

Stakeholder	Weight	Net Utility	Reasoning
You	1	-1	You must tell a lie, but it's not going to drastically affect your normal daily routines.
The meeting crew	1	-2	The team must all commit to the lie, but it won't affect them unless found out.
The employees	3	+5	The employees will increase productivity in fear of being fired.
The customers	5	+3	More customers will be able to get products produced faster than before and will benefit greatly.
Utilitarian Analysis:	$(1)(-1)+(1)(-2)+(3)(5)+(5)(3)=$	+27	Decision is Ethical.

#### **Act Utilitarianism:**

In this situation, from an Act Utilitarian standpoint, the action is completely justified. I would say that the action is genius from a utility standpoint. The consequence of this decision is greater productivity rates amongst the company, more products getting moved faster, and more happy customers. The end goal is that the most good is done for the most people, even if a few people (the secret meeting crew) must tell a small lie.

#### **Rule Utilitarianism:**

Given a Rule Utilitarianism perspective, I would have to find a rule that could apply to the most people that would produce the most benefit. In this situation, a general rule that I could establish to justify the ethics of this decision is that "Work must be done while you are at work." If I apply this basic known rule to the situation I could argue that the best way to positively impact everyone, from the employees to the customers, is to get more people to do more work. If more people are doing more work, then more people will be positively impacted by the end result.

#### **Rule Deontology:**

A Rule Deontology viewpoint would require me to see the people affected as rational beings as well as how the situation applies to *universal* rules that apply to all human beings. I would argue that the decision is ethical because it would give the employee an internal opportunity to make a rational decision to choose to do work instead of surfing the web. It is my duty to ensure all employees underneath me are performing and the optimal efficiency level. I would say that it is imperative that we ensure the employees are capable of making the right time usage choices at work, because we all know and agree that work must be done at an efficient pace when in the professional environment.

**Act Deontology:**

Making a decision based on the Act Deontology ethical analysis system would require me to consider prima facie duties as well as prioritizing duties in specific situations. Given this particular situation, I would say that my personal honesty and benevolence would not weigh heavily enough to outweigh the decision made by the president of the company. I may not agree on a personal level with the decision, but it is my duty to enforce productivity and agree with the boss at my current position. Since this was the idea of the CIO, if I would like to keep moving up in the company I could use this opportunity to gain trust and further my own self in the company in the future. Therefore, this would be an ethical decision based on my Duty-based ethics analysis.

**Social Contract Theory:**

Taking the stance of a Contract-based ethical viewpoint, in this situation I would consider the social contracts and policies that have been established between all parties involved. I would take into consideration the terms and conditions established between employee and employer as well as the natural rights of the individual to not be toyed with and unknowingly influenced to perform certain actions. Based on the commonly accepted natural rights of the individuals at stake I would say this is an unethical decision to be made between employee and employer. I would argue that an employer does not have the right to mentally influence employees against their will and without their consent.

**Virtue Ethics:**

From the perspective of a person with a strong moral character making a decision based on the theory of Virtue Ethics, I believe that I would tell the president that I do not agree with this idea and it would be a bad moral choice to lie to everyone in the company. Although the decision may improve productivity, basing my decision off the basic virtues that I would adhere to, I would think it is morally wrong to lie to the employees. If the integrity of the upper management is at stake and an employee were to find out about the scandal, all faith in upper management could be lost. The trust between manager and employee would be broken, especially if an employee has been honest and open about themselves with one of the people in the meeting. The social connections and bonds previously established could be irreparably damaged.