

Case Studies

Case 9.1

The Young Coach and the Old Tradition

As students graduate to become professionals in their chosen field, often they may be technically competent to take on their new role yet be unprepared to undertake the somewhat more subtle responsibilities of leadership. As a result a variety of situations may arise that will challenge their personal ethics as well as their personal and task-relevant maturity. This particular case was developed to provide an example of the conflict (internal/external and personal/professional) that an individual might face as he or she becomes a "professional" and is faced with additional responsibility and accountability.

Maggie was a 26-year-old graduate student in Kinesiology at one of the country's more prestigious universities. She had also been a top-ranked volleyball player in her years of competition. Her career as a player had been cut short as a result of a back injury sustained at a national championship. Maggie had managed, however, to continue her involvement in the sport as an assistant coach of the women's varsity team for two years.

In the second year of her graduate program the head coach, Rob, went on sabbatical and Maggie was offered the job of interim head coach. Maggie felt that this was indeed a major turning point in her career. As a graduate student she was in love with university life and felt that this opportunity to be a head coach would make her curriculum vitae very strong for any future university positions to which she may apply. She was extremely ambitious. Her competitive drive as an athlete was successfully transferred to her career as an "apprentice" academic.

The season began very well. The players, many of whom had played their first seasons with Maggie, respected her not only for the ability she displayed as a player but also for her academic success, her knowledge of the sport, and for her intense loyalty to the team. All seemed well. The team was preparing for an exhibition "road trip" and its members were getting rather excited about the season's first competition as well as the first overnight trip. The team members had a rather dubious reputation as "party animals." They tended to drink and carry on as hard as they played in competition, which was rather intense. This tradition had existed long before Maggie was

the interim head coach and had in fact been promoted to some extent by the head coach, Rob. His road trip motto was: "Nobody gets hurt, nothing gets broken, everyone plays to the best of their ability, go crazy!" Maggie had actually been one of the more popular and crazier players during her career. Now that she was head coach, her attitude towards drinking on the bus trips was somewhat different, particularly after learning that the athletic administrator, Dr. Belt, was a firm believer in athletes not drinking alcohol at all. This was a university policy. There was also some suspicion that Dr. Belt was anxious to catch the team in the "act" in order to punish Rob for the insolence that he had displayed towards the administration for the last 15 years.

The team boarded the bus and thought that the first stop would be to pick up a supply of beer and wine for the bus-party on the way to the tournament. Maggie had dreaded this moment; she had been, after all, one of the worst offenders as an athlete and her current puritan attitude may not be terribly popular, and was, to say the least, somewhat hypocritical (and inauthentic) based on her past. Nonetheless, Maggie stuck to her initiative to change the team's party culture and said that there would be no stops until they had reached the destination four hours away. The team was not amused. Upon arrival, rooms were assigned at the hotel, and the women were instructed to meet for warm-up in 45 minutes.

The tournament began and Maggie's team performed extremely well, as expected. They won all of their games in the first match and lost once in the second match. Following the matches, the team went out for a few beers at the local bar and were reasonably restrained since the next game was at 8:30 the next morning. As things turned out, Maggie's team won the tournament in wonderful form; the season was off to an excellent start. On the way home a few of the players asked Maggie if a few beers on the bus would be okay. Maggie's resolve weakened and she said it was permitted. The trip home was reasonably calm; some were doing homework, some were singing songs, and several were drinking and being a bit loud all the way home. Upon arrival at Sydney Hall (the Kinesiology building) one of the players dropped a bottle of beer as she got off the bus—it broke and her friends became uncontrollable in their laughter. Unfortunately for them, the head coach of the field hockey team, Professor Penny Rudent, witnessed the incident. The following morning Maggie was asked to meet with Dr. Belt—her heart sank. As she felt her bright career slowly slip away, she wondered what on earth she was going to say and do to resolve this dilemma.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. What was the nature of Maggie's conflict in this case?

