Philosophical Anthropology and Ethics for Management

1. Introduction

This is a propaedeutic course on the philosophical study of human nature and action, that complements other scientific approaches to management. At the heart of management -both as science and practice- lies the human person, that through his or her actions - in cooperation with other people and using resources efficiently- tries to achieve some valuable aims. Empirical sciences might not be sufficient for a full understanding of this reality.

In a Masters of Research in Management, a course like this one might need an explanation-if not a thorough justification. Here we provide just three preliminary reasons for its convenience:

First, Management is considered and studied as a branch of the social sciences, closely related to Economics, Psychology, Sociology, etc. In that regard, scientific contributions in this field are bound to the same methodological limitations proper to empirical sciences. Unavoidably, social sciences build on assumptions regarding the human being and society (typically the so-called homo oeconomicus). For purposes of intellectual rigor and for understanding the specific contribution of scientific knowledge, it is therefore necessary to discuss explicitly those assumptions -and further assumptions adopted in scientific enquiry. That is a philosophical task which is usually taken for granted.

Second, Management is a practice and therefore a dimension of human action. Human decisions and deeds are not the result of external or internal determinism, but a function of human freedom—at least this is a hypothesis worth discussing before taking for granted the opposite. Thus, the study of human action demands adopting an internal point of view of the acting person, taking into account his or her reasons for action. Such an study will prove more accurate descriptively than a purely external approach. But demands engaging explicitly and rationally in normative (ethical) questions regarding the desirability of the aims pursued in action, and their role in human flourishing.

Thirdly, understanding better the purposes to which management serves -individually and socially- allows to address responsibly pressing issues of social legitimacy that affect management as a science and as a practice, by emphasizing its human and social worth and effectively contributing to the common good. Even if we as individuals did not care much about the human person and its moral flourishing, people working in business firms and many other social actors care intensely.

A philosophical study of human action was central to the Western intellectual tradition since Ancient Greece until recently. Only within that tradition the emergence of Modern social science can be properly understood and cultivated. Moreover, contemporary to the development of management as a science in the last hundred years, alternative philosophical approaches have criticized heavily its assumptions from different perspectives: Marxism, critical theory, poststructuralism, feminism, etc. Among these alternative views, there has been a revival of Aristotelianism which has received significant attention in management literature.
Assuming that most students do not have any specialized training in philosophy, this course starts with four introductory sessions. We will then review some main philosophical concepts basic to Management, such as freedom, reason, knowledge, emotions, action, work, happiness, human dignity, responsibility, virtue, values, and so on. We will build the discussion on-but not restricted to-the Aristotelian tradition-mostly in its Christian-humanistic reception-central in shaping Western civilization. We will draw mainly on recent well established authors, who have entered in dialogue both with Modern scientific approaches and Modern and Postmodern philosophy.

2. Objectives

The overall goal of this course is to provide a strong anthropological and ethical base for understanding management and management theories. More specifically, the objectives pursued in this course are:

1. To discover and to explain that management always entails a certain vision of the human being, along with a view of the nature and purpose of business in society.
2. To gain understanding of different views of the human being provided by philosophy and social sciences.
3. To reflect on key anthropological topics and their relevance for management.
4. To introduce students to ethics and ethical theories.

3. Learning outcomes

After this course, students should be able to:

- Understand the anthropological models and ethical assumptions underlying economic and managerial theories.
- Know some basic concepts, arguments and proposals of philosophical anthropology and ethics that are applicable to management.
- Explore how philosophical anthropology and ethics concepts can be integrated in their own research.

4. Competences

General competencies:

CG1: Acquire knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes required to conduct research on a global basis in the field of business management.
CG2: Identify and solve business problems, often with uncertain and incomplete information, and involving direction and management of people in organizational frameworks.
CG3: Conduct a critical analysis, evaluation and synthesis of new and complex ideas with the objective to produce general principles applicable to business situations.
CG4: Profound understanding and appreciation of the importance of the human factor within an organizational framework.
CG7: Know the main concepts and policies in the area of philosophical anthropology that specifically contribute to deepening its relationship with business management.
Basic competencies:

CB6: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding that provide a basis or opportunity for originality in developing and / or application of ideas, often related to a research context.

CB7: Students must be capable of applying their knowledge and their ability to solve problems in new or unfamiliar environments within broader (or multidisciplinary) contexts related to business ethics and corporate social responsibility.

CB8: Students should be able to integrate business ethics knowledge and handle complexity, and to formulate judgments based on information that was incomplete or limited, including reflection on social and ethical responsibilities linked to the application of their knowledge and judgments.

CB9: Students should be able to communicate clearly and concisely their conclusions, underlying knowledge and reasons to a specialized and non-specialized audience.

