1. Prime Drive is faced with more than one ethical dilemma in this scenario. The main concern focusses on reaching a 40% sales volume increase and how to reach that goal. It is known through the story that the production managers is knowingly placing defective hard drives in new cases. Is it acceptable to provide a flawed/ defective product in order to produce a higher sales volume/ goal? Also what should a fellow employee do if they were unwillingly implicated in such unethical behavior?
2. The main and obviously given IT component in the Prime Drive case is the computer disk drives/ hard drives that the company manufactures and sells at part of their product. However, there is an underlying assumption that she has used some sort of software program to help with the calculations and ultimate result of the 15% increase in the volume and returns of defective TRX drives.

Granger Stokes- Has the right for return on his investment and higher profits, as well as achieving a competitive advantage in the market.

Customers/ Consumers- Has the right for a good, functioning product in which they are purchasing.

Keri Kalani- Right to confront and address her discoveries of her boss actions of placing defective disk drives in new cases.

Production Manager- Has the right to keep his job and meet the goals imposed on him.

4.

1. Keri Kalani can decide to do nothing as her boss demanded. She can push her finding to the side and allow her boss and the production department to continue putting defective disk drives in the new units. However, she is now implemented in the situation and can be held to the same accountability. If this was to happen the company is sure to face higher return rates, bad consumer reviews, and could ultimately tarnish the company name by violating professional ethics.
2. She can escalate the issue to someone higher in the command chain. The company could put a stop the productions managers unethical procedure. Maintain putting in new disk drives into new cases, while discarding the returned defective units. The return rate should dramatically decrease or at least go back to the normal average for returns/ defective units.
3. The company could try to gain a higher competitive advantage and look at their product and determine what flaw is causing these disk drives to be defective. Try to improve the product to eliminate the initial return rate, in turn would have a better product. More cost goes into this alternative.
4. ????
5. From a deontological perspective option 4b. is morally correct whereas option 4c. would be a great second choice by hitting the concept of beneficence, it relies on more associated costs. The 4c. option focuses more on the maxima of whether or not providing defective parts could become a universal law to increase sales volume. It is the company’s duty to distribute good justly and without knowingly deceiving its consumer.
6. From a teleological perspective option 4c. would be morally correct. It would be in the overall general good to have a completely flawless product. However this will not help Prime Drive meet the 40% increase in sales volume by adding more cost in a short term perspective. Ultimately by having a flawless product, the customers are getting the best product possible, which promotes the general good. It could also have a positive long term effect on Prime Drive by achieving the competitive advantage of enhanced products and services.
7. I would recommend Prime Drive to discard any returned, defective units and continue installing the new disk drives. However, I would recommend that they analyze their product to find a way to improve the flaws/ defects of the disk drives. In turn they will be creating a better product and more people would want t buy it. The productions manager would first and fore most be terminated. He has jeopardized the company and everyone's job by his unethical business practice. He was the only one solely practicing Ethical Egoism, in turn to keep his job.