

Exploring Learning During a YouTube Business Ethics Simulation

Rick Revoir, College of St. Scholastica

ABSTRACT

Online technologies are changing how businesses operate and also how university students learn. This paper discusses the findings from a study that explored learning during a business ethics simulation that incorporated YouTube. A qualitative case study method of inquiry was used to develop an in-depth description and analysis of student learning during a business ethics simulation. Based on student feedback three key themes that appeared to affect ethical thinking emerged during data analysis 1) working in groups, 2) watching YouTube videos, and 3) experiencing less nervousness. There is some element about students seeing themselves as an actor in a video which enhances learning. The process of students watching themselves “do the right thing” on screen may promote ethical thinking. The design of the simulation offers educators an engaging assignment that can be incorporated into courses.

INTRODUCTION

In September, 2008 the bankruptcy of investment bank Lehman Brothers helped trigger a global financial crisis. Many ethical questions have arisen as a result of the global financial crisis. For example, actions by Goldman Sachs and Ireland’s banks have presented ethical questions. Greece is struggling to manage the repayment of government debt and Goldman Sachs allegedly helped the Greek government hide the true amount of debt from the public [Keteyian, 2010]. Ireland is also struggling with record amounts of government debt because the government guaranteed the loans of Irish Banks that were facing bankruptcy due to large real estate loans. Between the market peak of 2007 and 2012 property values in Ireland have dropped over 50%. During the boom times between 2004-2007 developers in Ireland built more housing units than there were people to occupy them. It is alleged that government oversight was inadequate to regulate the banks which resulted in the banks issuing mortgages that fueled a housing bubble that burst in 2007. Some Irish bankers were issuing mortgages with minimal income documentation which resulted in easy credit for home owners and developers.

With all of the recent business ethics scandals one can ask how should universities teach ethics to business students? Online technologies are changing how businesses operate and also how university students learn. Multimillion dollar stock trades are executed online and young people spend a great deal of time online utilizing websites such as YouTube, Facebook and online gaming sites. In the United States during March 2012, YouTube was the third most visited site on the internet [Alexa, 2012]. Online technologies like YouTube offer an engaging tool that educators can use to help students learn about business ethics. This article presents the findings from a qualitative case study that analyzed student learning in a business ethics simulation that incorporated YouTube.

Business professionals face ethical dilemmas throughout their careers. Exposing students to business ethics education in college can increase their awareness of ethical issues and lead to more ethical decision making [AACSB, 2004; Ferrell & Ferrell, 2008; Sims, 2002a].

How students learn about business ethics is changing. For centuries students traditionally learned about ethics in a face-to-face environment, but growth in the 21st century of online learning offers a new modality where students can learn about ethics. Many students currently enrolled in college courses are part of the Millennial Generation. Howe and Nadler [2009] defined Millennials as people born between 1982 and 2004, making them the first generation to come of age during the new millennium. Millennials have been immersed in technology throughout their lives.

Millennials seem to prefer to communicate visually through photos and videos [Berk 2009; Oblinger, 2008]. They tend to be avid users of online collaborative technologies including video sharing sites, podcasts, blogs, wikis, instant messaging, online video games, virtual worlds, and social networking sites. Online collaborative technologies are an example of Web 2.0 tools which allow users to interact and share information on the Internet. Students are using online collaborative technologies to communicate and express themselves. Online collaborative technologies offer a means of helping students to learn in a modality that these students seem to prefer. According to Zull [2004], in order to encourage learning, students should work on activities and topics that naturally appeal to them. Online collaborative technologies are a promising example of 21st century technology that appeals to college students and could help students learn about business ethics.

Face-to-face ethics education has been around for centuries, while online ethics education has been available only recently. Currently, online education is experiencing significant growth. A 2009 survey of online learning noted online enrollment grew at an annual growth rate of 19% over the past six years which is much faster than the 1.5% annual growth rate for overall higher education enrollments [Allen & Seaman, 2010]. A great deal is known about learning in face-to-face business ethics courses [Sims, 2002b; Trevino, 1992; Waples, Antes, Murphy, Connelly, & Mumford, 2008] while comparatively little is known about learning in business ethics courses incorporating online collaborative technologies. A few authors have written about online learning and business ethics [Ottewill & Wall, 2002; Painter-Morland, Fontrodona, Hoffman, & Rowe, 2003; Walker & Jeurissen, 2003], but little is written about using advanced methods such as online collaborative technologies or Web 2.0 tools. This presents an opportunity and need to discover how online collaborative technologies such as YouTube can help college students learn about business ethics.