CB 10: Students should possess the learning outcomes that enable them to continue studying in a way that will be largely self-directed or autonomous.

Specific competencies:

CE1: Understand the concepts of anthropological philosophy and analyze from them management theory and practice.

CE5: Ability to understand state-of-the-art research in philosophical anthropology applied to management published in the top academic journals and compare and contrast the arguments developed in the papers from a logical and empirical point of view.

CE6: Ability to take current management and organizational human problems and identify how different philosophical anthropology can help us understand them.

5. Content

The course has three different parts:

- The first part introduces the relevance of a philosophical view of management and enters into dialogue with other approaches based on empirical and social sciences.

- The second part focuses on Philosophical Anthropology and reviews the main topics and their relation to decision-making and management.

- The second part focuses on Ethics and presents a general view of ethics and a framework that helps to understand the different ethical theories.

6. Methodology

Classes are based on discussion of readings.

7. Grading

Class participation and a final paper based on the concepts that have been discussed during the course.
8. General outline of the course

I. INTRODUCTION
   1. Epistemological perspectives on human action
   2. From Philosophy to Modern Science
   3. Social Science and Management
   4. Internal and external critiques to social sciences

II. PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY
   1. The person and the world
   2. Knowledge beyond perceptions
   3. Tendencies and emotions
   4. Freedom and human will
   5. Happiness and human flourishing
   6. Social animals: community, authority and cooperation
   7. Transforming the world: human work

III. ETHICS
   1. The ethical dimension of human action
   2. Human goods and utilitarianism
   3. Moral norms and deontologism
   4. Developing virtues
   5. Practical wisdom
   7. The common good
   8. Temperance, self-control and fortitude
   9. An integrative view of ethics and its role in social science and management
9. Detailed outline of the course (with assignments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>MATERIAL (CASES, READINGS,...)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART I. INTRODUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Questions:**  
1. What are the scientific approaches to the human being most useful in management?  
2. Are those scientific approaches able to give a comprehensive account of human life and more specifically of the uniqueness of the human person?  
3. What is specific of the human person as an object of study? |
| 2 | **From Philosophy to Modern Science** | Messerly, J.G., *An Introduction to Ethical Theories* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1995), Chapter 1: "What is Philosophy?", 1-15  
**Questions:**  
1. What's the relation between philosophy and science? And the difference? Is philosophy a science?  
2. What does it mean to think philosophically?  
3. How do you think philosophy can serve as a foundation for business and/or management studies? |
- Further readings:  
  o MacIntyre, A.: *After Virtue*, Chapter 7, "'Fact', Explanation and Expertise". |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the methodological purpose and grounding of the <em>homo economicus</em> model? How is it present in management sciences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you think the <em>homo economicus</em> model is descriptively accurate, instrumentally useful and normatively correct?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are you familiar with alternative views of human agency and their current impact in shaping management sciences and research agendas?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 Internal and external critiques to social sciences

- Further readings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are the main critiques or limitations to empirical social sciences from within those same sciences? What are the reasons for the limited predictive power of science, and what are the implications for interpreting its contribution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is it possible to explain and understand forms of social cooperation from a purely descriptive-value-free-perspective? What is the alternative? How could these alternatives not be expression of subjective preferences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is the relationship between the descriptive dimension of social science, the instrumental and the normative/evaluative dimension of it? How would these distinctions work in the field of your research in management?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART II. PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

#### 5 The person and the world


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the world / nature “rational”? If so, what does this claim mean? How different is the order in nature from the order in the artificial world?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How is nature ordered? (main divisions of nature)
3. How is the realm of life ordered? (main divisions of living things)
4. How would you characterize the “peculiarly human way of being-in-the-world”?
   How do you characterize the distinctiveness of the human being?
5. What are the pros and cons for supporting the existence of an “ahistorical human nature”?

6  Knowledge beyond perceptions

Questions:
1. The first step in the decision making process is to appraise and to know the world around us. How do the different types of reason intervene in the decision-making process?
2. What are the different steps that we follow in the process of knowledge?
3. Where our ideas come from? Compare the different proposals of the different theories that appear along the text.
4. What is the relation between knowledge, belief, certainty, truth? How would you characterize a scientific attitude towards truth?

7  Tendencies and emotions

Questions:
1. How are emotions evaluated? What are the dangers of denying/rejecting/downplaying emotions? What are the dangers of absolutizing/glorifying/exaggerating the importance of emotions?
2. Can human beings ever be free from their emotions? Would that be desirable? Why or why not?
3. What is the role of emotions and affectivity in the decision-making process?

