principles when refusing blood as they consider it would comprise their religious practice. In contrast Consequential (teleological) ethics are usually subdivided into Egoism and Utilitarianism. According to Holland (2007) consequentialism stresses that the undertaking is governed solely by the outcomes. The outcomes are required to act in ways that produce the most acceptable results to the majority. It uses an approach of analysis so that the judgments are judicious and self-centred. Consequentialist theory specifically asks:

Which outcomes are morally valid?

What weight should we give them?

By what means should we apply them in moral reckoning?

Jeremy Bentham became known as one of the most influential of the utilitarian's, through his own work and that of his students. The belief which he accepted was that an act is correct when it is seen in relation to proportion to happiness gained. By happiness it is regarded as that which can be achieved for the majority. Utilitarianism focuses on the shared well-being man to minimize pain and looks towards the gains (Sucher, 2008). Therefore it can be seen that an act is morally right if it results in the greatest good for the greatest number of people affected. This is often referred to as a cost-benefit analysis. Frequently past and present have no influence on the decision making. Utilitarianism is seen as being independent and detached as it creates happiness (Klikauer, 2010). The conundrum this presumes is that everybody has a similarly appreciation of happiness. What happens if corruption is the ruler?

Egoism can be defined as having the focus on intensification of one's desires and pursuits. Therefore, it can be seen that an outcome is morally right when the decision-maker freely decides to follow their ambitions or long-term goals. The person knows their act will bring them satisfaction without personal harm. Klikauer (2010) suggests that the person weighs up consequences and any alternatives so that least harm to themselves occurs. The people who come to mind are terrorists' but one must remember that to-days villains may be tomorrow's heroes as with Mandela. Chapman (2015) supports this point by saying "*Standards of what is considered ethical change over time, and generally these standards become more humane as humankind develops greater tolerance, awareness, and capacity for forgiveness and compassion*". Could Egoism equal selfishness (see appendix 1)?

More recently the principle of Relativism has evolved whereby all opinions are equally valid, and that all truth is relative to the individual or culture. Ward and Trobisch (2013) state “*Relativism is the philosophical position that all points of view are equally valid and that all truth is relative to the individual. This means that all moral positions, all religious systems, all art forms, all political movements, are truths that are relative to the individual. Under the umbrella of relativism whole groups of perspectives are categorized. In obvious terms, some are:*

- **Cognitive relativism**- *Cognitive relativism affirms that all truth is relative. This would mean that no system of truth is more valid than another one and that there is no objective standard of truth. It would, naturally, deny that there is a God of absolute truth.*
- **Moral/ethical relativism** - *all morals are relative to the social group within which they are constructed.*
- **Situational relativism** - *that ethics (right and wrong) are dependent upon the situation”.*

Crane and Matten (2010) state that these principles have made it easier for business since the Western ethical principles are usually based on consequentialist and non-consequentialist.



Locke conceptualized ethics into right and justice, he claimed that humans are entitled to certain ‘natural rights’ or moral claims, such as rights to life, freedom and property, freedom of speech, conscience, consent, privacy and entitlement to a fair legal process. These natural rights ‘are a certain basic, important and unalienable entitlements that should be respected and protected in every single action (Crane, & Matten, 2010.) These rights are sometimes seen as related to duties, since the rights of one person can impose duties on another. Examples:

- Declaration of the Rights of Man
- American Constitution
- United Nations Declarations of Human Rights

Limitation: the philosophies of justices are firmly positioned in a Western view of standards especially human rights.

Apart from these fields one can explore many sub-divisions (see appendix 2).

## **Ethical Investment**

Chapman (2015) “*considers ethical investment has been a growing aspect of business investment since the 1970s, although arguably the first types of ethical businesses can be traced back to the Quaker and Methodist movements of the 1800s. He continues by stating traditional profit-based business models, which arose and came to dominate global commerce from the beginnings of industrialisation, inherently do not require a socially responsible element, other than compliance with the law, and a reflection of public reaction for pragmatic marketing (and ultimately profit) purposes. The ethical approach to business and investment seeks to maximise profit and return on investment while minimising and avoiding where possible negative social effects. In this context 'social' and 'socially responsible' include related factors such as:*

- *the environment*
- *sustainability*
- *globalization effects - e.g., exploitation, child-labour, social and environmental damage anywhere in the world*
- *corruption, armed conflict and political issues*
- *staff and customers relations - for instance education and training, health and safety, duty of care*
- *local community*
- *and other social impacts on people's health and well-being” (Chapman, 2015.)*

