



**CHRISTIAN SERVICE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**  
**KUMASI -GHANA**  
**SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES AND ADMINISTRATION  
**END OF SECOND SEMESTER EXAMINATIONS, 2019/2020 ACADEMIC YEAR**  
**BACHELOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**  
**Level 300**  
**CSBG 364: BUSINESS ETHICS**

June 2020

[70 marks]

**INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES:**

- **Answer TWO Questions (for 35 marks each)**
- Write your answer on the **answer sheets provided**
- **Your answer for EACH QUESTION should be THREE (3) pages minimum.**
- *Please present your answer in ESSAY form*
- Write your index number clearly at the top of every page of the answer sheets used.

**Note: Marks will be awarded for:**

- Introduction
- Content
- Conclusion
- Evidence of Further Reading
- Originality and Independence (Cheating would be penalized and integrity rewarded)
- Correct grammar, clarity of expression and logical presentation of facts.
- Referencing (for Masters and Level 300-400 papers)

**Answer TWO Questions**

**Question One (35 marks)**

**Apple vs. FBI Case Study**

**Ann Skeet and Markkula Center Staff**

In the wake of the December 2015 terrorist attack in San Bernardino, attention turned to the perpetrator's iPhone. A federal judge asked Apple, maker of the iPhone, to provide "reasonable technical assistance" to the FBI in accessing the information on the phone with that hope of discovering additional threats to national security.

Apple provided the FBI with data it had in their possession and sent Apple engineers to advise the FBI, but refused to comply with the court order to bypass the phone's security measures: specifically the 4-digit login code and a feature that erases all data after ten incorrect attempts. The FBI argued that the bypass could only be used for this phone, this one time. The agency also cited national security concerns, given the phone may lead to better understanding the attack and preventing further incidents.

Apple CEO Tim Cook issued a public letter reiterating Apple's refusal to cooperate. Cook advocated for the benefits of encryption in society to keep personal information safe. He stated that creating the backdoor entry into the iPhone would be akin to creating a master key capable of accessing the tens of millions of iPhones in the U.S. alone. Cook also had concerns that the FBI was outstepping its bounds - by using the court system to expand its authority - and believed the case should be settled after public debate and legislative action through Congress instead.

Public opinion polls on the issue were split. A number of major tech firms filed amicus briefs in support of Apple. The White House and Bill Gates stood behind the FBI. In anticlimactic fashion, the FBI withdrew its request a day before the hearing, claiming it no longer needed Apple's help to assess the phone. It is speculated that an Israeli tech firm, Cellebrite, helped the FBI gain access.

**Questions**

- a. Was Apple wrong for not complying with the FBI's request? **(5 marks)**
- b. If so, why? If not, why not? **(5marks)**
- c. What ethical issues are involved in this case? **(10marks)**
- d. Who are the stakeholders in this situation? **(5marks)**
- e. Is the company's decision consistent with its values? Is that important? **(10marks)**

**Question two (35 marks)**

**Case Study: Discrimination in the Workplace**

by Elaine E. Englehardt

Humanities/Philosophy

Marian, a top graduate from Loyola in Humanities, was hired by a major corporation into a management position. Marian finished the corporation's management training program top in her group, and is performing above the norm in her position. She is really enjoying her work.

As a black woman she feels isolated, as there are no other black women managers and few women in her area. One night at a company party she heard a conversation between two of her male co-workers and their supervisor. They were complaining to him about Marian's lack of qualifications and her unpleasant personality. They cursed affirmative action regulations for making the hiring of Marian necessary.

Marian is very upset and wants to quit.

**Questions:**

- a. Are her co-workers correct in their evaluation? **(5marks)**
- b. Should Marian confront the co-workers? **(5marks)**
- c. Should Marian file a discrimination suit? **(10marks)**
- d. Should Marian go to the supervisor? **(5marks)**
- e. What else could Marian do? **(10marks)**

**Question three (35 marks)**

**Case Study: Substance Abuse**

by Stephen Adams

Graphics and Commercial Art

Fred, a 17-year employee with Sam's Sauna, was fired for poor job performance and poor attendance, after accruing five disciplinary penalties within a 12-month period under the company's progressive disciplinary policy. A week later, Fred told his former supervisor that he had a substance abuse problem.

Although there was no employee assistance program in place and the company had not been aware of Fred's condition, their personnel director assisted Fred in obtaining treatment by allowing him to continue receiving insurance benefits and approved his unemployment insurance claim.

Fred subsequently requested reinstatement, maintaining that he had been rehabilitated since his discharge and was fully capable of being a productive employee. He pointed to a letter written by his treatment counselor, which said that his prognosis for leading a "clean, sober lifestyle" was a big incentive for him. Fred pleaded for another chance, arguing that his past problems resulted from drug addiction and that Sam's Saunas should have recognized and provided treatment for the problem.

Sam's Saunas countered that Fred should have notified his supervisor of his drug problem, and that everything possible had been done to help him receive treatment. Moreover, the company stressed that the employee had been fired for poor performance and absenteeism. Use of the progressive discipline policy had been necessary because the employee had committed a string of offenses over the course of a year, including careless workmanship, distracting others, wasting time, and disregarding safety rules.

**Questions:**

- a. Should Fred be reinstated? **(5marks)**
- b. Was the company fair to Fred in helping him receive treatment? **(10marks)**
- c. Did the personnel director behave ethically toward Fred? **(10marks)**
- d. Did Fred act ethically for his company? **(5marks)**
- e. Would it be fair to other employees to reinstate Fred? **(5mark)**

**Question four (35 marks)**

**Case Study: Employee Absence**

by Stephen Adams

Graphics and Commercial Art

Joan, an employee of Great American Market, was warned about her excessive absenteeism several times, both verbally and in writing. The written warning included notice that "further violations will result in disciplinary actions," including suspension or discharge.

A short time after the written warning was issued, Joan called work to say she was not going to be in because her babysitter had called in sick and she had to stay home and care for her young child. Joan's supervisor, Sylvia, told her that she had already exceeded the allowed number of absences and warned that if she did not report to work, she could be suspended. When Joan did not report for her shift, Sylvia suspended her for fifteen days.

In a subsequent hearing, Joan argued that it was not her fault that the babysitter had canceled, and protested that she had no other choice but to stay home. Sylvia pointed out that Joan had not made a good faith effort to find an alternate babysitter, nor had she tried to swap shifts with a co-worker. Furthermore, Sylvia said that the lack of a babysitter was not a justifiable excuse for being absent.

**Questions:**

- a. Was the suspension fair? **(5marks)**
- b. Did Sylvia act responsibly? **(5marks)**
- c. Should Joan be fired? **(5marks)**

Index number \_\_\_\_\_ Programme Option \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

- d. Should the babysitter be fired? **(5marks)**
- e. Was Sylvia fair in her actions? **(5marks)**
- f. Is there ever a solution for working mothers? **(5marks)**
- g. Should working fathers take turns staying home? **(5marks)**