

Ethical Decision-Making in Workplace Disclosure and Employee Fairness

Posted on September 17, 2018

What Should Jack Do?

Jack is in a controversial situation where he needs to make rational choices that will not only build his integrity but also ensure that the position of his colleagues is not at risk. Jack has been asked if he is excited to work with Mathew again. It is evident that the recruiting manager has reviewed the information of each intern and has noted that the two had worked together before. Jack should inform the manager that he is looking forward to working with Mathew. The acknowledgment will prevent the manager from raising any suspicion.

Ethical Decision-Making Process

Jack is in a dilemma and must make decisions that are well thought out and follow the ethical model. The decisions should be ethical so that they do not create unnecessary conflicts. The decision-making process must be duly followed.

Considering all the facts is crucial in making the right decision. It is evident that the recruitment process is stringent, and the company scrutinizes the information for full-time hires. Interns like Jack and Mathew do not receive thorough checks since their positions are temporary. Mathew has additionally presented wrong information about his achievements and the roles he has taken in the past. These facts are crucial in the decision Jack is going to make. The impact of the decision should not be an issue, but the ethics behind such a decision matter. If the manager is to make further inquiries about the difference in their credentials, Jack should be able to make an honest disclosure of the roles they played in their previous internship (KPMG 2).

Jack can take two alternative actions in this case. First, he can choose not to disclose the discrepancies in Mathew's profile and inform the manager that he is looking forward to working with Mathew. The other alternative is to inform the manager that he is not looking forward to working with Mathew again because of the integrity issues (KPMG 3). All these alternatives attract consequences, and Jack must dig into the alternatives before choosing the right alternative.

The two alternatives elicit ethical issues in different ways. The first decision to keep quiet and express the pleasure of working together will portray Mathew as honest and will guarantee his internship position. The challenge that could arise in this case is when the recruiting manager inquires why the two have different skills, yet they worked at the same level in the previous company. Jack should be

ready to present a valid reason to support the choice. The second alternative of expressing displeasure will lead to further inquiry, which could see Mathew being denied the opportunity to work with the company (KPMG 3). The move to give an honest assessment of Mathew will portray Jack as a person of integrity while putting Mathew's position at risk.

Possible outcomes should be evaluated to determine the best choice that will have a fair impact on all the candidates. The first alternative offers desirable outcomes considering the scrutiny of internship positions. It is unlikely that the two candidates will undergo a thorough check, considering the procedures followed by the recruitment department. The second alternative will lead to more scrutiny and possibly changes in procedures for internship positions. The recruitment manager could be forced to relieve Mathew of his position, and the positions of other interns could additionally be reviewed.

The Recommended Decision For Jack

The decision made by Jack should be reviewed to ensure that it follows the required guidelines and prevents a situation that will create controversies in the future.

The decision should be consistent throughout, and Jack must stick to one decision to avoid creating unnecessary issues. Jack's decision should be able to answer a set of questions to ensure that it is consistent. Do you think that it is right not to disclose Mathew's credentials to the manager? Do you feel that your action will have an impact in the future? The two questions will reiterate the decision made and the considerations of the decision.

Jack should be aware of the consequences of his decisions and be in a position to defend his choices. Does your decision violate the ethical provisions of the company? Are you not afraid that this decision will ruin your reputation? The two questions will address the issue of awareness and will present Jack's views in regard to the possible backlash of his decisions.

Rules should be followed and should be guided by principles. The decision should comply with the company's existing rules and principles. Does the decision violate the company's principles? Are there rules that guide the disclosure of information in the company? The questions will be able to ascertain if the choice is in line with the rules and principles of the company.

Equity ensures that there is fairness to the parties in question. Do you think Mathew deserves a chance to work with the company? This question will address the issue of equity and will present an opportunity for Jack to present arguments on whether the decision promotes fairness and equal opportunities for all candidates.

Works Cited

KPMG. *The Ethical Compass: A Toolkit for Integrity in Business*. Case Study, 2012