This is not seen as an absolute listing it only highlights a few issues. Chapman says its examples some of ethical issues which are seen by Western investors and business people:

- *Industries such as tobacco*
- *Weapons that can be used in war*
- *nuclear expansion including weapons*
- *Scientific experimentation with all types of animals*
- *Countries which have oppressive or corrupt systems*

Popular opinion Chapman (2015) says is a substantial influence in the deliberation of what is ethical, may result in organisation ethics having their reputation made. Since influences can be seen to go both ways, ethics has become an essential part of business today. Poor ethical decisions will spread quickly. Ward (2013) says we cannot ignore influence of global ethics especially in relation to the expansion of technology.

## **The Role of Ethics in 21st Century Organizations**

In the 21st century, ethics is neither a luxury nor an option. Brimmer (2007) in his article says “*more than competence, experience, intelligence and drive, people at all levels of an organization need ethical values*”. According to Kidder (2001), “*The principle task of this decade is the creation and nurturing of a values-based culture*”. Kidder (2001) is the founder and president of the Institute for Global Ethics he states the following factors should be included:

- **Shared core values**—which are honesty, respect, responsibility, fairness and compassion.
- **Common language** - employees need a language of ethics that can be easily understood.
- **Commitment at the top** - ethics training must be throughout the whole organisations.
- **Moral courage** - face up to ethical dilemmas and wrongdoings firmly and confidently, without flinching or retreating.

Brimmer (2007) considers “*ethics, lifestyle and culture must become so interwoven that they cannot be separated. Together, they constitute how people relate to one another in the home, the workplace and every part of society*”. He also suggests that we move between theories depending on how a situation presents. I would agree since I would consider my ethical stance would be relativism; however I know I can use deontology when required. Early in my career as a midwife as paediatric house officers were not allowed to be called after 12 midnight to a delivery if we as midwives had a query with regard to the baby’s condition if they were born, they needed their sleep. Around 2am I delivered a baby who was obviously had Down’s Syndrome it was not recognised by the parents who were delighted with their daughter. Knowing they needed to be told I could not leave it to 10 am round for the house officers to tell them. So I rung the doctor and said the baby was cold he knew it was not and I needed him. He came and saw the parents and the sad news was imparted. The delivery suite was very busy we then delivered a preterm baby and had a caesarean section so he did not get back to bed until after 7 am and would need to call the registrar to do his morning clinic. No problem there, until the head of the department heard about it and I was sent for, any discussion was completely overruled and I was severely reprimanded, but I knew my action was correct. The policy changed six weeks later.

### **Should Businesses Be Expected to Behave Ethically?**

In the article "*Do businesses behave ethically?*" (tutor 2, 2010). It makes the following points by: "*arguing that businesses are products of the society in which they operate, in which they sell their products, and in which they hire their employees. So businesses should be expected to reflect the ethical standards of the surrounding society. One problem with this view is that society does not always have clear ethical standards to which businesses can adhere to. For example, some people care passionately about animal experiments, and argue it is deeply unethical, whereas many other people say such experiments are justified if real people benefit medically from the research. What is a business supposed to do? The opposite argument is that business is supposed to make a profit for their owners, to create jobs for employees, and to create wealth for society as a whole. Anything else is at best an irrelevance and at worst simply gets in the way of profitable business. Since argument is that businesses in the real world (or most of them, at least) would like to do both, if possible. There will always be conflicts. What then happens? Does the business stick with the ethical behaviour? Usually the business will go for the profits and it is this which upsets many people, although perhaps people sometimes expect too much and have not really thought through the consequences of their own opinions*" (tutor2u, 2010).

### **Are Businesses Behaving More Ethically?**

Business needs to look at which layer of their management behaviours ethically as current research would suggest that senior managers are more driven by profit than the middle and first line manager. It is apparent that middle and first line managers are more involved with the public and therefore have a different awareness of their customers' views. Sensitivity to public opinion in relation to their ethical behaviour was the mighty Shell Company with regard to the oil pipelines in Nigeria and the Brent Spar oil tanks in the North Sea the latter led to arson attacks particularly in Germany. Sceptics argue this is not because of a change of heart, but just another change in response to the changes in market conditions; however the pursuit of profit remains uppermost otherwise the organisation fails.

