**Applied Business Ethics**

Ethical Dilemma Description

An ethical dilemma refers to a choice that is made between two options that do not give solutions in a way that is ethically acceptable. In this case, the ethical dilemma involves a lady named “Ava,” living with a disability and has had to leave solely for the first time as an adult. She starts working at a marketing firm as a clerical officer and has to be at work on time for six days a week. The lady has a routine that she runs every morning prior to leaving for her office; she also has to take a bus to work, which takes her a long time to get to a bus station and, also, be at work on time. Ava’s supervisor finds her work excellent, and she always gets monthly awards for accurately delivering good work and meeting deadlines on any assignments that are assigned to her. Eventually, the supervisor notices her late coming and speaks to Ava to find a suitable solution to the problem. The habit stops for a week, but Ava is not able to put up with the pressure for too long. Ava gets fired after three weeks of warnings due to lateness, and, despite her explanation, she does not get a second chance to work at the company. The supervisor did not take time to hold a second meeting with Ava and find suitable solutions to the problems. The management decision does not express any form of value for Ava’s wellbeing and, also, opinion.

Justification

The organization follows various strict policies that are in favor of their visions and do not necessarily favor the needs and wants of the employees like that of Ava. This is an ethical dilemma in business since it disregards the wellbeing of the employee while focusing on the issues that only favor the institution without fully looking at the situation that affects Ava. The institution faces a waste of time and loss of clients due to Ava’s lateness. However, Ava lives with a disability and has no personal caretaker. The ethical dilemma comes in where the institution may have to change their principles and negotiate a solution with Ava due to her state.

Ava also holds several core values that make her a dependable person in other cases. The first value is that she is helpful. This makes her an asset to the company, and she also shows loyalty in all her professional relationships. The other reason why this is an ethical dilemma is that the institution, despite thinking that it is taking a utilitarian approach, expresses egotistic views on the matter (Baron & Karanika, 2014). The lady is not called back for an explanation, and the management does not take time to understand the situation. The fact that there is little effort made toward solving this issue means that the state of the employee has been ignored and moral policies have not been fully applied into the situation to make better judgment of these decisions.

The priorities in this case do not fall on employee wellbeing. These priorities do not favor the moral values of the employee. Despite her being on the wrong, there are issues that make it morally unacceptable to fire the lady. The issue of professionalism seems to blur the need to uphold morals and a need to favor the employee based on her situation. The theory of utilitarianism does not support egotistical measures. This theory supports the use of fairness to achieve goals that are fulfilling both to the employee as well as the management.

The employee’s salary indicates clearly that she does not receive enough allowances to have a caretaker. This reduces her free time by almost half and leaves her with no solution but to handle extra duties by herself. The condition of compensation contributes to the ethical dilemma since the institution does not fully function as responsibly as expected. The expectation here is that the institution takes responsibility and offers a raise for the employee to cater for her needs and reduce the distractions that cause her to come late to work. The ethics in this case is that Ava’s woes are heard and put into deep consideration.

Every person born into the world is born into a system that has various expectations of what morals should entail. The expectations that a person is led to believe in concerning morals differ from other people until they are merged with a group of people with common perceptions. The institution’s management shows a different understanding of morals from that of the employee (Gibbs, 2013). The institution has to understand what constitutes good conduct and what constitutes hardships when it comes to employees and various cases. It is easy to dismiss these factors and focus on personal interests without considering the moral consequences.

This situation has an opportunity for alternative possible actions and does not consider putting them into action in order to favor the employee while also showing favor towards the interests of the institution. This means that decisions are selfishly made, which makes it unethically correct. The alternative options may consider certain values and moral obligations that are relevant to the institution while favoring the state of the employees. Therefore, the ethical dilemma also results from the moral consequences that are bound to affect the institution in the future and cause an uproar in other decision-making processes in the future.

Ethical Solutions

The first step to this is ensuring that there is an understanding of the participative leadership style. This style shows value for the input of various employees and also boosts their morale to work better and be more vigilant in ensuring they are at par with the company’s requirements.

According to Kohlberg’s theory of moral development, the third stage, which is the post-conventional stage, explains that morality is based on principles and values that are more abstract (Nielsen & Abildgaard, 2015). This differs greatly from the conventional stage where morality and its values are on the basis of consequences. This means that, at the post-conventional stage, people can choose what is unjust and needs to be eliminated, changed, or improved from its original state.

The first solution is to ensure that the case goes through satisfactory research to determine the best way to solve the dilemma without causing a bigger uproar on ethics. The first step towards this is to ensure that there are truthful details provided concerning the employee. The second is to look into the motives of the supervisor as the person who initiated the basis for the employee to be fired and her responsibilities taken away from her abruptly. It will also create a deeper understanding of Ava’s situation and create solutions that do not contrast with basic principles. This solution requires that the regulations be non-burdensome and be at par with the creative levels of each employee. Creating non-burdensome regulations for the research paves way for honesty and responsibility (Ferrell & Fraedrich, 2015). The researchers will, therefore, show interest in the process without having to be pushed. In this case, Ava will be in a position to experience a fair and just ruling and also give a chance for the institution to regain balance in terms of their moral regards and ethics. This solution is necessary to also create awareness within the institution, concerning such cases and also offer ready solutions for the future.

The second solution is to create a team that is participative in order to listen to opinions. The opinions of the management and a responsible tea of employees are relevant to solve this case; the team, however, has to be fair and unbiased in ensuring that a solution is brought to the table to serve the interests of the employee and that of the institution. These opinions will lead to solutions that reduce the chances of self-centered decisions as well as those that affect the morality, values, and principles of a person. Moral development, according to Kohlberg, requires an environment that is supportive of the same and does not, in any way, negatively affect a situation. This means that clarifications have to be made on the processes that are necessary for positive results and clarity of an argument. This ensures that focus is placed on the most important aspects of decision-making and policy structures

The most important solution is to organize a meeting with the management and have Ava involved for the whole management to listen to what her issue really entails. Having different perspectives creates better chances for a fair verdict and ensures that the ethical standards are not disqualified and pushed aside in the process. The moral development theory also indicates that the post-conventional stage is not applicable to everyone, which makes it essential to weigh principles from certifiable sources and among people who do not express bias in their choices. Ava deserves a chance to grow and be understood in terms of what she requires to ensure that her chances and time are not wasted due to a poor communication system.
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