DegreeLive

BBA | Semester II | UK2DSCMGT103

Business Ethics and Corporate Governance

Course Code: UK2DSCMGT103 • Module 1 Notes

Module 1: Foundations of Business Ethics and Moral Philosophy

Course: Business Ethics and Corporate Governance (UK2DSCMGT103) • Semester II • BBA FYUGP Kerala University

1. Conceptual Foundations of Business Ethics

The term **Ethics** derives etymologically from the ancient Greek word *ethos*, signifying customary conduct, moral character, and guiding societal principles. In philosophical discourse, ethics is defined as the systematic inquiry into what constitutes right and wrong human conduct, moral duty, and virtue within society. When applied to enterprise administration, **Business Ethics** represents the specialized application of moral principles, ethical standards, and value systems to the organizational policies, commercial transactions, and strategic leadership decisions of business enterprises.

Business ethics investigates how commercial organizations ought to conduct their operations when corporate profit objectives intersect with the rights, welfare, and interests of diverse societal stakeholders. It examines the moral legitimacy of managerial practices across all organizational functions, including financial disclosures, employee working conditions, consumer marketing claims, environmental resource exploitation, and global supply chain partnerships.

The Scope of Business Ethics

The operational scope of business ethics functions across three interconnected systemic dimensions:

- **The Macro-Systemic Dimension:** Evaluates the moral legitimacy of overarching economic systems, including free-market capitalism, state-directed socialism, and mixed economies. It questions the justice of global trade regimes, sovereign patent protections on life-saving pharmaceuticals, income inequality, and the exploitation of natural ecological commons.
- **The Corporate / Organizational Dimension:** Focuses on the policies, structural governance, corporate culture, and collective actions of specific business enterprises. It addresses organizational whistleblower protections, diversity inclusion, product safety standards, corporate philanthropy, environmental stewardship, and fair executive remuneration structures.
- **The Individual / Micro-Behavioral Dimension:** Examines the personal moral integrity, psychological decision-making processes, and fiduciary responsibilities of individual managers and employees. It addresses professional conflicts of interest, bribery, misuse of proprietary enterprise assets, insider trading, and personal truthfulness in business communications.

Why Business Ethics Matters: The Business Case for Integrity

Far from being an academic luxury or public relations facade, ethical conduct provides measurable commercial and organizational advantages that protect long-term enterprise valuation:

- **Reputational Equity and Brand Trust:** In an era of instantaneous digital media and social scrutiny, a single ethical breach can vaporize decades of accumulated brand goodwill. High ethical

Degreelive

standards build durable trust with discerning consumers who actively reward authentic, socially responsible brands.

- **Mitigation of Legal and Financial Catastrophe:** Ethical misconduct inevitably culminates in regulatory enforcement, punitive civil damages, criminal indictments, and catastrophic shareholder value destruction (as demonstrated by historic corporate insolvencies like Enron, WorldCom, Lehman Brothers, and Satyam).
- **Attraction and Retention of Premier Talent:** Contemporary knowledge workers—particularly younger professional cohorts—deliberately seek employment with purpose-driven enterprises that embody high ethical integrity and progressive social impact, lowering recruitment overhead and employee attrition rates.
- **Lower Cost of Capital:** Global institutional investors and sovereign wealth funds increasingly mandate Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) compliance, providing ethical firms with preferential access to debt financing and premium equity valuations.

2. Morality, Ethics, and the Legal System: Conceptual Boundaries

In common parlance, the terms **Morals**, **Ethics**, and **Law** are frequently conflated. However, managerial scholars maintain precise analytical distinctions among these normative frameworks:

Dimension	Morality	Ethics	The Legal System (Law)
Origin & Source	Personal conscience, religious upbringing, cultural traditions, and family socialization.	Systematic philosophical inquiry, professional codes, and organizational standards.	State sovereignty, legislative enactments, judicial precedents, and regulatory statutes.
Focus & Scope	Subjective internal convictions regarding right vs wrong; personal spiritual duty.	Universal social and organizational rules governing professional conduct and relationships.	Formal, codifiable minimum behavioral standards required to preserve public order.
Enforcement Mechanism	Internal psychological guilt, personal remorse, and social ostracism.	Professional disbarment, employment termination, and loss of commercial reputation.	State coercive force: financial fines, asset confiscation, and physical incarceration.
Evolutionary Speed	Evolves slowly over generations alongside broad cultural transformations.	Adapts dynamically to new social expectations and organizational dilemmas.	Lags significantly behind societal developments; formal legislative enactment is slow.