### **The Growth of Corporate Responsibility**

The UK CBI defines corporate social responsibility as the acknowledgement by companies that they should be accountable for the impact of their activities on society and/or the environment. Over the last decade this type of awareness has slowly become part of business it is not a law but an acceptable face of business in the eyes of its customers. No longer is it acceptable for the UK to dump waste in another country or shipping to dump their waste at

sea. To-day it would consider this to be undesirable behaviour. Unfortunately it is not as easy as it sounds since public opinion may want a business closed because of for example pollution but the community would be devastated by the loss of jobs and community income. However, one has to recognise pressure groups are much better organised which has been aided by new technology. They are better organised, better financed and better able to attack businesses. From personal knowledge when Huntingdon Life Sciences UK was attacked by the Animal Liberation Movement their methods were extreme and threatened employees as well as shareholders and banks. Resulting in the business nearly becoming insolvent. Interestingly in 1798 Jeremy Bentham strongly supported vivisection (procedures on live animals) under his theory of utilitarianism as the results would progress the understanding of human anatomy and physiology so ensuring the greatest good for humanity. To-day in the UK animals are protected by the 2010/63/EU policy. Do pressure groups go out to find a business weak point? Do they need regulating or would this allow bad practices to return?

### **European Policy on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)**

In October 2011 the European Commission published “*A Renewed EU strategy 2011-14 for Corporate Social Responsibility*”. The Commission defines corporate social responsibility as “the responsibility of enterprises for their impacts on society” (p. 6). To fully meet their social responsibility, enterprises they “*should have in place a process to integrate social, environmental, ethical human rights and consumer concerns into their business operations and core strategy in close collaboration with their stakeholders*” (Carson, 2013, p.17). With the aim “*of maximising the creation of shared value for their owners/shareholders and for their other stakeholders and society at large; and identifying, preventing and mitigating their possible adverse impacts*” (Spiesshofer, 2013; p.36) This new policy was welcomed by all member states as a positive innovation for new provisions and facilities that would be positive to society and to minimise and prevent adverse influences. The Commission's policy puts forward an agenda for action covering the period 2011-2014 (see appendix 3). Was this new directive responsible for the recent statement from GlaxoSmithKline who are the sixth-largest global drug maker? They announced that it will no longer hire doctors to promote its drugs. The company will stop extra payment to their representatives’ in-line with their sales, for example number of prescriptions written by GP’s or Consultants. However these changes will be introduced during the next two years worldwide.

Where as it does not appear to have influenced the McDonald's Happy Meals for children as with each meal they received a toy and like all children they wanted to complete the whole set, so a demand for more McDonalds. The criticism started in San Francisco where a ban was demanded regarding the selling toys with fast food for children where they exceed acceptable health levels of salt, fat, calories and sugar. AS a result McDonald's did produce healthy alternatives which included apple slices and milk however are children willing to eat them? The high sodium content in burgers has not been addresses. Although McDonald has made an announcement in May (2015) of this year to say they are changing their meals.

Rajeev Syal reported back for The Guardian on Friday 3 January 2014 that "*Drug Companies are accused of holding back complete information on clinical trials*". This coincided with the UK. MPs concerns after receiving a report into decision to stockpile Tamiflu as its efficacy was misleading. A review of 20 existing studies into Tamiflu by the Cochrane Collaboration concluded it '*did not reduce influenza-related lower respiratory tract complications*'. A highly respected parliamentary committee voiced the possibility that clinical trial results are being routinely withheld from doctors, undermining their ability to make informed decisions about how to treat patients. MPs have spoken of their concern that drug manufacturers appear to publish approximately 50% of their results and warned that this practice has a "*ramifications for the whole of medicine*". Another point was that the MPs' exposed that experts did not agree how effective Tamiflu was however these discussions were hindered because it was suggested that important information was being held back or refused.

Syal (2014) reported in an article by Richard Bacon who was a senior member of the committee "*the practice of holding back results was undermining the ability of doctors, researchers and patients to make informed decisions about treatments. Regulators and the industry have made proposals to open up access, but these do not cover the issue of access to the results of trials in the past which bear on the efficacy and safety of medicines in use today. Research suggests that the probability of completed trials being published is roughly 50%. And trials which gave a favourable verdict are about twice as likely to be published as trials giving unfavourable results*".

He reported that Bacon said "*This was of extreme concern to this committee. The Department of Health and Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency [MHRA] must make sure, prospectively and retrospectively, that clinical trials are registered and the full methods and results of all trials are available for independent wider scrutiny by doctors and*



researchers. The committee noted that an NHS National Institute for Health Research review in 2010 estimated that the chance of completed trials being published is roughly half. Trials with positive results were about twice as likely to be published as trials with negative results”.

