

Question 1

Response:

Based on my understanding of this case, I think the primary ethical issue, is discrimination based on ethnic background, especially against Muhammad Shamoun, the investment counselor, due to customer distrust stemming from his Muslim identity. The supervisor's request to replace him with someone who “appears” more reliable to the customers is a clear act of discrimination in this situation. I think in that situation, I’m not, morally justified in making the call to replace Muhammad Shamoun. It would be ethically wrong to discriminate against an individual based on their ethnicity or religious background. It is important to treat all individuals fairly and provide equal opportunities regardless of their personal appearances. In fact, I think a morally justifiable action would be to address the issue of customer distrust through education and open communication. So, as the assistant manager in charge of operations, I would take the following steps into consideration instead: I would educate customers by organizing educational sessions or seminars to help them understand the investment products and services being offered; or providing clear information about the qualifications and expertise of Muhammad Shamoun, by highlighting his MBA and knowledge in mutual fund investments. Furthermore, I would encourage diversity and inclusion within the branch by highlighting the value of different perspectives and backgrounds. I would address customer’s concern and take them seriously, and promote trust and transparency in the company by reinforcing the company's commitment to serving all customers equally and provide channels for customers to voice any concerns or complaints they may have.

Question 2

Response:

In this situation, if we have the opportunity to analyze both sides, the management and the employees from an ethical perspective, our views would be as the following.

When it comes to the management’s action, we would say that Houston's management violated the employees' privacy by demanding the password to the Facebook group and subsequently firing them based on the content of their discussions. However, it is obvious that includes protecting the restaurant's reputation, but their actions raise ethical concerns in this regard. We are seeing harm resulting in this situation because the violation of employees' privacy can have several negative consequences. It destroys trust between management and employees, creates a chilling effect on freedom of speech in the workplace, and can lead to a hostile work environment. Additionally, the termination of employees for expressing their opinions can be seen as retaliatory and may lead to a negative public perception of the company. On the employees’ side, there was harm resulting in their actions as well, even though the employees did not directly violate anyone's privacy, as the group was meant for current and former employees only. However, they should have been aware that their comments, especially if they were derogatory or vulgar, could have negative repercussions if discovered by management. The employees should be mindful of the potential impact their comments can have if discovered by their employers. It is important to maintain professionalism and avoid derogatory or offensive

language when discussing work-related matters, even in private online forums. Therefore, the employees should seek alternative channels for expressing concerns, for instance, open-door policies, suggestion boxes, or meetings with management.

Question 3

Response:

I think in the case of Gravitt it is obvious to determine and examine the action of "blowing the whistle" to Congress first. So, to demonstrate the use of case facts, we are seeing that Gravitt has discovered that workers' training and idle time were being charged to defense jobs and that time records were being altered to shift costs from overrun projects to other projects. Gravitt noticed that overruns were charged to projects that weren't even in the plant yet. Therefore, Gravitt's complaints to his unit manager and plant supervisor were met with indifference, as they dismissed the issue as a common practice in the business world, and Gravitt consulted a private attorney who informed him about the false claims act, which allows employees to bring suit against employers engaging in fraudulent practices.

So, I think Gravitt should consider the legal protections available to whistleblowers, such as the False Claims Act, which provides avenues for reporting fraudulent activities to the government and potentially recovering a portion of the bounty resulting from the suit. Moreover, Gravitt should understand the potential risks involved in blowing the whistle, such as retaliation from his employer, and consider taking necessary precautions to protect himself. When it comes to demonstrating moral reasoning in Gravitt's situation, I think Gravitt's decision to blow the whistle to Congress can be morally justified based on the following considerations, upholding ethical standards by exposing fraudulent practices, Gravitt acts in accordance with ethical principles such as honesty, fairness, and integrity, or protecting the public interest so, by blowing the whistle, Gravitt helps protect the public interest and ensures that government funds are used appropriately.

Therefore, Gravitt should consider blowing the whistle to Congress as a morally justifiable decision because it aligns with ethical principles, protects the public interest, promotes accountability and transparency, seeks justice and fairness, and addresses internal ineffectiveness in addressing the issue.