**Scenario 4**

The ethical dilemma I am confronted with is a difficult decision: whether to attend a job interview at ProGrowth Pesticides, Inc., whose business is in direct opposition to my deeply held beliefs and the lifestyle of my family. My family has been running an exclusively organic farm and involved in campaigning against the use of pesticides. My parents taught me these values, and they even encouraged me to take up chemical engineering. Throughout my studies, these ideas have been reinforced, and I have no doubt now that pesticides can be harmful.

However, my situation has dramatically altered. My father recently became seriously ill, and this has created sky-high medical bills and has placed an immense financial burden upon my family. If we do not get more money, my family will not be able to pay the farm mortgage in a short while. My siblings and mother are doing their best to keep up with farming, but it is clear that without immediate financial relief, we could lose everything that generations of my family have worked so hard to build. The single promising career opportunity that has recently become available is with ProGrowth Pesticides, Inc., which is coming to campus to interview candidates for a position for which I am academically qualified. This role has the potential to generate the steady income that I require to save the farm and cover my father's medical expenses. The decision, then, is to attend the interview and potentially work for a company whose mission is opposite my values, or not attend and stand by my principles, but lose my family's farm and future.

As a moral guide for my decision, I turn to utilitarianism, focusing on creating the greatest good for the greatest number of people. If I attend the interview and obtain the job, the benefits are tremendous: my family would have the money that they so desperately need, the farm could remain in business, and my father's medical care could be well provided for. This would dramatically improve the health of my entire family and preserve something that is of immense cultural and emotional value to us. Second, by working at ProGrowth, there is a potential opportunity for me to change things from the inside, i.e., by encouraging the development of safer or more environmentally sound products in the future.

On the other hand, if I refuse to go to the interview, my family would most likely experience extreme hardship. The farm would be in danger of bankruptcy, my father's care would be compromised, and the uncertainty and tension this would cause would harm all the individuals involved. Additionally, my refusing to go would not stop ProGrowth from continuing to manufacture pesticides or from employing someone else for the position. In this case, skipping the interview would bring huge harm to my family without preventing the company's course of action. Comparing the consequences, attending the interview appears to achieve the most general good in terms of opening the way to financial security and the possibility of beneficial change while minimizing direct harm.

I also considered this decision by applying the ethical decision-making process. The first thing to do is to state the problem specifically, which I have done: a dilemma between my responsibility to my family and my responsibility to my principles and values. The second thing to do is to consider possible lines of action. I thought of three options: not attending the interview, attending but hiding my beliefs to get the job, or attending but being totally honest about my issues and values. After weighing these, I decided that attending but being honest about my beliefs is the best option. This option keeps doors open while my integrity remains intact. The final step is to make the decision and implement it with a view to evaluating the outcome at a later date. This made me consider logically and not make an emotional choice based on sentiments alone.

I also applied the three tests of ethical decision-making to my case. The first one is the test of transparency, which asks if I would be comfortable if my decision were to be published. I would not object to others, including my family and community, finding out that I went for the interview, as my intention is to look for ways to help my family and not abandon my values. The second one is the test of exemplarity, which questions whether my action sets a good example for others. I believe it does, as it demonstrates how to handle difficult ethical dilemmas in a professional and reflective way by asking for information before making a solid commitment. Lastly, the reciprocity test asks whether I would want to be treated the same way in return. If I were the company, I would want applicants to be honest about their values and goals. By being truthful regarding my beliefs at the interview, I offer honesty and respect mutually.