Syal (2014) commented that Dr Fiona Godlee, editor-in-chief of the British Medical Journal “told the MPs that the pharmaceutical industry published more positive results than negative ones from their trials. She noted that the journal had published very clear summaries of systematic reviews of data on individual medicines or classes of medicines where, when you add together the published and unpublished evidence, you get a very different picture of the quality and effectiveness of those drugs”. A review by the non-profit Cochrane Collaboration into 20 existing studies into Tamiflu found it "did not reduce influenza-related lower respiratory tract complications" but did induce nausea. It is now receiving full clinical study reports from manufacturer Roche, which are being used to complete a further review of the effectiveness of Tamiflu. The results of that should be used by government, the MHRA and the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence to review the drug's use, MPs said”.

MPs’ called on ministers to take action so that full trial results are available to doctors and researchers for all treatments currently being prescribed and carry out regular audits of how much information is being made available. A Medicines & Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency spokesman said they would work with partners in the UK and in the EU to ensure greater transparency in the dissemination of clinical trials information, ensuring that money was not wasted by stockpiling ineffective drugs.

### **Increasing Consumer Activism**

Consumer campaigns can be forceful and persuasive often sufficient enough for consumers stop buying the product. An example of parent pressure back in the 1980’s was when Cow and Gate decided to pink baby grows on one tin and blue on another. However, it caused chaos as the mother thought it indicated which one they should feed their baby, but it did not. Pink was 1-3 months and blue was 3-6 months. So as midwives we had some ill babies. The company were embarrassed and immediately withdrew the tins and then made them all white baby grows. Recently the action by UK mother’s to remove sweets from the cash tills or they would switch food stores since these stores were advertising healthy diets it worked

dramatically. Businesses can become guilty by association. Businesses may also have trouble recruiting enough good employees if their ethical practice is cast into doubt.

### **Benefits of Ethical Behaviour**

The main benefits for a business of behaving ethically are:

1. Averting of expensive and awkward PR disasters.
2. Improved impression with its consumers which will increase profits.
3. Appropriate recruitment to fit the business.
4. Employee interest and motivation so they are proud of their jobs.

### **Effects of Ethical Behaviour**

1. Business now are confronted with extra cost so they are not seen to be paying below the market wage as seen in India or dump waste material as seen in Nigeria.
2. Therefore organisations have to rationalise profit and ethical standards.
3. Organisations' now have to ensure their culture equals best business practice.
4. They equally have to ensure all their suppliers equally comply to their standards. This has been a problem in Brazil with regard to their trade in mahogany. As an expensive wood there is illegal trading so now sales have to have an officially recognised stamp to guarantee the source.

### **Can Businesses Be Expected to Behave ethically?**

The current debate is that businesses parallel the ways in which society work in relation to how they sell their merchandises and engage their employees. So should businesses replicate the ethical concerns of their communities? Immediately we can see a problem as communities do not always agree on their ethical principles so how can business adhere to them when there is no set agenda. It must be remembered that all businesses have to make a profit for their shareholders. Without a profit jobs cannot be created and the wealth for society would be affected. So it is essential that businesses are profitable, so they have to see how they can balance the argument as they function in real world so find they have to work to both agendas if possible. Therefore, can it be seen that conflicts will continue? How should businesses act ethically? Business must always look to being profitable otherwise their shareholders and the community may destroy them. However, it must be recognised that sometimes the expectations are unrealistic and have not really been considered appropriately.

## **Business Ethics**

Business Ethics can be said to be comparatively new however they become an essential part of business studies courses (Hawley, 2007) and are discussed annually in the Europe Ethics Summit (2014). A business sets out objectives and hopes these will be achieved however they may find obtaining a profit for the owners/shareholders could overlook the wishes of others. For example it could avoid essential safety checks to save monies. Most countries have specific business laws which society largely agrees with UK has stopped discrimination against women, which is not universal.