2. What do you think was the dominant moderator influencing Maggie's behavior?
3. How do you think that this situation could have been avoided?
4. How would the existentialist view this situation?
5. Why do we so often believe that players can become coaches? What is the fallacy in this argument?

Case 9.2

The Benevolent Autocrat

In the administration of many sport- and recreation-related associations, volunteers often play a significant role in organizational decision making. Volunteers join organizations for a variety of reasons, many of which are personal rather than organizational in nature. As a result the commitment of these individuals to the organizational goals may be overshadowed by their personal agendas. This case was written with a focus on decision making within committees and the reality of abuse of power. It provides an example of the ethical complexity of committee decisions and the variety of factors that may influence one's ethical decision making and influence the manner in which one reacts to perceived unethical decisions.

Jim was a 30-year veteran of the provincial government and a former professional boxer. He had held just about every high profile volunteer position, as well as being the executive director of the athletic association for 10 years. He was currently the athletic director of the local university. To put it mildly, Jim believed himself to be well connected and experienced in the nuances of the political climate of provincial and national sport. He was also known for his zealous and often fixated concern for efficiency and short-term effectiveness as well as the habit of running meetings exactly on time whether issues were completely explored or not. His decisions were based upon the bottom-line only.

In June the lobbying of many in the community for additions to the Derry Centre, an indoor aquatics complex, was successful as the state government agreed to provide a substantial grant to commence construction in the fall. Jim was asked to be the chair of the committee. He decided that a report to the Minister of Sport, Recreation, and Culture would be completed after eight meetings, no more and no less.

The committee consisted of members of the aquatics community, university coaches, athletes, and parents. A number of issues were on the table, not the least of which was the problem of what to do with the elite synchronized swimmers who would be displaced by the con-

struction. There were several national and international athletes using the facility, and finding them another venue in which to train was a concern. A number of suggestions were made for these athletes and what appeared to be a simple solution fast became an extremely heated political debate. This debate involved a number of sport organizations who felt that their interests were being compromised by the support offered to this group of swimmers. For example, the synchro team (the daughter of the dean of his faculty was a team member) felt threatened because they perceived that their hours were going to be reduced; the community swim program felt equally concerned because of reduced hours as well as the perception that the elite synchro swimmers were being favored over the grassroots speed swimmers once again (the son of the university's president was one of these athletes); and the all-male Old Dogs Triathlon Club, whose members always felt that they were being discriminated against (and were now facing reverse gender discrimination) were ready to go to the local paper with their concerns. It seemed that the members of the committee and the various groups that were going to be influenced by the construction had lost sight of the long-term potential for the new addition to enhance the swimming community at large. Jim, however, did not lose sight of this fact and was "on task" despite the tangents that seemed to be multiplying as weeks passed.

The committee members, after much debate, believed that they had reached decisions regarding the nature of the addition to the aquatics center as well as the displacement of the swimmers. Regarding the latter, the following was the committee's proposal:

1. As the Olympics were fast approaching, priority should be given to the displaced elite synchro swimmers at the city's other aquatics center;
2. The speed swimmers would have to arrange their schedule to share morning and evening pool times;
3. The community swim program would not be affected;
4. The Old Dogs would have to cancel their training in the pool until after the synchro team left for the Olympics.

These recommendations were unanimously supported by the committee at the seventh meeting. Prior to the eighth meeting, Jim sat beside the dean of the faculty at a varsity basketball game and discussed the progress of the committee. The dean made the comment that he sincerely hoped that his daughter's synchro team would not be affected by the new construction.

At the end of the eighth meeting, Jim read to the committee the recommendation that he was going to bring forth to the Minister. It was as follows:

1. The speed swimmers would share morning and evening practices with the Old Dogs;
2. The synchro team and the speed swimming club would not be affected because we must maintain the integrity of the grassroots developmental initiatives as well as our Olympic aspirations;
3. The community swim program would be temporarily cancelled.

