

Case Study Analysis

Prepare a 'brief' for each case study. Briefs are not papers. Briefs should enable one to readily familiarize themselves with the case and your ultimate position. For each case study:

1. **Identify the relevant facts.** This will require quite a bit of research. Be sure to use trustworthy news and academic sources.
2. **State stakeholder interests and claims.**
In a very general sense, stakeholders are any individuals or groups that may be impacted by decisions made relative to a case, i.e., they have a "stake" (interest or claim) in the case. Identify the stakeholders and describe their interests and claims.
3. **State the central ethical issues in the case.**
What ethical issues and/or apparent dilemmas are involved in the case?
4. **Apply moral principles. At a minimum:**
 - a. **What is good? What would consequentialists conclude?**
What would be ultimately "good" for those involved? Look at this from a variety of perspectives and possible actions. Refer to Zakhem Ch 1; utilize the principles and terminology therein, e.g., stakeholder 'desire'/claim/interest satisfaction or perceived value maximization; capability development, etc.
 - b. **What is the right thing to do?**
What are stakeholders entitled to in this case? How strong are their rights? What duties do the rights generate and for whom? Do any rights/obligations conflict? Refer to Zakhem Ch 2; utilize the principles and terminology therein.

Some common (not exhaustive) duties: 1). Duty of fidelity (promise keeping) 2). Duty of reparation (making up for prior wrongful acts) 3. Duty of gratitude (being grateful for others' acts of kindness) 4. Duty of justice (being fair) 5. Duty of beneficence (benefiting or helping others) 6. Duty of self-improvement (education or practice) 7. Duty of non-maleficence (not harming others). 8) Respecting another person's autonomy or liberty. 9) Honesty/truth telling. 10) Follow the law/just laws.

5. **State and defend your own moral argument.**

- a. Helpful terminology.
 - i. **Argument**: a series of statements where the last statement follows or is supported by previous statement(s). The last statement is called the conclusion, and the previous statements are premises.
 - ii. **Normative principle**: general claim about what is morally right or wrong or good or bad; a moral or ethical principle.
 - iii. **Empirical claim**: tell us what factually “is” the case (empirically testable).
 - iv. **Moral arguments**: arguments that include both normative empirical claims. They lead to normative conclusions or claims that tell us what one morally “ought to” do with regards to a specific case (they connect the “ought” normative and the “is” facts).
 - v. **Valid or deductive argument**: an argument that is structured so that if the premises of the argument are true (they need not actually be true) the conclusion must be true. A sound argument is valid and has true premises and withstands possible criticism.
- b. Number the premises and conclusion of your argument.
- c. Cite data/sources that support empirical claims.
- d. Clearly state the normative principle(s) to which you appeal.
- e. Identify and address at least one likely objection to your position.

An example of one of Friedman’s arguments:

1. Managers ought to be socially responsible.
2. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) ought to be directed at maximizing societal wellbeing (utilitarian claim).
3. Focusing on shareholder profit maximization maximizes overall well-being. Note: this would need to be carefully unpacked and empirically supported.
4. Therefore, the only CSR is to maximize profits.
 - a. Qualifier 1: one ought not to break the law.
 - b. Qualifier 2: one ought not to violate basic ethical obligations.

Possible objection to premise: a) focusing on profit maximization does not maximize overall well-being (again, unpack and empirically support)/premise 3) is false; b) focusing on profit maximization leads to the violation of fundamental rights, and fundamental rights should not be violated even when doing so is beneficial to some/premise 2 and 3 are false.