**Ethics Assessment Sequence**



Starting in college, **ethics** go from “theory” to real. Breaching them has consequences (not just to a grade) and adhering to them is expected of you, your work and your behavior in and out of class (not just for a grade). Also, clients, regulators, scholarship organizations, employers and the general public will judge YOU based on their perception of the “trustworthiness and honesty” of your chosen field (consider what you know people assume about salespeople, teachers, lawyers, military, etc).

Knowing your field’s ethics and the issues that have arisen around them is key to YOUR survival and satisfaction in the field.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Illustration by Peter Newell from COSMOPOLITAN,August 1898 | Figures often beguile me, particularly when I have the arranging of them myself; in which case the remark attributed to Disraeli would often apply with justice and force: **"There are three kinds of lies: lies, damned lies and statistics."**- *Mark Twain's Own Autobiography: The Chapters from the North American Review\** |

\*Twain's *Autobiography* attribution of a remark about lies and statistics to Disraeli is generally not accepted.

**Sequence Assignments**

***Case Studying (Buckley)***

Compose an original [close reading](#closeread) of Buckley’s satirical novel as *a case study of professional ethics*. Rhetorically analyze **how** the novel makes a complex argument regarding which kinds of violations are significant and why. Compare/contrast the violations that comprise Buckley’s argument, justifying the validity of YOUR claims with specific evidence from the novel.

Your [close reading](#closeread) should answer these questions: **What are the categories of *real world* ethical violations presented in the novel? What significant act(s) by characters exemplify each category? Where, specifically, does the author cue *the reader’s judgment* of each of these unethical acts? What are the implications of the difference in Buckley’s treatment of categories/acts?**

To meet the minimum standards for credit you must:

* meet length requirement of >500 words
* proofread for [CCSS](http://www.everettsd.org/Page/3080) conventions and style errors that might block me from understanding your meaning
* state your essay’s [clear, complex, significant and manageable argument](#thesis) (explicitly answer the questions)
* [integrate](#closeread) salient evidence from credible professional/academic primary sources to establish real world categories of professionalism/ ethics
* identify salient details of the novel’s narrative elements ([setting](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.49x2ik5), [characterization](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.2p2csry), [plot structure](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.147n2zr)) denoting at least one significant, unethical act fitting each category.
* [rhetorically](#closeread) analyze necessary passages’ stylistic elements (tone, [theme](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.3o7alnk), style) connoting the reader’s judgments of each unethical act.
* cite [paraphrases, quotations and/or other material](#paraphrase) used with applicable [MLA](https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/747/01/) in-text and works cited format

***Paper Proposal Précis (Buckley)***

Working Title: A PHRASE that provides a subtle but effective introduction to your paper’s argument for your specific audience.

Working Thesis: A clear, complex, significant and manageable CLAIM—Enforcing **X ethical standards in my field is intended to prevent Y kind of harm seen in both Z real world example(s) and examples from Buckley.** \_\_\_\_ are the actions I will take to avoid such ethical violations in my own career.

Methods: The SPECIFIC [STRATEGIES of argument](http://www.everettsd.org/Page/3080) you use for your audience and purpose. (May I suggest *close reading the real world cases for who, what, where, why, when, how JUST LIKE YOU DID Buckley*?)

Evidence: ANNOTATION of professional sources for real world violations—citation, summary of violation. Also your field ethics primary source(s)’ audience and purpose IDENTIFIED and your tertiary source(s) for that information cited.

Strengths: EXPLANATION of what a college-level, real-world audience in this field would need to see to be impressed with your writing/thinking/reading/researching and how your writing/thinking/reading/research process will address these.

Weaknesses: EXPLANATION of what a college-level, real-world audience in this field could see as missing or inadequate about your writing/ thinking/ reading/ researching and what barriers/problems/deficits exist for your writing/ thinking/ reading/ researching process that will need to be strengthened.

