

Student Name
Instructor
Course Name
Date

Ethics

Protecting the unborn at work

1. According to the case, Johnson's control of fetal protection policy involves the hiring of women viewed as sterile, and, thus, the view is that the lead present in the factories exposed the women to harm in terms of the capacity to bear children or affect the fetus when the women are pregnant (Shaw 352). The policy centers on limiting the women's chances of working in the company despite the fact that lead also affects men, and, it is factual that exposure to lead may harm the fetus. Therefore, since everyone has the right to work in any place as per their skills, pregnant women lack the moral right to work with lead. In other words, it is moral to work in an environment which is less harmful.
2. As per the utilitarian perspective, an action is considered to be morally right if it brings about plenty of benefits when compared to the harms to the affected individuals. In other words, as long as the action benefits the majority, then it is morally right regardless of how the benefits were achieved. As per the utilitarian perspective, the policy is morally right as it considers the health of the women and their future babies. According to the rights-based viewpoint, every person possesses rights. As per the rights-based viewpoint, the policy is morally wrong as it goes against the rights of women in employment. The rights involved in this case include the rights to equal opportunities regarding employment and the right to have a conducive working environment (Shaw 353). The benefit of such a policy is that it protects potential harm while the harm is that it discriminates against women by limiting them from accessing jobs.



Want a Similar Paper?

Use a promo code SAMPLE5 to get 5% OFF
your first order

[Order Similar](#)



Unprofessional Conduct

1. The Board of Education can be viewed to have violated Pettit's right to privacy. As per the case, her teaching expertise was unquestionable as she worked well with her students (Shaw 347). Taking away her license because of her private sexual life violated her right especially since her sexual conduct did not interfere with her profession as a teacher.
2. If an employee's actions reflect badly on the image of an organization, then the employer can exhibit legitimate interest regarding the off-the-job conduct of an employee. An employer may also exhibit interest if the employee has a history of misconduct; misconduct that may interfere with the functions of an organization (Topie et al. 252).

Drug Testing in the Workplace

1. The authors' perspective on the employers being aware of their employee's drug use is that the awareness is not relevant with the view that the only significant detail is if the employee produces output as expected. The information is viewed as irrelevant is the employee performs as expected (DesJardins & Duska 6).
2. The view from the authors on drug use leading to serious harm is that the employer has the right to take action especially when the performance and other aspects of the work environment are affected. The employer is viewed to possess a prima facie that gives him or her the right to punish or relieve an employee from duties when the performance is affected due to drug use (DesJardins & Duska 6).

A New Work Ethic

1. It can be viewed as reasonable, in a capitalist setting, to expect more efforts from employees who have for a long time worked in work settings which are respectable. Such employees have knowledge of when to exhibit certain efforts and the essence of hard work and commitment. Furthermore, such workers can be viewed as disciplined as they are aware of what is expected of them.
2. In the current society, capitalists focus on making more money through the efforts of the employees but fail to compensate them as per their efforts (Shaw 181). This can be viewed to cause plenty of strife from the employees such that they begin to engage in misconduct. The capitalists also expect to be the managers who influence the decisions in the work environment without necessarily considering the views from other members of staff in which such a setting makes the employees vulnerable for termination as their personal rights are not prioritized.

Works Cited

DesJardins, Joseph and Ronald Duska. "Drug Testing in Employment". *Business & Professional*

Ethics Journal, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1987, pp. 3-21.

Shaw, William H. "Cengage Advantage Books: *Business Ethics: A Textbook with Cases*". New

York: Cengage Learning, 2013. Print.

Topie, Jim, et al. "*Employee Safety: Regulatory Foundations for the Food Protection*

Professional." New York, NY: Springer, 2015, pp. 251-262. Print.