8  Freedom and human will
   - Calleja, R. and Cremers, M., “The business firm as a 'concert of freedoms'”, Working Paper pro manuscripta (to be delivered)
- Further readings:

**Questions:**
1. How would you describe your inner experience of freedom, and what role does that have in understanding other people's behavior?
2. What is the relationship between reason and free will? Is it possible to be free against reason? Is reason unilaterally directed to a given end so that free will is simply following it? How do emotions affect free will?
3. What are the implications of different normative visions of freedom in management studies?

### 9

**Happiness and human flourishing**

- Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book A
- Adler, M.J., "How can I make a good life for myself?", in *The time of our lives*, ch. 2, pp. 8-21.

**Questions:**
1. According to Aristotle, how can we characterize happiness?
2. To what extent is happiness related to and/or different from desire, satisfaction? Is happiness something objective or subjective?
3. According to Adler, how can we characterize a life worth living?
4. Is it going too far to ask business to make us happy?

### 10

**Social animals: community, authority and cooperation**

- Further readings:

**Questions:**
1. Is friendship and benevolence -willing the good of others for themselves- compatible with the view of self-interested individuals?
2. Why is authority necessary forms of human cooperation?
3. What is the relationship between authority and power? Are there any tensions between them?

11 Transforming the world: human work

Questions:
1. What is work? Is it a purely instrumental activity? Can it be subjectively fulfilling? Does it have an intrinsic meaning?
2. What are the main requirements that stem from the intrinsic meaning of work?
3. What are the implications of these discussions for issues related to the ongoing technological transformations and the future of work?

PART III. ETHICS

12 The ethical dimension of human action
- De Finance, J., “An Ethical Inquiry”, pp.7-31 (Note: You can escape footnotes and paragraphs with small letter, if you want)

Questions:
1. Is ethical behaviour just a matter of cultural forms?
2. Human beings move within a wider spectrum of actions (from hospitality to cannibalism, so to say). Does have ethics anything to say about that?
3. De Finance defines ethics as “the science of human action”. Try to analyze the main characteristics that this science has.

13 Human goods and utilitarianism
- Sandel, M. “Utilitarianism”, *Justice*, pp. 31-57.
- Further readings:
### Questions:
1. What is the best case for utilitarianism? How is it present in our ordinary moral reasoning?
2. What are the weaknesses of utilitarianism as a moral theory?
3. Is it reasonable to consider all human goods as forms of the same kind of good, therefore allowing comparison, measurement, and calculation? If not, what are the implications for social science and management?

### 14
#### Moral norms and deontologism

#### Questions:
1. How do deontologism and teleologism compare one each other? Similarities and differences
2. Try to understand and challenge the six fundamental insights of Adler’s proposal (pp. 161-165)
3. Why Adler’s proposal is sound, practical and undogmatic? Do you agree? How does he compare his proposal to other theories?

### 15
#### Developing virtues

#### Questions:
1. How can we acquire, develop and perfect the moral virtues?
2. Evaluate Hartman’s main position regarding the teachability of character.

### 16
#### Practical wisdom
- MacIntyre, A., *Dependent Rational Animals*, Chapter 8: “How do we become independent practical reasoners? How do the virtues make this possible?”, pp. 93-118
- Further readings:
### Questions:

1. What is the difference between instrumental reason and practical reason? Between technical expertise and moral virtue?
2. How do we learn to be reasonable in practice? How is that related with technical expertise and efficiency, so central to management?
3. What is the relationship between moral knowledge, prudence and individual conscience?
4. How can social science be integrated in practical decision making?

### Justice.

#### Human dignity and human rights

- Further readings:

#### Questions:

1. What is the meaning of justice, and its main forms?
2. What is the foundation for moral equality among human beings?
3. Why do we have a list of multiple rights and not simply a general right to freedom?
4. Is the language of rights sufficient to build a minimum universal moral consensus?

### The common good

- Calleja, R., “The common good and the economy. A disambiguation and a proposal” (Draft. To be delivered).
- Further readings:

#### Questions:

1. In what sense can we share goods with others? What are the dimensions of the common good?
2. How is the common good of any human group related to the wider social common good, the specifically political common good, and the common good of humanity?
3. What is -or should be- the contribution of business to the common good of society at large?
| 19 | **Temperance, self-control and fortitude**  
- McDermott, *Summa Theologiae. A Concise Translation*, pp. 382-399, and 422-441 (regarding the last pages on "virtues allied to moderation", just take a look)  
- Fontrodona, J. and Sanz, P., Moderation as a moral competence: Integrating perspectives for a better understanding of temperance in the workplace, *Journal of Business Ethics*, (to be delivered)  
**Questions:**  
1. How can we characterize fortitude and temperance? What is the role that these virtues play in human behavior?  
2. How can organizations favor or hinder the acquisition of these virtues? |
|---|---|
| 20 | **Revisiting the notion of management**  
- Andreu, R. and J.M. Rosanas, Manifesto for a better management. A rational and humanistic view |
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