The purpose of this study was to explore to what extent, if any, does a simulation that incorporates online collaborative technologies affect student learning in a business ethics course. In order to gain a better understanding, this study explored student learning during a simulation in a single business ethics course. The research questions include:

1. What do students identify as significant experiences in a business ethics simulation?
2. To what extent if any does a simulation that incorporates online collaborative technologies promote ethical thinking among college students?

To increase our understanding of how online collaborative technologies can help students learn about business ethics, qualitative research was conducted using a case study format. Creswell [2009] noted that a case study is a qualitative strategy of inquiry in which the researcher explores in-depth an event, program, or activity of one or more individuals. The case consisted of a single business ethics course taught at a private Catholic liberal arts

college in the upper Midwest. Twenty three undergraduate students participated in the study. The course used a hybrid model of delivery incorporating both face-to-face and online instructional methods.

As part of a normal class assignment students working in groups completed a simulation that involved students role-playing characters in a case study. Students created a video clip of their group role-playing the characters in the case study as they analyzed the ethical dilemma using an ethical decision-making model by Goodpaster, Nash and de Bettignies [2006]. Students spent time rehearsing and planning before video recording their ethical dilemma. Students created a story board that included an outline and dialogue for each scene. Students suggested a course of action to address the ethical dilemma. Videos were uploaded to YouTube and the class watched each of the four group videos together. After class students reviewed each YouTube video on their own and posted feedback online of each other's work. Multiple sources of data were collected including a questionnaire, focus group interviews, student ratings of the simulation, and a review of videos by the researcher.

This study was guided by the Four Component Model (FCM) proposed by Rest [1986] and Experiential Learning Theory (ELT) proposed by Kolb [1984]. According to Kolb [1984], learning proceeds as a cycle and results from the integration of four learning modes: (a) concrete experience, (b) reflective observation, (c) abstract conceptualization, and (d) active experimentation. The ELT was chosen in this study because it has informed the theory and practice of experiential learning in a variety of disciplines including business education [Kolb & Kolb, 2005]. Experiential learning is an effective strategy to help students learn about business ethics [Baetz & Carson, 1999; LeClair, Ferrell, Montuori, & Willems, 1999; Sanyal, 2000; Sims, 2002a; Sims & Felton, 2006].

LITERATURE REVIEW

Little is known about how online collaborative technologies can help college students learn about business ethics. The following review explores literature related to moral development and online experiential learning.

Moral Development. Kohlberg [1969] and Rest [1986] developed theories of moral development that have guided the development of ethics research and course development. Moral reasoning is judgment about what is right and wrong; moral development is the maturity level of moral reasoning [Kohlberg, 1969]. Kohlberg built upon the work of Piaget and developed a theory of cognitive moral development that proposed a stage theory of moral reasoning.

Kohlberg's theory focused primarily on only one process of morality: moral judgment. Rest [1986] built upon Kohlberg's work with the FCM of morality that described the inner psychological processes that lead to moral behavior [Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau & Thoma, 1999]. In order to behave morally a person needs to be performing all four psychological processes [Rest, 1986].