**Major Paper (Intertextual Essay 1)**

***Ethical It (Buckley)***

Compose an original essay after analyzing and discussing Buckley and considering your future area of study/career. Investigate how your field defines the bounds of ethical behavior—its **official** codes of conduct, oath, ethics guidelines—and where these have been violated by actual people in ways that caused harm. Compare/contrast the circumstances (*who, what, where, why, when and how*) with scenarios that support Buckley’s argument, justifying the validity of YOUR claims with specific evidence you close read from Buckley and outside sources.

Your essay should answer these questions: **What are the official ethics of my field? How have actual people violated these? How does Buckley’s argument about professionalism relate to these cases? What does connecting my field to Buckley show ME about *my work in the field*?**

To meet the minimum standards for credit you must:

* meet length requirement of >1,500 words (including works cited)
* proofread for [CCSS](http://www.everettsd.org/Page/3080) conventions and style errors that might block me from understanding your meaning
* state your essay’s [clear, complex, significant and manageable argument](#thesis) (explicitly answer the questions)
* [close read](#closeread) credible, professional/academic primary document (current official code of conduct/ethics) to justify your interpretation of ethics of your field
* close read details to establish the circumstances of significant act(s) that represent one category of ethical violation in Buckley’s text (for organization, perpetrator *and* victim)
* rhetorically analyze necessary passages to justify your interpretation of the severity/impact of the act/category argued by Buckley’s text
* [close read](#closeread) journalism/professional/academic source material (lawsuits/ criminal trials, case examples or studies of actual violations of ethics) to identify the circumstances of 3 cases of real world violations relevant to your field
* cite [paraphrases, quotations and/or other material](#paraphrase) used with applicable [MLA](https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/747/01/) in-text and works cited format

**Selected Materials**

*To analyze* the nuances (not “gist”) and the overlaps and conflicts between “insider” and “outsider” views of ethics, a detailed case study is ideal. The premise of this assignment is that Buckley produced one *as a work of satirical fiction*. **Treat it this way**.

FIRST—*Research* official/established guidelines for general professional ethical practice/ behavior in YOUR fieldand *close read* Buckley’s case study data (WHO, WHAT, WHERE, WHEN, HOW and WHY).

SECOND—*Synthesize your reading of the guidelines and your reading of Buckley* *to determine* what to your field is justifiably the WORST category/type of violation of ethics his case study includes.

THIRD—gather the details of SEVERAL actions fitting that category.

FOURTH—*Rhetorically analyze* HOW the novel presents *each action’s* severity relative to other categories (that are less severe but also occur).

That is, do NOT pick the worst ACT and explain what was bad about it (too simplistic); analyze the PATTERNS of acts to see a VARIETY of categories of ethical violation that they fit [examples: abuse of power; misleading consumers/regulators/shareholders; harassment/intimidation; failure to report; false reporting....etc]

\*Don’t oversimplify the story or its elements—instead argue **THE interpretation that shows you truly comprehend what they say and mean, even where it’s implicit, ambiguous or confusing**…in fact, *especially* where it’s implicit, ambiguous and confusing!) Most complex narratives will force you to figure out [setting](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.49x2ik5), [characterization](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.2p2csry), [plot structure](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.147n2zr), [theme](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.3o7alnk) or the WHO, WHAT, WHERE, WHY, WHEN and HOW and their argument instead of tell it to you explicitly and linearly. Generally, if you find yourself saying I know I’m right because it says “X” right HERE in the text, you’re oversimplifying it.

Does Buckley’s 90s argument about ethics still matter?

<https://slate.com/technology/2018/03/big-sugar-isnt-to-blame-for-steering-us-away-from-fat.html>

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/mar/15/climate-change-denial-florida--global-warming-naomi-oreskes-interview>

A close reading of narrative breaks down into this form of the default questions you practiced for expository texts:

