Dear writer, I am looking for two 275 word responses for the discussions below. These are discussion post that require feedback. Will you please ensure that the responses are seperate of each other.

Consider the following situation:  
One week ago you joined XYZ Corporation. On the very first morning at work, you signed a pledge to uphold the company’s code of ethics. Item 4 of that code reads as follows:

Theft of company property and/or services will in every case result in discipline and possible criminal prosecution. All employees are required to immediately report knowledge of violations. Failure to report such violations shall also result in discipline.

In discussing the policy with your manager, it was clear that even using company phone systems for personal reasons was unacceptable and should be reported.  
  
Later that same week you are with a coworker, Fred, getting ready to leave the office at the end of the day. As you begin to walk out the door, Fred says, “Just a minute. I have to call my wife. She wanted me to pick something up at the store and I can’t remember what it is she wanted.” At that point you notice that he uses the company phone to make that call.

Reply to two other class members\' posts. In each response, address the following issues:

* Did the person correctly describe the idea from the readings that they chose to use in the answer? Please explain.
* Did the person provide a convincing explanation with respect to why their choice would be most effective in resolving the dilemma? Please explain.

Respond to: "We learned in this week’s course commentary that moral codes of conduct and moral values can be both seen and used as useful tools for deciding on the best next step and choices to make when dealing with morally problematic situations. Moral codes of conduct also allow individuals to assess others’ choices and give reasons for and against courses of action.

In *The Ethics of Human Resources and Industrial Relations by Budd,*Kantian Duty is discussed as the ethics of duty*. “M*ost literally, people have a duty to act in certain ways, for example, not to lie, even if it does not produce the best outcome. The ethics of duty is rooted in Immanuel Kant’s categorical imperative “Act only on that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law,” which in turn is rooted in the belief that humans are rational beings capable of self-determination and self-governance (Bowie 1999). Every responsible person is therefore entitled to dignity and respect” (Budd 9). Based on this perspective, individuals have a duty to act a certain way and to not lie, even if it does not produce the best outcomes.

Additionally, we learned of the moral codes of conduct. Once of the codes is the duty-based moral code. This explains that everyone has a clear duty to keep promises, even if the results of promise keeping do not offer any advantage. As an employee, I made a promise to the company to report any violations made. Fred violated company policy by using his phone. The theory of deontology states *we are morally obligated to act in accordance with a certain set of principles and rules regardless of outcome* (Shakil).

Being a new employee, the last thing I want to do is break a pledge I obeyed to in reporting violations made in regards to the code of conducts. Based on the duty I have of upholding my commitments to the company, I would decide to report the violation so that I am remaining compliant with my pledge and acting in an ethical manner for the company. I also would not want to be up for disciplinary actions as well. Kantian Duty details not to lie even if it does not produce the best outcome. I would explain my decision to Fred beforehand and let him know that I wanted to stay in good-standing with my role and had a moral responsibility to XYZ company. I weighed the cost of my relationship with my co-worker with the  risk of facing disciplinary action myself. I would listen to Fred\'s view point from there and understand explain to Fred that this using the phone is referred to as "theft of corporate services" in the manual. I would say that I do not believe that he had the intention of stealing from the company, but would tell him that this in the manual this is a terminable offense. I would feel bad and ask for leniency in policy for Fred and explain the situation as to why he had to use the phone.
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Respond to:

"As a new HR professional with XYZ Corporation, while signing my pledge to uphold the company\'s code of ethics, I would imagine worse case scenarios that support reporting violations to the company\'s theft policy.  Severe cases such as theft of company financial data or business equipment would not only warrant reporting but also any associated discipline, as the policy guarantees.  But it does not seem reasonable nor fair to discipline a coworker, who may be a stellar performer for the company, for making a quick, personal phone call using the company phone systems at the end of a work day.  I would not report Fred\'s act based on the concept of Rawlsian Fairness.

Rawlsian Fairness is the "ethical theory of distributive justice or fairness" (Budd and Scoville.  2005. p. 11).  There are 3 important conditions under this concept:

1.  Veil of ignorance which "means that what counts for the justice of work is not the actual consent we give when we take a job, but the consent we would give under ideal circumstances"  (Budd and Scoville.  2005. p. 11).  This condition allows individuals to make judgements on what they would consider to be \'ideal circumstances.\'  With the company\'s theft policy, should an employee steal intellectual property, for example, it would be ideal for the situation to be reported and the employee to be disciplined.  But, classifying the use of company phone systems for personal reasons, regardless of the situation, as theft seems extreme.  Fred was simply making a quick phone call to his wife.  His act does not fall under the realm of \'ideal circumstances\'.  Therefore, from my own moral perspective, Fred\'s act need not be reported.

2.  "EACH person is to have an EQUAL RIGHT to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all"  (Budd and Scoville.  2005. p. 11).  This condition asserts fairness in treatment for all.  It begs the question \'*What if the violation was committed by the CEO or another company executive?  Would they be reported and receive the same discipline as Fred?*\'  I would assume that the answers to these questions would be \'no\'.  Therefore, this condition also support not reporting Fred\'s act.

3.  "Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both: a. to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged, and b. attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity."  (Budd and Scoville.  2005. p. 11).  This condition allows for "differential outcomes ... if they... are not arbitrary or discriminatory factors"  (Budd and Scoville.  2005. p. 11).  Therefore, unless EVERY personal phone call made using company phone system was reported AND disciplined, reporting and disciplining Fred would be arbitrary.
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