

1. The FTC accused Skechers of making claims about the health and fitness benefits of their toning shoes. The argument is that there is no substantiation. There seems to be a lack of supporting evidence because there is no evidence that it would enhance the buyer's "bottom half". Skechers failed to disclose the chiropractor's marital ties to the marketing executive and the final compensation. This can make the Skechers campaign look like it was intentionally misleading. There is a lack of truth and reliable evidence to support what they are claiming in their advertisement. Skechers settled with the FTC for a bigger sum than Reebok. This can mean that Skechers had more severe and misleading information. The bigger sum can reflect the seriousness of misleading information from Skechers from the campaign.

Some customers at a Skechers store expressed the opinion that advertising tends to exaggerate product effects, which means that people have the responsibility for their exercise. However, it is crucial to consider the average consumer's perception. Essentially, advertisements should not have the goal to deceive or even mislead consumers, because they rely on what the company is saying, and that it is true. Skechers's claims about the benefits of their toning shoes misled consumers so that they can purchase their products. So consumers are buying this product because of the false promises.

The lack of evidence and facts, the misleading research, the failure to disclose conflicts of interest, and the bigger settlement in comparison to similar cases of other companies can conclude that this Skechers campaign is deceptive and tricked consumers to buy their products. This campaign would have been ethical if there was enough scientific evidence to support their claim.

2. Insider trading means buying and selling stocks or other securities based on material or nonpublic information about the company. It is mostly considered illegal because it gives people an unfair advantage over others. This law is to help protect the fairness and integrity of the selling market. In this case, there is no proof that Sally Smith gave the neighbor nonpublic information about Company Y, she only suggested that the neighbor should buy a certain stock. Based on this information, it can be assumed that the neighbor made the purchase because Sally gave advice. Sally did not share any information or traded any information for her potential gain. It can be concluded that the neighbor is not guilty of unethical insider trading.

3. I believe that U.S. companies should not use foreign supplies that employ children. Child labor is unethical and exploitative. It negatively impacts children's rights to education, health, and safety. Companies have a responsibility to respect human rights, especially children. Morally, children should be protected from economic problems and gains. If child labor is supported, it contradicts the moral principles to protect children. Even if the culture might be different depending on the country, child labor is still a violation of human rights. It may seem normal, but the reality is that it cannot be justified by cultural normality. With Nike, child labor was big in Pakistan. However, Nike was also held responsible for unethical employment in their supply chain, despite the country's practices. This concludes that moral standards should be above local norms in regard to child labor. Ethical standards should be a priority for U.S. companies in any country where they want to expand their labor. Nike paid its employees 10 cents an hour, which can prove that it is exploitation. Indonesia is a country with lower wage levels compared to the U.S. The cost of living and economic conditions could be different. Even if there are differences between countries, fair wages, and equal treatment should remain the same and be valued. Companies should make sure that employees receive good enough wages so that they can have a decent standard of living.