

Question 01:

Utilitarian Analysis

Option	Consequences	Probability	Negative Impact on Public Health and Safety
Ali follows Ahmad's Order	Ali has to write a report immediately and abandoning additional tests might put public health and safety at stake.	Certainty/High	Very High
Ali doesn't follow Ahmad's Order	Usman will write the report. Usman may not write a sound report.	High	High
Ali compels Ahmad to not write a report without conducting additional tests.	Additional tests will be carried out and the sound report will be written.	Very Low	Very Low

As it's clear from the utilitarian analysis, the act of Ali to follow Ahmad's order will have a greater negative impact on public health and safety. So, Ali's act doesn't comply with Utilitarianism.

Kantian Analysis

Formulate the Maxim:

I will follow my boss's order as I have to follow the rules. It is my duty and I am obliged to follow my boss orders.

Generalization Of Maxim:

Everyone will follow his/her boss's order as it is their duty to follow their boss's orders.

Figure Out the PSW:

In the PSW, it will be common knowledge that people follow their boss's orders as it is their duty.

First question: Would it be rational to adopt and act on my maxim in the PSW?

Yes, because in the PSW everyone would be aware that it's good to follow the boss's orders because we are professionally bounded to do so.

Second question: Could I rationally choose the PSW as one in which I would be a member?

Yes, I would rationally choose the PSW as one in which I would be a member because colleagues must follow the boss's orders.

So, according to Kantian Analysis, Ali's act was professionally and ethically right.

Question 02(a):

The ethical issue, in this case, is of "Research Integrity". Smith's decision of publishing research papers separately leads to an incorrect listing of authorship, theft of your partners' contribution. The request of Jones to be allowed to submit an alternate version is also misleading of listing authorship. Ethically, Jones's responsibility was to report the misconducting behavior of Smith.

What if I was the editor?

If I was the editor, after the report of Jones, I would have contacted both Jones and Smith and suggested that they should end the dispute, resubmit the paper for publication with the correct content and list of authorship. Otherwise, I wouldn't have published this paper because it's against the integrity code of conduct.

Question 02(b):

Yes, the journalist's action was ethically right. As the confidential documents were already uploaded by the hackers, so, everyone has access to read those documents. The journalist just published the key details from the document for the awareness of the public. As a result, people will not have to read the full documents but they can see the journalist's report and get an idea of the inappropriate behavior of nuclear waste facility. So, the journalist's action was ethically and professionally right.

According to the definition of whistle-blowing: "The act of organization members, either former or current, disclosing information on illegal and unethical practices within the organization to parties internal or external to the organization, who can take action". So, it is clear from the definition that a whistle-blower is always a current or former employee of the company. And the journalist was neither an employee of the nuclear waste facility nor did he report to internal/external organizations to take some action against the nuclear waste facility. So, the journalist's action cannot be classified as whistle-blowing.
