Facts

As a plant manager for the company, pat (punc.: Pat) has a responsibility to have the company's best interest at heart. Pat is aware that the company is going to have to lay off two hundred workers and that rumors are circulating in the plant about this issue.

<u>Issue</u>

The ethical issues she faces are to maintain complete confidentiality with her boss about company information and also to tell her old friend the honest truth (ss.: rewrite). Pat also knows that there is a possibility that her friend's job might not be affected but her duty to the company is also very important. She cannot afford to risk exposing company information because there are some expensive (wc.) consequences to that, and she is not sure that her friend will indeed lose her job. There are five different plants in the company in which two hundred unidentified employees would be laid off.

[🗲 F1]

Ethical Lenses and Analysis

There are some deontological theories that (one) can apply to this situation which is Utilitarianism and the Golden Rule. Utilitarianism is a theory that means to carefully weigh an issue and choose the decision that will maximize social welfare. Pat can take this theory (theory's) approach and decide not to respond to her friend because if she does respond, she could hurt the whole company and other employees; whereas if she didn't respond, only her friend would be affected. [F2]The Golden Rule is the theory that is based on a western biblical tradition that provides a guide of doing unto others as you would have them do unto you. This is also an approach in (delete) which Pat can take, by telling her friend the whole truth without considering the consequences. Pat could put herself in her friend's shoes and consider the situation from her friend's perspective. She would want a friend to tell her the truth especially if her life depended on it.

The affected parties are the company and her friend. If she decides to tell her friend everything she knows the information (wc.) and stability of the company would be at stake. If she lies or doesn't respond to her friend, she could lose her friend in the event she gets laid off and cannot afford to pay for her house. There are some key consequences to any decision Pat chooses which makes it hard to give a perfect response to her friend's question. A potential consequence if she exposes the company's confidential information is the risk that shareholders will lose confidence in the firm and it can affect the financial stability of the company. [\checkmark F3] Pat has to give a response that avoids symbolic consequences by making sure her response is very clear, concise and not complex [\checkmark F4]. Pat has obligations to her boss when she agreed not to tell anyone, so she has to keep her promise. She also has to make sure she does not jeopardize her loyalty to her friend.

The obligations she owes to both parties presents some significant values that are at stake in this situation (rephrase). Considering what other people might think of the decision she makes is also important. The nature of her response can affect what people think of her character. If she tells her friend, some people might think she is a loyal and brave friend while others might think she doesn't care about the company and is not a trustworthy employee. She needs to maintain her character (and) integrity before she acts. A good way to take away the pressure from the situations is to creatively respond to her friend. [\checkmark F5]

Conclusion

A creative response will let the friend know Pat's stance on the situation. She can tell her friend that discussing the issue is against company policy, and that she doesn't have the power to affect the outcome of any consequence that may or may not occur. That response has the potential to bring the uncomfortable conversation to a close. A rule of thumb that can also help Pat in her decision planning is to check her guts. If it does not feel right, don't do it and you probably won't regret it later. [\checkmark F6]

×	- Critical Thinking	Knowledge Application
7	- Written Communication	

Criteria	ID	Focus	Feedback	References
*	[F1]	Critical Thinking	You need to set the context more CLEARLY. Ethical dilemma is also not clearly brought out. How are these two choices incompatible? Explain.	Assignment Guidelines; Trevino & Nelson, 2006, ch. 1-4
*	[F2]	Critical Thinking	Good arguments made here! You may also like to think about the other employees of the company, the owners/shareholders, the customers, dependent local community etc.?	Assignment Guidelines; Trevino & Nelson, 2006, ch. 1-4
*	[F3]	Knowledge Application	Application of the Golden Rule is not very clear. What if her friend were to leak the information to the rest of the employees? Also, remember that the Golden Rule leads you to the best decision only	Assignment Guidelines; Trevino & Nelson, 2006, ch. 1-4

Criteria	ID	Focus	Feedback	References
			if you're highly ethical.	
*	[F4]	Written Communication	I am not clear what this means. Simplify this sentence for clarity. How does this fit in with your arguments?	Assignment Guidelines; Trevino & Nelson, 2006, ch. 1-4
*	[F5]	Critical thinking	Where does this argument come from? I am not clear. Is this from one of the two theories you apply here? You must bring this out.	Assignment Guidelines; Trevino & Nelson, 2006, ch. 1-4
*	[F6]	Critical thinking	While you have made an attempt to conclude your paper, the conclusion needs to be more clearly tied in to the analysis and application of the two ethical theories above.	Assignment Guidelines; Trevino & Nelson, 2006, ch. 1-4
*	[F7]	Written Communication	You could work to improve your paper by organizing your ideas to flow logically from one to the other. In addition, you could also try to make more convincing arguments by fully supporting your ideas. Application of theories to the case needs to be done in a more focused and direct manner, so that it is clear how your decisions are derived from application of these theories.	Assignment Guidelines; Trevino & Nelson, 2006, ch. 1-4