

## Syllabus LGST 611, Fall 2020

### A Note about Covid, July 21, 2020:

- This syllabus is being adjusted to the Covid crisis. Some of the assignments and grading criteria will change.
- This class will be held entirely online. There will be no physical meetings.
- The format of the class will be “hybrid,” using a combination of synchronous and asynchronous elements.
- All synchronous, all-student sessions will be held at the time scheduled for the class, Eastern Time.
- Attendance of synchronous all-student sessions is encouraged, but in light of obvious challenges for some students, is not required.

### **RESPONSIBILITY IN GLOBAL MANAGEMENT: (sections 001 and 002)**

**Instructor:** Thomas Donaldson

The Mark O. Winkelman Professor at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania.

E-mail: [donaldst@wharton.upenn.edu](mailto:donaldst@wharton.upenn.edu)

### **Goals for the course:**

This course introduces students to important legal and ethical challenges they may face in global business. It is designed to raise ethical and legal conflicts and dilemmas, and to provide plausible frameworks for dealing with those conflicts. It is also designed to reveal common patterns of success and failure. It is not intended to convert sinners into saints, preach absolute truths, convey the wisdom of moral philosophers, or deter the morally vulnerable. Class sessions will consist of collaborative case discussions, exercises, and discussions of theoretical frameworks for interpreting ethics and law.

### **Readings:**

All materials are available on CANVAS. In each assignment, there will be links to the relevant readings, which are stored on CANVAS in either the Files or Study.Net tab.

### **Grading and Logistics**

1. **Reaction Papers** (15% of course grade).
2. **Overall Contribution to Class** (25%)
3. **Short-Answer Readings/Lecture Quiz** (15%).
4. **Final Essays: Analysis of case-study and your personal definition of business responsibility** (45%)

**1. Reaction Papers (15% of course grade).** During the course, you will be asked to write and submit five brief “reaction papers” (approximately 150 words). In each paper you will be asked to respond to a question created by the instructor about the upcoming class's readings and issues. I want your personal reactions. Each paper is due prior to the class session. Assignments are ungraded and will be marked only “acceptable” or “unacceptable.” Except in rare instances, I will not critique or comment on your paper. An “acceptable grade” creates a credit of 3 points, for a total of 3 points X 5 reaction papers = 15 points, and 15% of the final course grade. Failure to submit a reaction paper on time or an unsuccessful submission (one that fails to follow the guidelines, or is of very poor quality) will result in an “unacceptable” and 0 points. However, if you fail to submit a paper on time, or if the paper is of unacceptable quality, you may submit after the due date but within the “availability” dates specified on CANVAS, and receive a total of 1 point for the assignment. Because you will have approximately five days in which to submit a given reaction paper before the class session, no excuses for late papers will be accepted.

Reaction papers should be entirely your own work, involving no collaboration with other students.

## **2. Overall Contribution to Class (25% of class grade)**

Assuming attendance, your commitment to exercises, preparation, class engagement and participation will comprise 25% of the grade.

The top 20% of the class on this component will receive 25 points. The next 60% will receive from 22-24 points. The bottom 10% will receive from 0-21 points.

## **3. Short-Answer Readings/Lecture Quiz (15%).**

A 30 minute "Readings/Lecture Quiz" will be given in the final class. This quiz will feature short-answer questions (i.e. a sentence or two), true/false, fill in the blanks, etc. The purpose of the quiz is to reward students who prepare and master the assigned readings and who learn from class lectures. It is closed-book and closed-note.

## **4. Final Essays: Analysis of case-study and your personal definition of business responsibility) (45%)**

A final assignment is due by midnight, one week after our final class (see schedule). The major portion (2/3rds) consists of the analysis of a new case study (not one that we have already read in class), making use of the tools and materials discussed in class. The smaller portion (1/3rd) consists of an essay articulating your personal definition of business responsibility. The two sections together should not exceed 1500 words. The exercise will be open-book and open-note. The case study and essay instructions will be available on CANVAS immediately following our last class. You will submit your essays via CANVAS.

## **Class Attendance and ground rules:**

The course meets six times. Classes will consist of some combination of lecture and discussion depending on the nature of the materials, but in all instances student preparation and participation are essential. Students should come to class prepared to discuss the cases and share both their analysis and recommendations. It should be noted that you cannot participate if you are not in the classroom.

Please turn off internet connections during class time. You may use an iPad or a similar flat device that does not protrude upwards in order to take notes or to access already-downloaded class readings. Please put away mobile telephones.

