Case 1:

Steven Severson was in his last year of his graduate program. He was anxious to get a degree so he could spend more time with his wife and small children. The end was in sight, he could look forward to both a better job and to being a better husband and father.

As part of his graduation requirements, Steven was required to develop a research report. Most of the data strongly supported his conclusions as well as prior conclusions developed by others. However, a few aspects of the data were were at variance and not fully consistent with the conclusions contained in his report. Convinced of the soundness of his report and concerned that inclusion of the ambiguous data would detract from and distort the essential thrust of the report, Steven wondered if it would be all right to omit references to the ambiguous data.

Case 2:

Brad is in the second year of his first full-time job after graduating. He enjoys project design, but is becoming increasingly concerned that his work is not being adequately checked by more experienced software engineers. He has been assigned to assist in the design of a number of projects that involve issues of public safety such as traffic control systems and medical imaging software. He has already spoken to his supervisor, whose competence and experience he respects, and he has been told that more experienced engineers check his work. Later he discovers that his work is often not adequately checked and instead just included into the main projects. Often, the software is deployed within a few weeks of completion.

Brad is concerned that he will make a mistake that will cause serious injury or death. The projects he is being assigned are becoming more difficult, allowing even less time for review and testing. What should Brad do?

Case 3:

Amanda signs an agreement with Company A (with no time limit) that obligates her not to reveal its trade secrets. Amanda later moves to Company B, where she finds a use for some ideas that she conceived while at Company A. She never developed the ideas into any application while at Company A, and Company B is not in competition with Company A.

Still, she wonders if the using of those ideas at Company B is a violation of the agreement she had with Company A. She has an uneasy feeling that she is in a gray area and wonders where to draw the line between the legitimate and illegitimate use of knowledge. How should she proceed?

Case 4:

It is Victor's job to recommend other firms to subcontract portions of major projects. Specifically, his area is user interfaces. His firm has a new government project that will run for five years and bring in a large amount of money. After some research, into things like coding practices, experience, number of qualified employees, and all the government mandated HR practices as well as examining samples of their work, he decides to use ACME for the job. On the day after the contract with ACME was signed, an ACME representative visits him and gives him a voucher for an all-expense paid trip to the ACME Forum meeting in Jamaica. Paid expenses include day trips to the beaches and the rum factories. If Victor accepts, has be been bribed? How should he handle this situation?

Case 5:

Your firm has just added six new H-1B workers to your 50-person department. You have been asked to help get one of the workers "on board." Your manager wants you to introduce him to other team members, provide him with some basic company background and information, and explain to him how work gets done within your organization. Your manager has also asked you to help your new coworker become familiar with the community, including residential areas, shopping centers, restaurants, and recreational activities. Your goal would be to help the new worker be productive and comfortable with his new surroundings as soon as possible. How would you feel about taking on this responsibility? Does it make any difference that this an H1-B worker? Would extra pay for doing this introduction change how you answer?

Case 6:

You are a mid-level manager at a major metropolitan hospital and are responsible for capturing and reporting statistics regarding the cost and quality of patient care. You believe in a strict interpretation when defining various reportable incidents regarding patient care problems; as a result, your hospital's rating on a number of quality issues has declined in the six months you have held the position. Your predecessor was more lenient and was inclined to let minor incidents go unreported or to classify some serious incidents as less serious. The quarterly meeting for quality review is next week, and you know that your reporting methodology will be challenged by the chief of staff and other members of the quality review board. How should you prepare for this meeting? Should you defend your strict reporting procedures or revert to the former reporting process for the "sake of consistency in the numbers," as several people have urged?