The Divergence Between Legality and Morality

A fundamental axiom of managerial ethics is that **the law represents the absolute moral minimum**—a baseline threshold below which societal sanctions apply. What is legally permissible is

not necessarily morally right, and what is morally mandatory may occasionally conflict with unjust statutes:

- **Actions That Are Legal but Unethical:** Exploiting legal tax loopholes in offshore tax havens to pay zero corporate income tax in jurisdictions where operating profits are generated; aggressively marketing high-sugar processed foods to young children where statutory advertising bans have not yet been enacted; or outsourcing manufacturing to sweatshops in developing countries with negligible minimum wage and safety regulations.
- **Actions That Are Illegal but Ethical:** Historically, civil disobedience against discriminatory apartheid legislation or segregation laws; or an employee breaking a corporate non-disclosure agreement (NDA) to expose imminent environmental toxic dumping that threatens public drinking water supplies.

3. Philosophical Frameworks of Moral Philosophy

To evaluate complex commercial dilemmas systematically, managers rely on three foundational traditions in normative moral philosophy: Deontology, Teleology (Utilitarianism), and Virtue Ethics.

1. Deontological (Duty-Based) Ethics

Formulated by Enlightenment philosopher **Immanuel Kant**, **Deontological Ethics** (from the Greek *deon*, meaning duty) posits that the moral rightness of an action is determined intrinsically by adherence to absolute moral duties and universal moral rules, entirely independent of the consequences or outcomes generated by that action.

Kant argued that morality is grounded in pure human reason and articulated the supreme moral law as the **Categorical Imperative**, expressed through two primary formulations:

- **The Formula of Universal Law:** *"Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law."* Before executing a business decision, a manager must ask: "What if every business executive in the world engaged in this exact action?" For example, if a firm considers defaulting on commercial debt or issuing fraudulent financial statements, universalizing deceit destroys the entire institution of commercial contracts. Therefore, lying and fraud are unconditionally immoral.
- **The Formula of Humanity as an End:** *"Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never merely as a means to an end, but always at the same time as an end."* Human beings possess inherent rational dignity and autonomous moral worth. It is fundamentally immoral for corporate management to treat employees or suppliers merely as disposable economic instruments or production tools to generate shareholder profit.

Deontological Strengths: Provides unequivocal moral boundaries, protects individual human rights, and insists that basic human dignity cannot be sacrificed for economic efficiency.
Deontological Limitations: Highly rigid; struggles to resolve moral conflicts when two fundamental duties collide (e.g., the duty to tell the truth versus the duty to protect an innocent colleague from physical harm).

2. Teleological / Consequentialist Ethics (Utilitarianism)

In contrast to deontology, **Teleological Ethics** (from the Greek *telos*, meaning end or purpose) holds that the moral rightness or wrongness of an action is determined exclusively by the goodness or badness of the consequences it produces.

The dominant teleological framework in commercial governance is **Utilitarianism**, founded by **Jeremy Bentham** and refined by **John Stuart Mill**. Utilitarianism operates upon the **Principle of Utility**: an action is morally right if it promotes the greatest net happiness or well-being for the greatest number of affected stakeholders.

- **Act Utilitarianism (Bentham):** Evaluates each individual action on a case-by-case basis using a "hedonic calculus" to determine whether that specific act generates more net pleasure over pain across all affected individuals.
- **Rule Utilitarianism (Mill):** Advocates conforming to general rules (e.g., "tell the truth", "honor contracts") that historically and predictably produce the greatest overall social utility when universally observed, even if violating the rule in a specific isolated case might seem expedient.

Utilitarian Strengths: Highly pragmatic and aligned with corporate decision-making tools such as **Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA)**, calculating net societal utility across projects.
Utilitarian Limitations: The "Tyranny of the Majority"—can be used to justify horrific abuses against minority stakeholder groups (e.g., exploiting low-wage migrant workers or dumping toxic waste near an impoverished village because the overall net cost savings benefit millions of nationwide consumers).