Rest's model suggested four inner psychological processes together result in observable behavior. The FCM consists of the following processes:

1. Moral sensitivity (interpreting the situation, role-taking how various actions would affect the parties concerned, imagining cause-effect chains of events, and being aware that there is a moral problem when it exists)
2. Moral judgment (judging which action would be most justifiable in a moral sense)

3. Moral motivation (the degree of commitment to taking the moral course of action, valuing moral values over the other values, and taking personal responsibility for moral outcomes)

4. Moral character (persisting in a moral task, having courage, overcoming fatigue and temptations, and implementing subroutines that serve a moral goal). [Rest et al.,1999, p. 101]

The FCM by Rest [1986] was chosen to guide this study because it is widely used in ethics research [Rest & Narvaez, 1994; Rest et al., 1999]. The study focused on the first two components of Rest's model, moral sensitivity and moral judgment. Most theorists include moral sensitivity and moral judgment as the necessary first steps in ethical decision making [Ritter, 2006]. Trevino, Weaver and Reynolds [2006] noted the link between moral sensitivity and moral judgment has rarely been studied. In addition, much has been written about moral judgment; however, there is a need for more research focusing on moral sensitivity [O'Fallon & Butterfield, 2005].

Online Experiential Learning. Experiential learning that once occurred primarily face-to-face is now also occurring online. Online experiential learning exercises include threaded discussions, online simulations, and the use of online collaborative technologies like YouTube.

Group discussions occur online through message boards and threaded discussions. Roper [2007] observed in online courses that student interaction mostly occurs through threaded discussions. Asynchronous threaded discussions allow students to spend more time preparing their responses. Through threaded discussions students can actively experiment with ideas and discuss them with classmates and instructors.

Online simulations offer students an experiential exercise that exposes them to real world problems. Prensky [2009] observed online simulations allow people to "exercise their imaginative capacity in ever-more complex what-if constructions, allowing for more thorough exploration of possibilities and, in turn, wiser decisions" [para. 19].

Web 2.0 tools include Internet content and applications that are continuously modified by users in a participatory and collaborative fashion [Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010]. Online collaborative technologies are an example of Web 2.0 tools which allow users to interact and share information on the Internet. A partial list of online collaborative technologies include (a) blogs, (b) Google Docs, (c) online discussion boards, (d) social networking sites, (e) social bookmarking sites, (f) video sharing sites such as YouTube, and (g) wikis.

Online collaborative technologies can be used to facilitate experiential learning exercises. Google Docs and wikis allow two or more people to edit a document online in real time. Educators are using wikis to support writing instruction [Alexander, 2006; Ferris & Wilder, 2006] including peer editing assignments. Wikis can be used for problem solving, information libraries, and project spaces. Ferris and Wilder [2006] noted wikis by their nature lend themselves to collaborative work by students and teachers.

Educators are having students create videoblogs on YouTube as an experiential learning exercise to help students reflect on their learning [Dixon, 2009; Downes, 2008]. According to Downes [2008], online video technology is accessible and affordable for students and video sites "transform learning not merely by providing a new channel for educational content but by creating new opportunities for students to express themselves and to see their own learning reflected back to them in a familiar environment" [para. 13]. Experiential learning that historically occurred face-to-face is now also occurring online.

Online learning offers several advantages including increased access to education, reduced commuting costs, flexibility, and opportunities for continuity planning in the event of

a global pandemic. Online learning has increased student access to education [Allen & Seaman, 2007]. Students can enroll in online classes regardless of where they live. Students can also save money on commuting costs by enrolling in an online course. Allen and Seaman [2008] asserted online learning will continue to grow because of rising fuel costs. As gas becomes more expensive online students can save money by staying at home to complete their coursework.

Another advantage of online learning is flexibility. Online learning offers students and faculty flexibility in terms of when coursework is completed. In addition, faculty members and chief academic officers noted the most important motivation for teaching online is flexibility in meeting the needs of students [Allen & Seaman, 2008]. In 2009 the world experienced an outbreak of the H1N1 flu virus. According to Allen and Seaman [2010], online learning could become an important part of academic continuity planning in the event of a global pandemic such as H1N1. Colleges could substitute online courses for face-to-face courses in the event of a global pandemic.

Online collaborative technologies may provide an authentic learning experience for students in a business ethics course. Online collaborative technologies allow users to interact with others on the Internet to create, share, and change web content. Online collaborative technologies are integrated into online course management systems including Blackboard, Desire2Learn, and Moodle.