1. Please display your name tent during the first two classes. If you forget yours, please make an informal one.
2. You may eat in class

**Calendar:**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Readings and reactions</b>	<b>Reaction Paper:</b>
<b>Week 1</b>	<p><b>How to think about values and business</b></p> <p>Case Study: Please read the mini-case studies, “Lisa Jordan,” “Carlos Garcia ,” and “Dexter Simmons” in “Professionals' Quandaries</p> <p>Case study: “Dicing with Death? A case study of Guidant Corporation’s implantable defibrillator +++</p> <p>Additional (not required) readings: “Does Business Ethics Make Economic Sense” Sen, Amartya (1993).</p>	
<b>Week 2</b>	<p><b>Ethics Away from Home</b></p> <p>“Values in Tension: Ethics Away from Home,” Donaldson, Thomas, Harvard Business Review, September-October, 1996. Study.net</p> <p>Case study: "What Price, Safety?"</p> <p>Case Study: Kitchen Best: Ethics When Doing Cross-Boundary Business in Southern China Study.net</p> <p>+++</p> <p>Additional (not required) reading: “The Business Case for Complying with Bribery Laws.” Nichols, P. 2012. American Business Law Journal 49(2): 325-368.</p>	<p><b>Reaction Paper:</b></p> <p>In the case study, “Kitchen Best: Ethics when doing cross-boundary business in southern China,” which, if any, of the following incidents reflect deeper, long-term problems? Shago, Haus de Metro, and the Honghau account? Why?</p> <p><i>Your answer should be approximately 150 words. (You do not have to write exactly 150 words, but excessively brief or overly lengthy reactions will be penalized. Your answer should be entirely your own work, involving no collaboration with other students.</i></p> <p><i>Submit online using the embedded CANVAS function in this assignment.</i></p>

<p><b>Week 3</b></p>	<p><b>Corporate Purpose</b></p> <p>“Stacey Duquette” Case Study in HBS Professionals' Quandaries</p> <p>Porter, M. E. 2011. Creating Shared Value. Harvard Business Review, 89(1/2): 62-77 Study.net</p> <p>“Doing well by doing good: The grand illusion.” Karnani, A. 2011. California Management Review, 53: 69-86.</p> <p>"Serving Shareholders Doesn't Mean Putting Profit above All Else."</p> <p>“Should business put purpose before profit?” Edgecliffe-Johnson, A. (2019) FT.Com</p> <p><b>Additional (not required) readings:</b> "Androids and Corporations," Donaldson, T. 2019 Georgetown Journal of Law and Public Policy</p>	<p><b>Reaction paper:</b></p> <p>Should Stacey Duquette and other employees of Barker Consulting (BC) ever “intentionally mislead” clients in situations like the one described in the case study? Might your opinion differ depending upon how Barker Consulting sees its mission or “purpose?”</p>
<p><b>Week 4</b></p>	<p><b>Corporate Governance and Financial Systems</b></p> <p>Case: The Goldman Sachs IPO (HBS case 9-800-016) <b>Study.net</b></p> <p><i>The Financial Crisis:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stiglitz, “Needed: A New Economic Paradigm”</li> <li>• O’Driscoll, “An Economy of Liars”</li> <li>• Donaldson, “Three Ethical Roots of the Financial Crisis”</li> <li>• Norris, F. "In Actions, S.&amp;P. Risked Andersen’s Fate"</li> <li>• Thaler, “Recipes for Ruin, in the Gulf or on Wall Street”</li> </ul> <p>Additional (not required) reading:</p> <p>“Banking Conduct and Culture: The Group of Thirty, 2018.</p>	<p><b>Reaction Paper:</b></p> <p>Was the pre-IPO partnership structure of Goldman Sachs necessary to preserve Goldman's special culture?</p>

<p><b>Week 5</b></p>	<p><b>Value Challenges for Technology</b></p> <p>“Preparing for the future of artificial intelligence.” Executive Office of the President National Science and Technology Council Committee on Technology, October 2016 (Read especially section on Workforce Diversity pp 26-28 and Fairness, Safety and Governance pp 30-32)</p> <p>“The History of Technological Anxiety and the Future of Economic Growth: Is This Time Different? Joel Mokyr; Chris Vickers; Nicolas L. Ziebarth. <i>The Journal of Economic Perspectives</i>, 07/2015, Volume 29, Issue</p> <p><i>Using online resources, familiarize yourself with the events at Google surrounding the infamous "Damore Memo." Come to class prepared to take a position on whether James Damore should have been fired by Google chief executive, Sundar Pichai.</i></p> <p>"Google Playboy Interview" <i>Playboy Magazine</i></p>	<p><b>Reaction Paper:</b></p> <p>How would you compare Google's corporate culture today to that of 2004 (the time of the Google Playboy Interview)</p>
<p><b>Week 6</b></p>	<p><b>Managing Systemic Operational Risk:</b></p> <p>Donaldson, T. 2004. “Dangerous Currents” <i>Directors &amp; Boards</i></p> <p>Self-Inflicted Industry Wounds: Early Warning Signals and Pelican Gambits,” Donaldson and Schoemaker, <i>California Management Review</i>. Winter, 2013.</p> <p>Case Study: “Barclays and the LIBOR Scandal” HBS 9-313-075 <b>Study.net</b></p> <p><b>Exercise:</b> “Used Car” [Handed out in class]</p>	<p><b>Reaction Paper:</b></p> <p>How responsible was Bob Diamond for Barclays’ misbehavior in the LIBOR disaster? Did he deserve to be fired?</p> <p><b>Short-Answer Readings Quiz</b> (15% of course grade).</p> <p>A 30 minute "Readings/Lecture Quiz" will be given in the final class. This Quiz will feature short-answer questions (i.e. a sentence or two), true/false, fill in the blanks, etc. The purpose of the quiz is to reward students who prepare and master the assigned readings and who learn from class lectures. It is closed-book and closed-note.</p>