3. Virtue Ethics

Rooted in the classical philosophy of **Aristotle**, **Virtue Ethics** shifts the moral focus away from abstract universal duties or calculated consequences toward the internal moral character, habitual integrity, and virtuous habits of the decision-maker.

Aristotle argued that the ultimate goal of human life is **Eudaimonia**—a state of human flourishing, excellence, and living well. Virtues are moral excellences acquired through deliberate practice and habitual repetition until they become second nature. Aristotle conceptualized virtue as the **Doctrine of the Mean**—a balanced golden mean situated between two extreme vices of deficiency and excess:

- **Courage:** The virtuous mean between the vice of deficiency (Cowardice) and the vice of excess (Rashness / Recklessness). In business, a courageous manager blows the whistle on dangerous corporate fraud despite personal career risks.
- **Temperance / Moderation:** The virtuous mean between Insensibility and Licentiousness / Greed. Prevents reckless corporate expansion and predatory exploitation.
- **Justice / Fairness:** Giving each stakeholder their equitable, deserved due, balancing the interests of workers, customers, and investors.
- **Prudence (Phronesis):** Practical practical wisdom—the intellectual capacity to discern the appropriate, virtuous course of action in complex, ambiguous operational scenarios.

Degreelive

In modern business, virtue ethics emphasizes creating organizational environments that cultivate moral character, where executives act ethically not out of fear of legal sanction or utilitarian calculation, but because they are intrinsically honest, just, and honorable human beings.

4. The Great Debate: Shareholder Primacy vs Stakeholder Theory

A central ideological conflict in business ethics and corporate governance revolves around the fundamental purpose of the corporate enterprise: For whose benefit should the modern corporation be managed?

Milton Friedman's Shareholder Primacy Theory

In a famous 1970 essay titled *"The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits,"* Nobel laureate economist **Milton Friedman** articulated the classical free-market doctrine of **Shareholder Primacy**:

- Corporate executives are legal agents employed by the shareholders (stockholders), who are the ultimate legal owners of the enterprise. The manager's sole fiduciary responsibility is to conduct business in accordance with shareholders' desires—which is invariably to generate maximum economic profit while conforming to the basic rules of society, both embodied in law and in ethical custom.
- Friedman asserted that when a corporate executive spends corporate capital on non-profit social objectives (such as environmental pollution abatement beyond legal mandates or funding community welfare centers), the manager is effectively imposing an undemocratic tax on shareholders, employees, and customers without their consent.
- He maintained that competitive free markets, guided by Adam Smith's "invisible hand", allocate scarce societal resources with optimal economic efficiency. Social welfare is best addressed by democratically elected governments, not by unelected corporate executives deploying other people's capital.

R. Edward Freeman's Stakeholder Theory

In his landmark 1984 work *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*, philosopher **R. Edward Freeman** mounted a decisive challenge to shareholder primacy, formulating **Stakeholder Theory**:

- A **Stakeholder** is defined as any individual, group, or constituency who can affect or is affected by the achievement of an organization's objectives.
- Freeman categorized corporate stakeholders into two fundamental groups:
  - **Primary / Core Stakeholders:** Entities without whose continuous participation the corporation cannot survive: Shareholders/Investors, Employees, Customers, Suppliers, and Local Communities.
  - **Secondary Stakeholders:** Entities that influence or are influenced by the enterprise but are not engaged in direct commercial transactions: Government Regulators, Media Organizations, Trade Associations, Competitors, and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs).

DegreeLive

- **The Separation Fallacy:** Freeman rejected the notion that business decisions and ethical decisions can be divorced. Every commercial decision carries profound ethical ramifications for human beings.
- **The Principle of Stakeholder Interdependence:** A corporation cannot generate sustainable, long-term shareholder value by exploiting or alienating its other stakeholders. A firm that mistreats its employees suffers high turnover; a firm that cheats its suppliers suffers delivery bottlenecks; a firm that poisons its local community faces regulatory shutdown. True strategic leadership manages stakeholder relationships harmoniously, creating win-win value configurations.