## **What Business Ethics Covers**

At present many organisations have only recently come to recognise the importance of ethical decisions, and how they are perceived. In a recent situation with the Church of England's investments; the Archbishop of Canterbury spoke out about the practice regarding money lending in one organisation to discover later it was such organisation which they had invested in. There are criticisms regarding medical and pharmaceuticals that they only research areas that will give them good returns. So it can be seen that inadequately research is undertaken into diseases like malaria which usually affect underprivileged people and developing governments. Body Shop was amongst the first organisation to market their ethical stance by saying they as their products are not tested on animals. So it became a unique selling point. Can it be seen there is a conflict between ethics and profit? Modern business environment has become more complicated, as factors all pull in different directions (see appendix 4). It has become more difficult and more complicated. Business may even employ a professional philosopher to help them create a workable ethical stance (Donaldson et. al.; 2007)

## **So What Are We Looking at?**

Jim Riley in his article in 2012 spelt out the possible component parts where ethical decisions are made. The ones he picked out are the ones that directly affect the customer. The following areas which have a direct impact:



In looking at suppliers Riley (2012) said “that a business cannot claim to be ethical firm if it ignores unethical practices by its suppliers for example:

- Use of child labour and forced labour
- Production in sweatshops
- Violation of the basic rights of workers
- Ignoring health, safety and environmental standards

An ethical business has to be concerned with the behaviour of all businesses that operate in the supply chain – i.e.

1. Suppliers
2. Contractors
3. Distributors
4. Sales agents”

The two articles below provide a good example of the ethical issues that arise in the supply chain:



### Do Pressure Groups Lead Multinationals to Act Ethically?

To-day organisations find themselves increasingly facing external pressure to improve their ethical reputation. Organisations have to be aware of internet activities since this is a method favoured by some consumer activists who can then form effective pressure groups. Even the UK Government has had to recognise petitions for debates can result from internet direct and

indirect action so ethical practice of multinationals or industries can be exposed more easily by this method.



Organised consumer action can force/achieve change. Action groups can become so forceful they undermine organisations in ways that could be considered unethical in destroying the fashion fur industry in the 1990's. However, times and attitudes change and now fur fashions are coming back. They can act irresponsibly for example criticising Primark for not having paid compensation to the families of the fire disaster. When in truth they were the only UK firm to have funded compensation. Although on the other hand the growth of Fairtrade business is a good prototype of positive consumer action.

### Is Ethical Behaviour Good or Bad for Multinational?

The problem with this question is that it is not simple and there will always be two sides to every argument. The advantages can be said that there will be increased revenues where there can be seen positive consumer support which result in an improved brand and business awareness and recognition. This in turn will usually develop better employee motivation and recruitment. All in all it may lead to creating a new financial stream from shrewd ethical financiers. So what about the other side it will increase organisation costs if they are forced to purchase from Fairtrade suppliers rather than lowest priced ones. This in turn will increase overheads and possible training and communication their policy with the danger of building up false expectations of its work force or customers.

Ethical investment is now part of life and it will always be presenting us with more challenges. How would you respond to Guardian columnists Seumas Milne and Peter Lee, (a military expert at Portsmouth University) who on December 2<sup>nd</sup> 2014 wrote *“The use of unmanned aerial vehicles, or 'drones', is one of the most controversial elements of modern*

warfare? The technology allows for the delivery of bombs and bullets with no risk whatever to the attacker. So does the use of drones create new ethical problems” (Milne & Lee, 2014)? So will drones generate new ethical problems? Should we deny the fire service from using them when they can indicate the extent of a fire? They were first used in Bolton in May 2014 and more recently Drone footage helped firefighters tackle blaze. A Tech-enthusiast Andrew Thyer, 35, tells how his flying device helped bring a mountain grass fire under control near Swansea, South Wales (May 2015).

## Conclusion

To conclude there are no commonly approved laws of ethics, no given standards or mechanisms, and no permanent or fixed philosophies. So how do we manage ethics on contemporary life and society?

## References

1. Altman, M. (2011) *Kant and Applied Ethics: The Uses and Limits of Kant's Practical Philosophy*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
2. Andrew, W. (2006) *Kant: The Three Critiques*, Cambridge: Polity.
3. Beauchamp, T. Childless, J. F. (2013) *Principles of Biomedical Ethics* (7<sup>th</sup> Ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press
4. Brimmer, S. E. (2007) *The Role of Ethics In The 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Published by *Leadership Advanced Online* Issue 1 Fall 2007: PDF. Online available at:  
[http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/lao/issue\\_11/pdf/brimmer.pdf](http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/lao/issue_11/pdf/brimmer.pdf)
5. Casson, J. (2013) Occasional Paper –A Review of the Ethical Aspects of Corporate Governance Regulation and Guidance in the EU (p.17) The institute of Business Ethics in Association with ECOD  
Brussel: EU.
6. Chapman, A. (2015) *Businessballs*, Leicester: England. Online available at:  
[http://www.businessballs.com/ethical\\_management\\_leadership.htm](http://www.businessballs.com/ethical_management_leadership.htm)
7. Crane, A. & Matten, D. (2010) *Business Ethics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. New York: Oxford University Press
8. Donaldson, T. Werhane, P. Van Zandt, J. (2007) *Ethical Issues in Business: A Philosophical Approach*, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, Cambridge: Pearson.
9. European Commission (2011) *A Renewed EU strategy 2011-14 for Corporate Social Responsibility*, Brussels: EU.