YouTube.com is an online collaborative technology that allows users to upload video content and allows other users to comment on that content. YouTube enables users to share video and audio files which results in new user generated web content. In order to promote sharing of videos, YouTube provides specific codes to users that can be embedded in third party websites such as online course webpages, blogs, and social networking sites. The popularity of YouTube cannot be overstated. Although YouTube is barely seven years old in March 2012, YouTube.com was the third most visited website in the U.S. [Alexa, 2012].

METHODOLOGY

The case study method was appropriate for this study because it enabled in-depth description and analysis of a bounded case: student learning in a single business ethics class. Gall, Gall and Borg [2007] stated the purpose of selecting a case “is to develop a deeper understanding of the phenomena being studied” [p. 178]. Additionally, Merriam [1988] asserted case studies are an appealing method of inquiry in applied fields like education because “educational processes, problems, and programs can be examined to bring about understanding that in turn can affect and perhaps even improve practice” [p. 32]. The case study method helped develop a deeper understanding of the research questions in the study. A case study is bounded by time, place, and context is essential.

CASE CONTEXT

The context for the case study consisted of a single section of a business ethics course at a private liberal arts. This bounded system, a single business ethics class, was purposefully selected for in-depth study. The study explored student learning during a two-week business ethics simulation that incorporated YouTube, an online collaborative technology.

DATA COLLECTION

This study used the Critical Incident Questionnaire (CIQ) developed by Brookfield [1995], student ratings of the simulation, focus group interviews, and a review of videos by the researcher as sources of data to be analyzed. Please see the appendix for copies of the CIQ, focus group interview questions and the checklist used to review the videos. The researcher collected these data which were used to perform in-depth, triangulated analysis of the students' learning experiences.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis and interpretation used recommendations from Creswell [2009] to analyze the questionnaire responses and focus group data consisting of (a) organizing and preparing the data for analysis, (b) reading through all the data and making sense of it, (c) coding the data, (d) using codes to generate description of categories and themes, (e) describing the findings of the analysis including interrelated themes, and (f) interpreting the meaning of the data.

The CIQ contained five constructed response questions. The results were transcribed and coded to identify patterns and emergent themes. Pattern analysis of the responses to each question indicated the emergent themes. The focus group responses were transcribed by the researcher and downloaded into NVIVO software which was used to analyze the data. The NVIVO software assisted in organizing and coding the data. Nodes were used in NVIVO to develop codes and themes.

Findings by Research Question

Research Question 1: What do students identify as significant experiences in a business ethics simulation?

Based on analysis of the CIQ data students identified (a) working in groups, and (b) watching YouTube videos as meaningful experiences during the simulation. These themes are discussed in more detail in the next section.

Research Question 2: To what extent, if any, does a simulation that incorporates online collaborative technologies promote ethical thinking among college students?

Ethical thinking incorporates moral sensitivity and moral judgment. Based on student feedback the following three key themes appeared to affect ethical thinking: (a) working in groups, (b) watching YouTube videos, and (c) experiencing less nervousness.

Working in groups emerged as a theme based on triangulating data from the CIQ, student ratings of the simulation, and focus groups. Working in groups provided students with more perspectives to consider. Working in groups appeared to affect moral sensitivity because students were exposed to more perspectives from classmates who helped them interpret the case, and identify ethical issues. Working in groups appeared to affect moral judgment because students were exposed to more perspectives from classmates as they reasoned through the case.

Working in groups was a key theme in this study. Individuals frequently make ethical decisions in group meetings and through discussions with co-workers. Workplace ethical decisions are influenced by other people including co-workers and supervisors [Ferrell & Ferrell, 2008; Loe, Ferrell, & Mansfield, 2000]. Students should be exposed to learning experiences that reflect real life ethical issues in the workplace [AACSB, 2004] and this group simulation did just that.

Watching YouTube videos. This theme emerged based on triangulating data from the CIQ, student ratings of the simulation, focus groups, and the review of videos by the researcher. Watching YouTube videos allowed students to rewind and review video which was helpful to learning. A student explained:

I think [the technology did help] because you can instead of just learning it you can look back and keep repeating what people's decisions were so I think that is how technology can go back and see it again. I think that helped a lot.

