

## The Carol and Lawrence Zicklin Center for Business Ethics Research

### Research Proposal

<b>Title</b>	The Significance of “I” in ISCT
<b>Principal Investigator</b>	Tae Wan Kim
<b>Time Frame</b>	July, 2008 - August, 2008
<b>Description</b>	<p>A philosopher John Searle in 1964 posed the following question: “How can my stating a fact about a man, such as the fact that he made a promise, commit me to a view about what he ought to do?”<sup>1</sup> My research wants to pose the same question to ISCT: it attempts to examine the concept, evidence, and implications of “I (Integrative)” in ISCT. In particular, the following questions will be asked. 1) Why “Integrative”? 2) What is the exact meaning of “I” in ISCT? 3) What is the role of “I” in ISCT? 4) What is the relationship between fact and value that “I” stipulates in ISCT? 5) Which one is the fundamental basis of ISCT between fact and value? 6) Is everything in ISCT the subject of empirical research? 7) Can ISCT provide empirical propositions regarding human decision making processes? 8) Do people really make their moral decisions through the ISCT decision process?</p>

---

<sup>1</sup> John Searle, ‘How to Derive “Ought” From “IS,”’ *The Philosophical Review* 73(1) (1964): 43-58, p. 57.