10. Europe Ethics Summit (2014) *Leadership Through Ethics & Governance* Sept 24-25 in London: Conference
11. Hawley, G. (2007) *Ethics in Clinical Practice: An Interprofessional Approach*. Cambridge: Pearson Education
12. Hinman, L. M. (2012) *Ethics: A Pluralistic Approach to Moral Theory*, University of San Diego, Asia: Cengage Learning. E-Book 2013, [www.cengageasia.com](http://www.cengageasia.com)
13. Holland, S. (2007) *Public Health Ethics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
14. Kidder, R.M. (2001). Ethics is not optional. *Association Management*. Washington: Dec. 2001. 53(13), 30-32. Retrieved July 18, 2007. Online available at: <http://proquest.umi.com.eres.regent.edu/>
15. Klikauer, T. (2010) *Critical Management Ethics*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
16. La Follette H, (2007) *The Practice of Ethics*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing
17. Milne, S. & Lee, P. (2013) *Is the use of unmanned military drones ethical or criminal?* Online available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/video/2013/dec/02/unmanned-military-drones-battle-ethical-video-debate>. 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2013
18. Riley, J. (2015) *Study notes Business Ethics - In Practice*. Accessed on 5<sup>th</sup> May 2015. Online available at: <http://beta.tutor2u.net/business/reference/business-ethics-in-practice>
19. Spiesshofer, B. (2013) *Global Financial Crisis, Corporate Responsibility and Poverty: GFC Taskforce Phase II, Chapter 9* p.136,
20. Sucher, S. J. (2008) *The Moral Leader: Challenges, Tools and Insights*, Abbingdon: Routledge.
21. Syal, R. (2014) *Drug companies accused of holding back complete information on clinical trials*. Online available at: [www.theguardian.com/business/2014/jan/03/drug-firms-information-clinical](http://www.theguardian.com/business/2014/jan/03/drug-firms-information-clinical)
22. tutor2u (2010) *Business Ethics - do businesses behave ethically?* Online Educational Publisher. Online available at: [http://www.tutor2u.net/business/external/ethics\\_modern.htm](http://www.tutor2u.net/business/external/ethics_modern.htm)
23. Ward, S. ED. (2013) *Global Media Ethics: Problems and Perspectives*, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell
24. Ward, R. F. & Trobisch, D. J. (2013) *Bring the word of life*, Cambridge: Wm B. Fredmans Publishing Co, UK. Also an E-book.

## **Bibliography**

- Cohen, A. & Wellman, C. (2005) *Applied ethics*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Harrison, R. & Shaw, D. (2005) *The Ethical Consumer*, London: Sage.
- Horner, J. S. (2000) For debate: The virtuous public health physician, *Journal of Public Health Medicine*, 22 (1), 48-53
- Keown, J. (2002) *Euthanasia, ethics & public policy*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge
- Lloyd, D. Widdows H. & Dickerson D. (2005) *Cases in Medical Ethics and Law*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge
- Lucas K, & Lloyd B, (2005) *Health Promotion*, London: Sage.
- Mapel, D. R. (1993) *Traditions of International Ethics*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge
- Ottenson, J. (2006) *Actual Ethics*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge
- Rhodes, R. Francis, I. & Silver, A. (2007) *Medical Ethics*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing
- Seedhouse, D. (2010) *Ethics: the heart of health care*, 2nd Edition, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons



## **Appendix 1**

**There are many other sources you may like to look up:**

1. philosophy - the rational investigation of questions about existence and knowledge and ethics
2. bioethics - the branch of ethics that studies moral values in the biomedical sciences
3. casuistry - moral philosophy based on the application of general ethical principles to resolve moral dilemmas
4. endaemonism, eudemonism - an ethical system that evaluates actions by reference to personal well-being through a life based on reason
5. hedonism - an ethical system that evaluates the pursuit of pleasure as the highest good
6. descriptivism - (ethics) a doctrine holding that moral statements have a truth value
7. prescriptivism - (ethics) a doctrine holding that moral statements prescribe appropriate attitudes and behaviour