Evaluation Dimension	Shareholder Primacy (Milton Friedman)	Stakeholder Governance (R. Edward Freeman)
Primary Corporate Purpose	Maximize short-run and long-run financial returns to equity shareholders.	Create sustainable shared value across all participating stakeholder groups.
Managerial Fiduciary Duty	Strictly owed to shareholders as legal owners of the business.	Owed to all core stakeholders whose interests are intrinsically valuable.
Role of Non-Financial Stakeholders	Instrumental means used to generate shareholder profits.	Autonomous ends possessing inherent moral rights and valid claims.
Resolution of Conflicts	Prioritize shareholder financial returns above all competing interests.	Seek integrative, mutually beneficial solutions balancing stakeholder claims.

5. Ethical Leadership and Moral Psychology in Enterprise

Individual ethical behavior within an organization is not solely determined by formal written rules; it is heavily mediated by the moral psychology of individual decision-makers and the ethical climate established by executive leadership.

Lawrence Kohlberg's Stages of Moral Development

Psychologist **Lawrence Kohlberg** formulated a seminal theoretical framework explaining how human beings evolve their capacity for moral reasoning over time. Kohlberg posited that moral development progresses through six discrete stages grouped into three developmental levels:

Level 1: Pre-Conventional Morality (Self-Centric Focus)

The individual evaluates right and wrong based entirely on personal physical consequences and immediate self-interest:

- **Stage 1: Obedience and Punishment Orientation:** Right action is defined simply by obedience to powerful authority to avoid physical punishment or disciplinary sanctions. In business, an employee refrains from stealing office inventory solely out of fear of getting caught and fired.

Degreelive

- **Stage 2: Instrumental Purpose and Exchange (Individualism):** Right action is viewed in terms of personal transactional benefit ("What is in it for me?"). Cooperation occurs only when there is an immediate, direct quid-pro-quo benefit.

Level 2: Conventional Morality (Conformity and Societal Order)

The individual evaluates morality based on social acceptance, interpersonal relationships, and maintaining societal order:

- **Stage 3: Interpersonal Concordance ("Good Boy / Nice Girl" Orientation):** Right action is determined by conforming to the expectations of immediate peer groups, colleagues, and family. The individual seeks social approval, loyalty, and harmonious relationships.
- **Stage 4: Social System Maintenance (Law and Order Orientation):** Morality is defined by upholding societal laws, fulfilling official duties, and maintaining social stability. An executive conforms strictly to corporate policies and national statutes because the legal system preserves collective civil order. (Kohlberg found that the vast majority of adults operate primarily at Stage 4).

Level 3: Post-Conventional / Principled Morality (Universal Ethical Principles)

The individual evaluates morality based on autonomous, self-chosen philosophical principles that transcend existing laws and social conventions:

- **Stage 5: Social Contract and Individual Rights:** Right action is evaluated in terms of fundamental human rights, constitutional liberties, and social contracts that maximize societal welfare. Laws are viewed as social agreements that can and should be amended through democratic processes if they fail to serve human flourishing.
- **Stage 6: Universal Ethical Principles:** The pinnacle of moral maturity. Right action is guided by internalized, universal principles of justice, human dignity, equality, and moral reciprocity (such as Kant's Categorical Imperative or the Golden Rule). The individual adheres to these principles even if doing so results in imprisonment, societal condemnation, or financial ruin.

James Rest's Four-Component Model of Moral Behavior

Educational psychologist **James Rest** demonstrated that ethical action in organizational life requires four sequential psychological components; failure in any single component results in ethical failure:

1. **Moral Awareness / Sensitivity:** The ability to recognize that a specific operational situation or business decision contains an ethical dilemma that will impact the rights or well-being of others. Managers who suffer from "ethical blindness" fail to recognize moral implications in routine commercial transactions.
2. **Moral Judgment:** The cognitive capacity to evaluate which course of action among available alternatives is morally justified, drawing upon moral reasoning frameworks (Kohlberg's stages).
3. **Moral Motivation / Intent:** The willingness to prioritize moral values above competing organizational imperatives, such as short-term profit quotas, career promotions, or personal financial bonuses.
4. **Moral Character / Implementation Courage:** Possessing the emotional fortitude, persistence, interpersonal courage, and resilience to execute the ethical decision in the face of

DegreeLive

intense executive pressure, organizational peer resistance, and personal career risks.