1. Decode the text to “get” its meaning (look up interfering “known unknowns”).
2. State a hypothesis for the ARGUMENT: \_\_\_\_ are the categories of unethical behavior presented in this fictional case study because the characters’ circumstances fit the “real world” definitions of ethics/professionalism.
3. Cite the *necessary* data (passages that capture [setting](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.49x2ik5), [characterization](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.2p2csry), [plot structure](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.147n2zr), [theme](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.3o7alnk)) within the text using [MLA](http://bcs.bedfordstmartins.com/resdoc5e/) to *clearly, honestly and comprehensively* capture where/how this argument shows up in the text—explicitly and implicitly, agreeable to you and not.
4. Justify how the details in your cited data MEAN what you SAY is the argument of the text, by themselves *and* in context of the whole work (this is taking your [interpretation](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.23ckvvd) hypothesis…and adding data analysis to back it up)
5. Draw its implications: \_\_ is how this text’s argument likely relates to argument(s) *above and beyond it* that I think are worth pursuing ABOUT MY FIELD [IN INTERTEXTUAL ESSAY 1](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.1y810tw).

Need:

Familiarizing yourself with the current established ethics of your field and real-life abuses and consequences related to them might just give you the incentive and know-how to avoid problems in your own, possibly satirical, life.

Task:

*Research* credentialing, regulating and/or governing associations/organizations for your field.

[Close read](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.4i7ojhp) and [rhetorically analyze](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.2jxsxqh) their materials to identify the most credible documentation(s) of official/established guidelines for your specific field’s professional ethical practice/ behavior (relevant to your future career goals).

[*OD*](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk_l7DAAdGbvASBgW8LS4yGjdiRuO0BlUOVHONQmo8o/edit#bookmark=id.26in1rg)the documentation you find.

*Research* reports of actual unethical behavior incidents in your field.

Review Buckley to identify similar kinds/types of behavior depicted in his “case study.”

*Synthesize* the documentation, reports and analysis of Buckley *to create an original argument:*

How does the established set of ethics of my future career seek to prevent significant kinds of harm critiqued by Buckley, with what consequences/ enforcement measures? What specific actions do I propose to deter, reduce or prevent me from acting unethically?

Tools:

I started with a Google search: *ethics violations*, to which it added several options including *in business.* That got me:

[*https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=ethics%20violations%20in%20business*](https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=ethics%20violations%20in%20business)

A search for *ethics rules* gave me these relevant, other paths to follow:

Searches related to ethics rules of conduct

[**cfp board code** of ethics **and** rules of conduct](https://www.google.com/search?espv=2&biw=1280&bih=915&q=cfp+board+code+of+ethics+and+rules+of+conduct&revid=1244797299&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiWqfrh4a7LAhUBWGMKHYNhDC4Q1QIIjAEoAA)

[**ethical** rules of conduct **for practitioners**](https://www.google.com/search?espv=2&biw=1280&bih=915&q=ethical+rules+of+conduct+for+practitioners&revid=1244797299&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiWqfrh4a7LAhUBWGMKHYNhDC4Q1QIIjQEoAQ)

[**code** of ethics **and** conduct **for ngos**](https://www.google.com/search?espv=2&biw=1280&bih=915&q=code+of+ethics+and+conduct+for+ngos&revid=1244797299&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiWqfrh4a7LAhUBWGMKHYNhDC4Q1QIIjgEoAg)

[**code** of ethics **and** conduct **for sports coaches**](https://www.google.com/search?espv=2&biw=1280&bih=915&q=code+of+ethics+and+conduct+for+sports+coaches&revid=1244797299&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiWqfrh4a7LAhUBWGMKHYNhDC4Q1QIIjwEoAw)

[**code** of conduct **and** ethics **policy for the tidewater police department**](https://www.google.com/search?espv=2&biw=1280&bih=915&q=code+of+conduct+and+ethics+policy+for+the+tidewater+police+department&revid=1244797299&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiWqfrh4a7LAhUBWGMKHYNhDC4Q1QIIkAEoBA)

[**code** of conduct **and** ethics **examples**](https://www.google.com/search?espv=2&biw=1280&bih=915&q=code+of+conduct+and+ethics+examples&revid=1244797299&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiWqfrh4a7LAhUBWGMKHYNhDC4Q1QIIkQEoBQ)

