

ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR





LEARNING JOURNAL UNIT 1

BUS 4402-01 ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR - AY2025-T1



SEPTEMBER 5, 2024

INSTRUCTOR: TERRY MACON



ADDRESSING ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN ACADEMIA: A CASE OF FAVORITISM AND FAIRNESS



INTRODUCTION

The foundation of organizational integrity is ethical behavior, which sustains confidence among stakeholders, clients, and staff. Nonetheless, moral conundrums frequently arise in a variety of contexts, including businesses and educational organizations. These circumstances put people's and organizations' moral judgment to the test. Misrepresentation, carelessness, and harassment are common instances of unethical behavior that can hurt people and tarnish an institution's reputation. This journal post will consider a hypothetical ethical conundrum I saw in a university setting and investigate what ought to have been done differently and why.

HYPOTHETICAL ETHICAL DILEMMA

Consider a circumstance in which a lecturer consistently offers favor to some students over others, giving them more opportunity to gain additional credit or giving them forgiving ratings on their work. While this is going on, other students who might work even harder are not given the same opportunities and receive grades that closely follow the syllabus. This favoritism creates an unfair academic environment where success is not based on merit but on personal relationships between students and the professor. Such a scenario undermines the values of fairness and equality that are critical in academic institutions.

ANALYSIS OF THE SITUATION

There are several levels of unethical behavior present in this scenario. First, by treating certain students better than others, the professor is going against the fairness principle.



Academic evaluations of students are supposed to take into account their knowledge, effort, and compliance with assignment requirements. In addition to demotivating other students, giving some students an unfair edge by a professor creates a poisonous atmosphere of inequity. Such conduct devalues academic accomplishments and could lead to mistrust between students and teachers.



Second, the professor's actions may be seen as biased. Even in cases when prejudice is not based on gender, ethnicity, or any other legally protected trait, favoritism nevertheless occurs when one person's preferences outweigh those of another. This creates an uneven playing field, and students outside of the professor's close circle may lose motivation to do their best in class.

Finally, this moral conundrum may result in more serious systemic problems. Students' perceptions of the entire academic institution may be impacted if they learn about the unfair treatment, which could result in poorer morale, disengagement, or even official complaints. Institutions depend on integrity to function, and when moral principles are violated, it can negatively impact those institutions' legitimacy and reputation for a long time.

WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY

There were various ways to handle the ethical concerns in this fictitious scenario. Initially, the lecturer ought to have followed the syllabus's specified grading guidelines and given each student equal treatment. Extra credit chances and grades ought to be given on the basis of work and performance, not on personal connections. This guarantees that each student receives an equitable evaluation, and that academic success is attained according to merit.

Second, the university should have clear policies regarding grading practices and favoritism. These policies should be communicated to both faculty and students so that everyone understands what is expected. Regular training for professors on ethical behavior in academic



settings could also help prevent such situations. Ethical training can emphasize the importance of impartiality, fairness, and transparency in all interactions with students.



In addition, a confidential system for students to report unethical activity should be in place. Fear of reprisals or bad effects on their scores might make many students feel afraid or reluctant to speak up against a lecturer. Thus, ensuring that students feel safe raising ethical issues will need the provision of anonymous means for reporting and investigating such events.

WHY THIS APPROACH IS IMPORTANT

These changes would make the classroom more open and welcoming for all students, and they would ensure that grades are based on actual work rather than subjective factors like teachers' opinions or students' interests. Students are more likely to put out their best effort and have confidence in their accomplishments when they are treated with respect, which in turn creates an atmosphere of trust. It also helps preserve the institution's legitimacy, which is key to its survival and success.

Teachers may provide a positive example for their children by acting ethically themselves and underlining the necessity of honesty in the classroom and beyond. Even more importantly, this would lessen the possibility of systemic problems like official complaints or legal challenges stemming from unethical activity.

CONCLUSION

Ethical quandaries jeopardize the integrity of people and organizations, whether they arise in the workplace or in academics. Fairness and equality are fundamental values in any academic environment, and the professor's actions in the hypothetical case of bias in grading compromised these values. In order to address these problems, institutions must be committed to moral behavior



and establish procedures for reporting and resolving misbehavior. Maintaining these standards promotes the general well-being and reputation of the institution or organization by ensuring a transparent and equitable atmosphere where people are evaluated according to their merits.

.....

5



References:

Johnson, C. E. (2020). *Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership: Casting Light or Shadow*. SAGE Publications.

Trevino, L. K., & Nelson, K. A. (2021). *Managing Business Ethics: Straight Talk about How to Do It Right*. Wiley.