Watching YouTube videos provided students with more perspectives which appeared to affect moral sensitivity because the videos helped students interpret the case, and identify ethical issues. Watching videos appeared to affect moral judgment because the videos provided students with multiple approaches for reasoning through the case.

YouTube is an online collaborative technology that Millennial students are accustomed to using. Millennials seem to prefer to communicate visually through photos and videos [Berk, 2009; Oblinger, 2008]. They tend to be avid users of online collaborative technologies including video sharing sites, podcasts, blogs, wikis, instant messaging, online video games, virtual worlds, and social networking sites. Online collaborative technologies offer a means of helping students to learn in a modality students seem to prefer. YouTube is an engaging technology that appeals to students and this technology can help them learn. In this study YouTube provided students with more perspectives for resolving an ethical dilemma through an engaging technology students seem to prefer.

Experiencing less nervousness. Students experiencing less nervousness emerged as a theme in the focus group data. Students noted being less nervous while recording their YouTube video than they would be if they had to complete an in-class role-play. One student explained:

I think people get a lot more nervous in front of the class so you don't do things to your fullest...when you are just with your group it is not as nerve wracking for some people and if you mess up you can just take it out.

Students reported that during in-class role-plays, students focus on their own presentation and not on other groups' presentations.

College students have grown up using technology in their personal lives and so they are comfortable using technology in classroom assignments. Keeter and Taylor [2009] observed:

Millennials are the first generation in human history who regard behaviors like Tweeting and texting, along with websites like Facebook, YouTube, Google and Wikipedia, not as astonishing innovations of the digital era, but as everyday parts of their social lives and their search for understanding. [p. 1]

Prensky [2001] designated Millennial generation students as "Digital Natives" because they are "native speakers of the digital language of computers, video games and the internet" [p. 1]. 'Digital Natives' have spent their lives surrounded by cell phones, video games, and

computers, and Prensky asserted that because of their immersion in technology students now think differently than their predecessors.

After the videos were completed the class watched each of the four group videos together and then after class students reviewed each video on their own. In this study students reported being less nervous because they had already completed their own video which allowed them to focus their attention and learning on other groups' YouTube videos. The literature supports findings that integrating online strategies can increase learning. According to a meta-analysis of online learning by Means, Toyama, Murphy, Bakia and Jones [2009], the overall finding noted classes with online learning (whether taught completely online or blended), on average, produce stronger student learning outcomes than classes with solely face-to-face instruction. Researchers also stated when students in online courses spent more time on task than students in the face-to-face courses there was a greater benefit for online learning [Means et al., 2009]. In this study online YouTube videos allowed students to focus their attention and learning on other groups videos.

DISCUSSION

Findings from this study have implications for faculty in the classroom. This study adds to the body of knowledge regarding teaching business ethics and the area of integrating technology into coursework. This study informs college instructors, deans, and others interested in helping college students learn about business ethics. This study offers instructors another technique to incorporate into their courses utilizing an engaging technology which students are accustomed to using.

Colleges can hold down costs by utilizing websites like YouTube. YouTube is a free video sharing website anyone can utilize. Some college libraries loan students \$100 Flip video recorders that can be used to create video clips. YouTube is easily integrated into course management systems including Moodle and Blackboard, and users do not have to pay for online storage of video files which saves colleges money.

The study may also have implications for understanding the role of using YouTube in disciplines outside of business ethics. Courses that require presentations or group work may benefit from the findings in this study. Learning about ethics and moral reasoning is complex. The simulation in this study could be a useful learning tool for other complex topics. Disciplines similar to ethics that do not have clear cut answers and rely on student perceptions may benefit from the findings in this study.

YouTube an Engaging Technology

Students reported that the simulation was engaging and it helped them learn. The simulation in this study offers educators an engaging tool which can be incorporated into courses.

Students reported being less nervous while recording their YouTube video than if they had to complete the assignment in-class in front of their peers and this is an important finding for educators. Because students had already completed their own video they were able to focus their attention and learning on other groups' YouTube videos. Utilizing video technology can enhance student learning because students are not worried about their impending presentation. By recording videos, students produced a better outcome because they were able to make mistakes in their videos and reshoot them before videos were uploaded to YouTube.