## **Appendix 2**

### **Egoism**

However one has to consider did this theory lay behind the Jonestown masccaras. The first reports out of Guyana on November 18, 1978 were that Congressman Leo J. Ryan and four other members of his party were shot and killed as they attempted to board a plane at Port Kaituma airstrip. Within hours, came the shocking announcement that 408 American citizens had committed suicide at a communal village they had built in the jungle in Northwest Guyana. The community had come to be known as “Jonestown.” The dead were all members of a group known as “The People’s Temple” which was led by the Reverend Jim Jones. It would soon be learned that 913 of the 1100 people believed to have been at “Jonestown” at the time, had died in a mass suicide. Or the Waco Massacre, February 28, 1993, the United StatesBureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF) attempted to execute a search warrant at the Branch Davidian ranch at Mount Carmel, a property located nine miles (14 km) east-northeast of Waco, Texas. An exchange of gunfire resulted in the deaths of four agents and six Davidians. A subsequent 51-day siege by the Federal Bureau of Investigation ended on April 19 when the complex was destroyed by fire. Seventy-six people, including 21 children and two pregnant women, along with Davidian leader David Koresh, died in the

incident. They left recordings saying they were going to a better place. They were all dead before the fire. Could it happen again?

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Hawley, G. (2007) Ethics in Clinical Practice: An Interprofessional Approach**

**Pearson Education**

**Extract Page 5 & 6 Chapter 1.**

1. Willowcreek School, USA (1963-1966). This was a residential home for children with physical and mental impairments who were purposely infected (by injection) with hepatitis A to see how quickly the disease spread and whether or not the medication gamma globulin was effective.

2. USA drug company Pfizer approached the Nigeria's northern Kano State to trial of the experimental drug, Trovan. Pfizer said that only 200 children had been given Trovan or the older antibiotic. In all, 11 children died in the trial: five after taking Trovan and six after taking an older antibiotic used for comparison in the clinical trial. Others suffered blindness, deafness and brain damage. Despite making reparation in 2011 the company still contends that meningitis, not its drugs, was responsible for the deaths and injuries, a Pfizer spokesman said. Epidemics sweep Africa's arid "meningitis belt" on dust-filled winds during the dry season every year, and more than 12,000 Africans died of meningitis in 1996; in addition, the drugs in the trial were given only to children who were already very sick.

3. Tuskegee, USA (1932-1972). This 40-year-long experiment was performed to study the difference between syphilis patients who were treated with penicillin and those who were not. A public health nurse (Eunice Rivers) helped to persuade some 400 African-American men with syphilis to forgo penicillin treatment, even though it had already been tested and was the available and standard treatment for the disease. As this experiment was exposed, its immorality towards people who were not aware of their rights and informed consent gained the reputation of being an 'horrendous evil' and gross violation of justice (Cranston, 1973).

4. National Women's Hospital, New Zealand (1958-1987), also known as the Cartwright Inquiry.

The story of this dreadful tragedy is written by Sandra Coney (1988) in the book. *The Unfortunate Experiment*. Women with cervical cancer were not given the correct care. A total of 948 women who had the disease were divided into two groups: those who received treatment and those who received no treatment except to have their disease state monitored. As a result, many women died and others were traumatically disfigured so that they were unable to have sexual intercourse (Report of the Cervical Cancer Inquiry, 1988). As a result of the inquiry other substandard practices which had been allowed to continue for over 20 or more years came to light (Bromberger and Fife-Yeomans, 1991). The ethical problems uncovered during this inquiry centred on clients' or patients' rights and research (see Chapters 4 and 16).

5 Chelmsford Hospital, Sydney, Australia (The Royal Commission Inquiry into Chelmsford Hospital, 1990). People with psychiatric illness were prescribed 'deep sleep' to cure their illnesses. This involved deep sedation for days on end. The full information about this can be found in the Royal Commission Inquiry into Chelmsford Hospital. Patients who survived gave evidence at the Royal Commission. The consequences of such immobility without appropriate adjunct care included bronchopneumonia, deep vein thrombosis, pulmonary embolism, decubitus ulcers, muscle wasting, contractures, etc. and death. This inquiry discovered that the rights of the mentally ill or psychiatric patient were abused.

6. Bristol Royal Infirmary Inquiry (1984-1995), also known as the Bristol Heart Inquiry. Babies and children requiring cardiac surgery were not provided with the correct standard of care, and many died as a result. This tragedy was not about bad or uncaring health professionals, but rather the ethical problems occurred because some lacked insight and their behaviour was flawed (Bristol Royal Infirmary Inquiry, 2001). This was compounded by some professionals in the cardiac surgical team failing to communicate with each other and work effectively together as a team .