[**code** of conduct **and** ethics **standard**](https://www.google.com/search?espv=2&biw=1280&bih=915&q=code+of+conduct+and+ethics+standard&revid=1244797299&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiWqfrh4a7LAhUBWGMKHYNhDC4Q1QIIkgEoBg)

[**code** of conduct ethics **definition**](https://www.google.com/search?espv=2&biw=1280&bih=915&q=code+of+conduct+ethics+definition&revid=1244797299&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiWqfrh4a7LAhUBWGMKHYNhDC4Q1QIIkwEoBw)

Having trouble pinning down actions you will take to avoid ethical violations? *The Economist* can help…

Cross the boss

**What your manager may have in common with a vampire**

**Mar 19th 2016 | From the print edition**



SHOCKING as it may sound, bosses occasionally ask underlings to do unscrupulous things. In a study in 2013 by Ethics & Compliance Initiative (ECI), a nonprofit body, 9% of American employees said they had been pressured by managers to undertake a task that compromised their ethical beliefs. Standing up for yourself can be bad for your career. When Countrywide, an American mortgage broker, leant on its staff to commit fraud by passing on defective loans to the government, it fired those who spoke out. Indeed, according to ECI, 21% of employees who reported misconduct at work said they faced some sort of retaliation from their firms. So perhaps it is better to ward off a dodgy request by signalling to your boss that such an approach would be unwelcome. New research by Sreedhari Desai of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, to be published in the *Academy of Management Journal*, suggests one potential strategy. Just as vampires in gothic fiction can be kept at bay with a brandished crucifix, so too, it seems, can evil bosses. Ms Desai conducted field research at Indian firms to test whether those who kept a religious symbol at their desks were treated differently by their bosses to those who did not. In another experiment she looked at what happened when members of a team appended a virtuous quotation to their email signoffs, such as “Better to fail with honour than succeed with fraud”. In each case she found that managers were less likely to ask those in their charge to act unethically if they displayed some indication of moral values. It may be that bosses are reluctant to put seemingly righteous employees in an awkward situation. Or they may fear that such people are more likely to blow the whistle on any improper demands. Or perhaps exposure to a moral sentiment or symbol makes bosses look deep within themselves, consider the ethics of what they are about to ask, and think better of it. The truth seems to lie in a mix of these factors, says Ms Desai. Her experiments showed that those in positions of power who were exposed to moral or religious symbols were less likely to ask something immoral of any of their employees—but they were even less likely to do so of the person to whom the symbol belonged. Interestingly, when looking at white collar workers in India, it appeared that it made little difference whether the two parties shared a religion. Muslims were more likely to respect someone displaying a Hindu deity or Christian cross, for example, than someone who did not display anything. Indeed, Ms Desai worries that bosses who are themselves religious may discriminate more generally in favour of workers who are openly devout, to the disadvantage of those who keep their faith to themselves, or do not have one. In relatively godless Western countries, workers with a strong religious faith have become increasingly inclined to react against secular pressure by insisting on their right to self expression at work. For example, in 2013 a British Airways employee won a discrimination case against the airline after it had told her to cover up a crucifix necklace which, it said, breached its uniform policy. In a survey by the Randstad Research Institute, the research arm of a big human resources consultant, 23% of French managers reported instances of religious conflict in their workplace last year, about double the proportion in 2014. But attitudes to expressions of personal values at work may vary greatly between similar countries. The early findings of a follow up study Ms Desai is conducting suggest that, for example, when Americans see a moral quotation appended to an email they tend to take it as a true representation of the sender’s beliefs; Australians, by contrast, suspect the sender is being “holier than thou”, and tend to trust him less. The Aussies may be on to something. There may not be a correlation between someone who proclaims his religious or moral principles at work and that person’s propensity to act in a moral way. In a further experiment, Ms Desai gave her participants the opportunity to behave ethically or unethically. Then, in what they believed was an unrelated study, they were given the option of appending a moral quotation to an email to others in their group and/or to one sent just to themselves. Those who chose to signal their righteousness only to the outside world were more likely to have misbehaved in the first part of the experiment. Such people might do well to consider Luke 16:15 in the New Testament: “Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts.”