Utilizing video technology also allowed students to have their learning reflected back to them. Students could review and rewind their own group's video and other groups' videos. Students reported that being able to review and rewind videos helped them interpret the case and identify ethical issues. If students did not understand part of a video or if they missed a key detail then they could simply rewind and review the video. Students could visually review how their group reasoned through the dilemma which gave student's another means of reflecting on their learning.

Some may argue that YouTube is overused and students are getting YouTube fatigue, but in this simulation, students were the actors in the video which is an important reason why students felt engaged. There is some element about students seeing themselves as an actor in a video which enhances learning. The process of students watching themselves "do the right thing" on screen may promote ethical thinking.

Utilizing YouTube and other online technologies can raise privacy concerns. It is critical that access to videos be restricted to include only the instructor and students. An instructor should not require students to complete an assignment that then could cause harm to the student or institution. For example, during this simulation a student could have recommended that the central character in the case study lie in order to keep his job. If this video was accessible to anyone with an internet connection, then a student could be harmed because potential employers or graduate schools could view the video and misinterpret it. In addition, the institution could be harmed because many of the students in the videos were wearing shirts bearing the college's logo. Another reason for keeping the videos private is because the content of an ethical dilemma could present students in negative manner. For example, if students role play a dilemma that involves sexual harassment or racial discrimination, then by uploading the video for all internet users to view, students and the institution could be harmed. In order to address privacy in this study the videos were uploaded as private videos which restricted access to include only the instructor, students, and researcher.

A limitation of this study is that it was conducted at the institution where the researcher teaches, but he did not teach the course. Student perceptions of the researcher could affect their willingness to participate in interviews, so participation was voluntary.

This study focused on one section of a business ethics course taught at a private Catholic liberal arts college. The study was not designed to generalize about all students enrolled in business ethics courses. This study analyzed selected theoretical components of ELT [Kolb, 1984] and the FCM [Rest, 1986]; it did not seek to analyze all of the components of these theories.

CONCLUSION

Online technology is changing how businesses operate and also how university students learn. YouTube is an online technology that educators can use to help students learn about business ethics. The study resulted in several findings specific to student learning during a business ethics simulation that incorporated YouTube. Based on student feedback three key themes that appeared to affect ethical thinking emerged during data analysis 1) working in groups, 2) watching YouTube videos, and 3) experiencing less nervousness. The design of the simulation offers educators an engaging assignment that can be incorporated into a business ethics course.

The findings of this study add to the literature in the area of business ethics by describing how the integration of technology for ethical simulations may affect student

learning. With the three themes identified, the results of this study have implications for college instructors who are teaching business ethics courses.

REFERENCES

- Alexa. (2012). *Top websites accessed in the United States*. Retrieved from <http://www.alexa.com/topsites/countries/US>
- Alexander, B. (2006). Web 2.0: A new wave of innovation for teaching and learning? *EDUCAUSE Review*, 41(2), 32-44. Retrieved from <http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ERM0621.pdf>
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2007). *Online nation: Five years of growth in online learning*. Retrieved from Sloan Consortium website: <http://www.sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/index>
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2008). *Staying the course: Online education in the United States, 2008*. Retrieved from Sloan Consortium website: <http://www.sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/index>
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2010). *Learning on demand: Online education in the United States, 2009*. Retrieved from Sloan Consortium website: <http://www.sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/index>
- Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. (2004). *Ethics education in business schools: Report of the ethics education task force to AACSB International's board of directors*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacsb.edu>
- Baetz, M., & Carson, A. (1999). Ethical dilemmas in teaching about ethical dilemmas: Obstacle or opportunity? *Teaching Business Ethics*, 3, 1-12.
- Berk, R. (2009) Teaching strategies for the net generation. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal*, 3(2), 1-24. Retrieved from http://www.ronberk.com/articles/2009_strategies.pdf
- Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *The classroom critical incident questionnaire*. Retrieved from http://www.stephenbrookfield.com/Dr._Stephen_D._Brookfield/Critical_Incident_Questionnaire_files/CIQ.pdf
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dixon, B. (2009). *A formative experiment investigating the use of reflective video journals to increase high school students' metacognition* (Doctoral dissertation). San Diego State University, San Diego, CA.