6. Ethical Decision-Making Frameworks in Practice

To assist executives in navigating high-stakes moral dilemmas under intense time constraints, ethicists have developed practical, structured decision heuristics:

The Potter Box Framework

Formulated by Harvard theologian Ralph Potter, the **Potter Box** guides managers through a four-step iterative cycle to reach justifiable ethical decisions:

1. **Definition / Empirical Facts:** Comprehensively clarify all objective facts of the situation without speculation or moralizing. Identify all involved parties, financial stakes, and operational realities.
2. **Values:** Identify the underlying personal, organizational, and professional values at stake (e.g., corporate loyalty, public safety, shareholder return, personal honesty).
3. **Principles:** Apply foundational philosophical frameworks (Kant's Deontology, Mill's Utilitarianism, Aristotle's Golden Mean) to analyze the moral imperatives.
4. **Loyalties:** Explicitly identify to whom the decision-maker owes primary allegiance (shareholders, customers, colleagues, family, society). The convergence of these four quadrants produces an ethically defensible policy.

Laura Nash's Twelve-Question Model

Business ethicist **Laura Nash** formulated twelve practical diagnostic questions that corporate managers must answer before finalizing any controversial operational decision:

- 1. Have you defined the problem accurately?
- 2. How would you define the problem if you stood on the other side of the fence (from the customer or employee perspective)?
- 3. How did this situation occur in the first place?
- 4. To whom and to what do you give your loyalty as a person and as a member of the corporation?
- 5. What is your intention in making this decision?
- 6. How does this intention compare with the probable results?
- 7. Whom could your decision or action injure?
- 8. Can you discuss the problem with the affected parties before you make your decision?
- 9. Are you confident that your position will be as valid over a long period of time as it seems now?
- 10. Could you disclose without qualm your decision to your chief executive officer, your board of directors, your family, and society as a whole (The Front-Page / Sunlight Test)?
- 11. What is the symbolic potential of your action if understood? If misunderstood?
- 12. Under what conditions would you allow exceptions to your stand?

Degreelive

Rushworth Kidder's Dilemma Paradigms

Ethicist **Rushworth Kidder** observed that the most agonizing managerial dilemmas are not "right versus wrong" (which merely requires basic moral courage to obey), but **"Right versus Right"** dilemmas where two deeply cherished core values clash. Kidder identified four classic right-versus-right paradigms:

- **Truth versus Loyalty:** Telling the objective, unvarnished truth versus maintaining personal loyalty to a colleague, superior, or organization.
- **Individual versus Community:** Protecting the rights and dignity of a single individual versus safeguarding the collective well-being of the wider organization or society.
- **Short-Term versus Long-Term:** Addressing immediate operational survival and quarterly earnings pressures versus investing in sustainable long-term institutional health and ecological preservation.
- **Justice versus Mercy:** Enforcing strict, impartial corporate disciplinary rules versus extending compassionate, individualized mercy to an employee facing extraordinary personal hardship.

7. Religious and Cultural Traditions in Business Ethics

Long before the formalization of modern corporate jurisprudence and secular philosophical ethics, human civilizations grounded economic commerce in sacred spiritual traditions and cultural value systems. Understanding these diverse traditions is essential for contemporary managers navigating global and cross-cultural enterprises.

The Indian Ethos in Management and Ancient Wisdom

The Indian philosophical tradition offers profound insights into commercial ethics, sustainable prosperity, and leadership integrity:

- **The Purusharthas (The Four Legitimate Aims of Human Life):** Indian philosophy integrates material prosperity with moral duty across four life objectives:
  - **Dharma (Moral Righteousness and Duty):** The supreme regulatory foundation. All human endeavors must conform to universal cosmic order, truthfulness, and ethical duty.
  - **Artha (Material Wealth and Economic Means):** Wealth creation is explicitly recognized as noble, necessary, and virtuous, provided it is acquired strictly within the boundaries of Dharma.
  - **Kama (Sensory Enjoyment and Fulfillment):** Legitimate aesthetic and emotional desires pursued ethically.
  - **Moksha (Spiritual Liberation):** The ultimate realization of human potential. Wealth (Artha) generated through unethical violations of Dharma leads to spiritual degradation and societal collapse.
- **Nishkama Karma (Selfless / Non-Attached Action):** Articulated in the *Bhagavad Gita* (Chapter 2, Verse 47: *"Karmanye vadikaraste ma phaleshu kadachana"*), this principle teaches that an individual has a sovereign duty to perform work with total dedication, craftsmanship, and