7. Alder Hey Hospital Inquiry (Report of the Royal Liverpool Children's Inquiry, 2001). This inquiry centred on the different collections of babies' and children's organs. During the inquiry it was discovered that the first collection commenced in 1948, with others being added over the years. Central to the investigation was Professor van Velzen who, shortly after his appointment as Professor of Foetal and Infant Pathology, issued an order that no human material was to be disposed of (including returning organs to a body at the end of a post-

mortem examination) without his permission. Instead, it was to be retained for his research. This activity is illegal under the Human Tissue Act of 1961. The inquiry also uncovered unethical practices within Alder Hey and Liverpool University, including the collection of children's body parts at the Institute of Child Health (responsibility of the University), the Eye collection (held by the University), the Heart collection (joint responsibility between Alder Hey and the University), and the Foetal and Cerebellum Collections at Myrtle Street (responsibility of the hospital).

## **Appendix 4**

### **Introduction to the Europe Ethics Summit (2014) *Leadership Through Ethics & Governance* Sept 24-25 in London: Conference**

#### **The Modern Business Environment**

Today, things have got more complicated:-

1. There is no longer one agreed moral code. Most people have a weak sense of religion or none at all. So their morals must come from somewhere else.
2. There are competing religious and social moral codes, especially for multinational companies operating in different parts of the world and employing people from different cultures.
3. The pursuit of profit has become a goal in its own right, and this puts pressures on people to compromise their standards, not just ethically, but in less important areas also. For example, a very rude manager might be tolerated because he (it usually is a he) makes large profits. So when good behaviour and good profits come into conflict, businesses find it difficult to resist the profits.
4. Businesses are only the people who work there; businesses don't decide anything – it's the people who make decisions. But businesses have group cultures with their own norms and standards. Individuals have a strong need to fit in and be accepted, so it is very difficult for any individual to stand up against attitudes and decisions they disagree with.
5. Greater wealth in the western economies means people have less tolerance for ethically dubious behaviour. We are no longer so desperate for growth and employment at any cost. People are also better educated and better informed. People are less deferential for example if they are less accepting of what people in authority say. So there are higher expectations of how businesses should behave.

6. Businesses have to sell to consumers and employ workers who have their own standards and opinions. They are not going to buy from or work for a business they disapprove of. So there is a competitive pressure for better behaviour from businesses.

7. Many managers and owners have ambitions of social acceptance and recognition for example knighthoods, and so are not going to get caught behaving unethically.

8. Modern technology creates ethical dilemmas which never existed until quite recently. Medical products, and gene technologies, are a good example of this. Should parents be allowed to alter the genes of their unborn children, and should businesses sell the products to do this?

## **Appendix 5**

### **The new corporate social responsibility policy presented today puts forward an action agenda for the period 2011-2014 covering 8 areas:**

- Enhancing the visibility of CSR and disseminating good practices: this includes the creation of a European award, and the establishment of sector-based platforms for enterprises and stakeholders to make commitments and jointly monitor progress.
- Improving and tracking levels of trust in business: the Commission will launch a public debate on the role and potential of enterprises, and organize surveys on citizen trust in business.
- Improving self- and co-regulation processes: the Commission proposes work with business and other organizations to develop a code of good practice to guide the development of future self- and co-regulation initiatives.
- Enhancing market reward for CSR: this means leveraging EU policies in the fields of consumption, investment and public procurement in order to promote market reward for responsible business conduct.
- Improving company disclosure of social and environmental information: the new policy confirms the Commission's intention to bring forward a new legislative proposal on this issue.
- Further integrating CSR into education, training and research: the Commission will provide further support for education and training in the field of CSR, and explore opportunities for funding more research.
- Emphasizing the importance of national and sub-national CSR policies: the Commission invites EU Member States to present or update their own plans for the promotion of CSR by mid 2012.
- Better aligning European and global approaches to CSR: the Commission highlights the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, the 10 principles of the UN Global Compact, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the ILO Tri-partite Declaration of Principles on Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy, and the ISO 26000 Guidance Standard on Social Responsibility. The Commission aims to monitor the commitments of large European enterprises to take account of internationally recognized guidelines and principles. It will also present a report on EU priorities for the implementation of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and

Human Rights, and develop human rights guidance for a limited number of industrial sectors and for small businesses.

Online available at: [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release MEMO-11-730 en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-11-730_en.htm)