- Downes, S. (2008). Places to go: YouTube. *Innovate: Journal of Online Education*, 4(5). Retrieved from <http://www.innovateonline.info/index.php?view=article&id=633>
- Ferrell, O. C., & Ferrell, L. (2008). A decision making framework for business ethics education. In D. Swanson & D. Fisher (Eds.), *Advancing business ethics education* (pp. 221-241). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Ferris, S. P., & Wilder, H. (2006). Uses and potentials of wikis in the classroom. *Innovate: Journal of Online Education*, 2(5). Retrieved from <http://www.innovateonline.info/index.php?view=article&id=258>
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Goodpaster, K. E., Nash, L. L., & de Bettignies, H. C. (2006). *Business ethics: Policies and persons*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Howe, N., & Nadler, R. (2009). *Yes we can: The emergence of Millennials as a political generation*. Retrieved from <http://lifecourse.com/research/reports.html>
- Kaplan, A., & Haenlein, M. (2010). User of the world unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons*, 53, 59-68. doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003
- Keeter, S., & Taylor, P. (2009). *The Millennials*. Retrieved from Pew Research Center website: <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1437/millennials-profile>
- Keteyian, A. (2010, April 7). Is Goldman Sachs playing fair? *CBS News*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbsnews.com>
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence. The developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp. 347-480). Chicago, IL: Rand-McNally.
- Kolb, A., & Kolb, D. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(2), 193-212.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- LeClair, D., Ferrell, L., Montuori, L., & Willems, C. (1999). The use of a behavioral simulation to teach business ethics. *Teaching Business Ethics*, 3(3), 283-296.
- Loe, T. W., Ferrell, L., & Mansfield, P. (2000). A review of empirical studies assessing ethical decision making in business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 25, 185-204.
- Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2009). *Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies*.

Retrieved from www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Oblinger, D. (2008). Growing up with Google: What it means to education. *Emerging Technologies for Learning*, 3, 11-29.

O'Fallon, M. J., & Butterfield, K. D. (2005). A review of the empirical ethical decision-making literature: 1996-2003. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 59(4), 375-413.

Ottewill, R., & Wall, A. (2002). Business ethics and e-learning: A contradiction in terms? *Teaching Business Ethics*, 6(3), 319-334.

Painter-Morland, M., Fontrodona, J., Hoffman, W. M., & Rowe, M. (2003). Conversations across continents: Teaching business ethics online. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 48(1), 75-87.

Prensky, M. (2001). *Digital natives, digital immigrants*. Retrieved from <http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-%20Digital%20Natives%20Digital%20Immigrants%20-%20Part1.pdf>

Prensky, M. (2009). H. sapiens digital: From digital immigrants and digital natives to digital wisdom. *Innovate: Journal of Online Education*, 5(3). Retrieved from <http://www.innovateonline.info/index.php?view=article&id=705>

Rest, J. (1986). *Moral development: Advances in research and theory*. New York, NY: Praeger.

Rest, J., & Narvaez, D. (Eds.). (1994). *Moral development in the professions: Psychology and applied ethics*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M., & Thoma, S. (1999). *Postconventional moral thinking: A neo-Kohlbergian approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ritter, B. A. (2006). Can business ethics be trained? A study of the ethical decision-making process in business students. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 68(2), 153-164.

Roper, A. R. (2007). How students develop online learning skills. *Educause Quarterly*, 1, 62-64.

Sanyal, R. N. (2000). An experiential approach to teaching ethics in international business. *Teaching Business Ethics*, 4(2), 137-149.

Sims, R. R. (2002a). Business ethics teaching for effective learning. *Teaching Business Ethics*, 6, 393-410.

Sims, R. R. (2002b). *Teaching business ethics for effective learning*. Westport, CT: Quorum.

Sims, R. R., & Felton, E. L. (2006). Designing and delivering business ethics teaching and learning. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63(3), 297-312.