moral excellence, without remaining psychologically obsessed or paralyzed by personal selfish desire for the fruits (fruits or profits) of action. In modern management, Nishkama Karma translates into **Process-Oriented Excellence**: executives who focus relentlessly on quality, customer service, and ethical integrity naturally achieve superior commercial outcomes as an organic byproduct.

- **Kautilya's Arthashastra:** Written by Chanakya in the 4th century BCE, the *Arthashastra* provides a comprehensive treatise on statecraft, governance, economic administration, and public accountability. Chanakya articulated the famous governance maxim: *"In the happiness of his subjects lies the king's happiness; in their welfare his welfare."* He established strict auditing protocols, severe penalties for bureaucratic embezzlement, and consumer protection mandates against merchant hoarding and price gouging.
- **Trusteeship Model (Mahatma Gandhi):** Gandhi formulated the socio-economic doctrine of **Trusteeship**, positing that wealthy industrialists and business owners are not the absolute sovereign proprietors of corporate wealth; rather, they are merely moral "trustees" holding societal resources in trust for the collective welfare of the community and the impoverished masses. This philosophy laid the spiritual foundation for Indian corporate philanthropy (e.g., the Tata Group's trust architecture).

Global Spiritual Perspectives on Commerce

- **Confucian Ethics (East Asia):** Dominates business conduct in China, Japan, and East Asia through the concept of **Guanxi** (reciprocal interpersonal networks built on mutual trust). Emphasizes filial piety, collective societal harmony, respect for hierarchical authority, and the virtue of *Ren* (benevolence and humaneness).
- **Islamic Banking and Shariah Principles:** Commercial transactions under Islamic jurisprudence prohibit **Riba** (usurious interest charges, promoting equity profit-and-loss sharing contracts such as Mudarabah and Musharakah) and **Gharar** (excessive contractual ambiguity, deception, and gambling/speculation). Investment in alcohol, tobacco, arms, and predatory financial derivatives is strictly forbidden.
- **Judeo-Christian Ethics:** Emphasizes the sanctity of individual contracts, strict truthfulness in weights and measures, the stewardship of the natural Earth, and the moral duty of employers to pay fair, prompt wages to day laborers without exploitation.

8. Corporate Moral Agency: Can a Corporation Be Morally Responsible?

A contentious theoretical debate in business ethics investigates whether an abstract legal entity—the corporation—can be classified as a genuine **Moral Agent** capable of holding moral responsibility, or whether moral praise and blame attach exclusively to the flesh-and-blood human beings who operate within it.

The Non-Agent (Individualist / Reductionist) View

Scholars such as John Ladd argue that a corporation is merely an artificial legal fiction—a legal machine or formal organizational structure. Machines possess neither a conscious mind, nor

emotional capacity, nor autonomous moral soul. Consequently, it is a category mistake to hold a corporation morally responsible. When ethical atrocities occur (such as industrial chemical disasters or accounting fraud), accountability must be reduced strictly to the specific individual human executives, engineers, or directors who made the culpable decisions.

The Corporate Moral Agency View

Philosopher **Peter French** developed the seminal **Corporate Internal Decision (CID) Structure** theory, establishing that corporations are genuine moral agents:

- A corporation possesses a structured CID framework comprising formal organizational flowcharts, designated lines of decision-making authority, standard operating procedures (SOPs), and overarching corporate policies.
- When an individual employee acts within the authorized rules of the CID structure, their personal action is synthesized and converted into a **Corporate Intentional Action**. The ultimate decision represents the institutional intent of the corporation as an autonomous entity, transcending any single individual's personal motives.
- Therefore, corporations can legitimately be held morally praiseworthy or blameworthy, subjected to societal censure, organizational reform mandates, and punitive corporate criminal liability independent of individual sanctions.

DegreeLive