

1. Ethical Dilemma Response: Favoriteism in Project Assignments

Issue Description: A manager in a mid-sized IT support unit regularly gives the most visible (or career-enhancing) projects to an elite group of employees. These are the employees who receive plenty of praise, while others with similar or even stronger qualifications are often assigned routine or trivial activities. It is not open but has an effect of morale problems, tension, and minor fissures in the team.

Decision: An effective way of solving the situation is by implementing a transparent and performance-focused system of project allocation. It includes the establishment of rotation policies, working with skills matrices, and inclusion of KPIs in the choice of personnel (Miura & Shirasaka, 2025). Most of the feedback should be anonymous to detect any perceived biases and make adjustments as needed.

Ethical Principle- Integrity: Integrity is upholding objectivity and making fair decisions without bias. Honesty, fairness, and transparency must be applied at all times through all the decisions made by an IT supervisor. Integrity is one of the practices that ensures the integrity of the team, trust, and performance.

Justification as a Leader: Integrity as a leader creates a culture of inclusivity where every employee feels valued and inspired. Favoritism undermines the validity of its team success, as well as dampening understaffed talent, and eventually increasing turnover. The incorporation of fair practices will make a project successful, enhance team participation, and ensure the organization's ethical standards are met.

Real-World Examples: In 2019, Google faced internal allegations after being revealed to be favoring some employees within the organization in their promotions and transfers to projects. Among employees, there were complaints, with engineers being the most vocal complainants, that the advancement process was more dependent upon personal relationships with the senior managers rather than quantifiable performance or merit. This view of

favoritism was the cause of frustration, disengagement, and demands for systemic change (Eisenstadt & Haugh, 2024). As a reaction, Google launched an overall audit of its internal mobility system to foster openness and equity in the distribution of opportunities. In the case of Uber, as well, a few skilled workers were taken to the bench as a culture that favoured the executive instead of the talent was prevalent during the initial years of operation. These issues ultimately led to internal HR probes (Kniebel et al., 2025). Uber installed fixed performance reporting and meritocratic project allocation principles that would encourage equality and create a team spirit within departments.

References

- Eisenstadt, L. F., & Haugh, T. (2024). Nudging diversity: Merging law and behavioral science to reduce workplace discrimination and increase diversity. *Emory LJ*, 74, 249.
https://heinonline.org/hol-cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/emlj74§ion=9
- Kniebel, K., McMullen, T., & Miner, T. (2025). Mind the Skills Gap: Moving From Skills-Based Pay to Skills-Based Reward. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 57(3), 214-221.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/08863687251337554>
- Miura, K., & Shirasaka, S. (2025). Evaluation of the Impact of a Matrix-based Approach on the Adaptive Management of Performance Indicators and Decision Making. *International Journal of Japan Association for Management Systems*, 17(1), 28-40. https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/ijams/17/1/17_28/article/-char/ja/