Trevino, L. K. (1992). Moral reasoning and business ethics: Implications for research, education and management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11, 445-459.

Walker, R., & Jeurissen, R. (2003). E-based solutions to support intercultural business ethics instruction: An exploratory approach in course design and delivery. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 48(1), 113.

Waples, E. P., Antes, A. L., Murphy, S. T., Connelly, S., & Mumford, M. D. (2008). A meta-analytic investigation of business ethics instruction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81, 133-151. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9875-0

Zull, J. E. (2004). The art of changing the brain. *Educational Leadership*, 62(1), 68-72.

Appendix
The Classroom Critical Incident Questionnaire (Brookfield, 1995, p. 115)

Please take time to respond to the questions below about the business ethics simulation.
Thanks for taking time to do this.

At what moment in class this week did you feel most engaged with what was happening?

At what moment in class this week were you most distanced from what was happening?

What action that anyone (teacher or student) took this week did you find most affirming or helpful?

What action that anyone took this week did you find most puzzling or confusing?

What about the class this week surprised you the most? (This could be about your own reactions to what went on, something that someone did, or anything else that occurs).

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Focus Group Protocol

Hello, thank you for participating in this focus group to discuss your experiences over the past two weeks in the business ethics simulation. I encourage you to respond to each other's comments during this interview. Your participation is voluntary and I am able to conduct these focus groups to ensure that your anonymity remains intact. We will be digitally audio recording this focus group. We will then transcribe these proceedings using none of your names or identifying information. Please let me know whether this recording is OK with you and whether we have permission to proceed. When each of you agrees, we will turn on the recorder (Williams, 2010).

You received a copy last week of the focus group questions that we will discuss today. Let's take a minute to review the Four Component Model (FCM) of Morality by Rest that the class has been discussing this semester. The FCM identifies the inner psychological processes that lead to moral behavior including (a) moral sensitivity, (b) judgment, (c) motivation, and (d) character (Rest et al., 1999).

Please take a few minutes to discuss in small groups the simulation that you completed over the past two weeks. Please think about and discuss how the simulation may have affected your sensitivity to ethical issues and your process of reasoning through the ethical dilemma.

1. Please review each part of the simulation listed in the table below and rate each item from 1-5 in terms whether each item affected your sensitivity to moral issues and your moral judgment.

Not very important 1 2 3 4 5 very important

<u>Parts of Simulation</u>		<u>Sensitivity</u>	<u>Judgment</u>
		Enter 1-5	Enter 1-5
Individually reading through the case			
Using the decision making model			
Working with group members			
Creating dialogue and storyboards			
Role-playing and video recording			
Watching your video online			
Watching other group's videos online			
Online questions and discussion			

2. Thanks for rating the different parts of the simulation. Let's take some time to discuss each part of the simulation.
3. As you see it did the technology help your learning? If so how did the technology help your learning?
4. As you see it did the technology hinder your learning? If so how did the technology hinder your learning?
5. During the simulation what stood out for you and why?
6. Please describe what helped you recognize the ethical issues in the simulation.
7. Tell me about how you reasoned through the possible courses of action?
8. You came to a conclusion (a course of action) would you have come to the same conclusion two weeks ago? What would be different and what made that difference?
9. If the class was going to complete this simulation again would you keep it the same or would you change the simulation? If you would change the simulation please explain what you would change.

References

- Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M., & Thoma, S. (1999). *Postconventional moral thinking: A neo-Kohlbergian approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Williams, J. Personal communication, June 16, 2010.

Researcher Checklist for Evaluating Videoclips

	Group # _____
<u>Sensitivity</u>	
Identified ethical issues	
Identified stakeholders	
Identified alternatives for actions	
Explained implications to stakeholders	
<u>Judgment</u>	
Referenced interest based (consequences) moral theory as part of reasoning	
Referenced rights based moral theory as part of reasoning	
Referenced duty based moral theory as part of reasoning	
Referenced virtue based moral theory as part of reasoning	
Referenced other framework _____	
Recommended course of action is justified based on one or more moral theories?	
List the course of action	