The committee members were stunned. They did not respond to the "edict" out of shock and perhaps out of fear of crossing the imposing, autocratic, and omnipotent figure of Jim. The recommendations were delivered to the Minister. Shortly afterward, however, the Minister was informed that this recommendation in no way represented the will of the committee. He was apprised of the committee's wishes and was then faced with a dilemma.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. How would you explain the behavior of the committee members?
2. What was the value orientation of Jim?
3. What influenced his decision-making behavior?
4. What role do you think that Utilitarian philosophy played in this particular case?

Case 9.3

The Only Coach in Town

The influence and power of the coach in sport is often underestimated. The coach's power to control the behavior on and off the field is significant and more often than not unquestioned. Within this athlete-coach dyad there exists the potential for physical and psychological abuse. This case was developed for the reader to explore the ethical tension between a variety of issues, which include societal values and human sexuality, violence between coach and athlete, and the conflict between the deontological/societal right and the Utilitarian greatest good for the greatest number.

The village of Thames was a quiet community about 70 kilometers from Newlondon, a large city with a population of about 2.5 million. There was only one secondary school in the village that served a considerably large area of the county. The village population had decreased in the past 10 years as the opportunities for young people were few and most left as quickly as possible for jobs and university in Newlondon. The school, Sir W. Church Secondary School, was

able to support a few interscholastic athletic programs. These teams, despite having a relatively small population of students from which to draw, always seemed to be very successful not only in county competition but also in tournaments in Newlondon where they were playing against much larger schools.

One of the school's most successful teams was the women's rugby team. They had been county champions for the past four years thanks to the outstanding and demanding coaching of Mike Murphy—a former national team member. Mike had attended Sir W.C. in the 1980s and, after completing his bachelor's and master's of education degrees and his career as an international competitor, was able to return to Thames to teach in his old secondary school. Mike was a strict teacher. He taught biology, physical education, and health with expectations that exceeded those of most academics in the school. His credo was "Pursue excellence on the pitch, in the classroom, and in your life." This was welcomed and encouraged by the principal, Dr. Jane Smith who felt that the academic performance of the school had slipped in recent years. Needless to say, Mike was very well respected by the students, teachers, parents, and the village-at-large.

All seemed to be going well with Mike until his behavior began to change at the beginning of the fall semester. He became unusually quiet in staff meetings, and his temper was extremely short in class and on the pitch. Rumors started flying and the change in his behavior was the talk of students and staff alike. Dr. Smith had heard these rumors as well as the staff's banter and felt that she needed to speak to Mike to find out the nature of his problem. She decided that she would try to meet with him after rugby practice one evening and take him for coffee. She observed part of the practice and noticed that he was being extremely hard on his athletes, bordering on being verbally abusive to them. Jane was glad that she had chosen to meet with him to prevent this situation from escalating further. After practice the two went for coffee and Mike, with little prodding, gave Jane a story she had not expected.

Mike confided in her that he was gay and that the relationship he had been in for the past seven years had suddenly ended. Most of his family had been unaware of this side of Mike until it was accidentally revealed to them by his sister. There was more—his mother was not well and he was experiencing a number of stress-related symptoms as a result. Mike's life was coming apart.

Jane made a number of suggestions to help, including his taking some time off and seeking out counseling. Mike was unwilling to accept this suggestion since he was not the kind to admit "defeat." Jane left him with the assurance that, if he needed to talk, she was always ready to listen.

The season progressed, the team was winning, but Mike's attitude and behavior were degenerating. The situation came to a crisis during a tournament in Newlondon when Mike, in front of the crowd and the local television cameras, directed a number of profanities at his team, kicked over the announcer's bench after a penalty was missed by the referee, and finally slapped his team captain after a poor play. Mike was ejected from the game. The rugby union disciplinary committee was called immediately in order to determine Mike's fate.

The committee met and was unanimous in their shock regarding Mike's behavior and its decline. Dr. Smith was invited to provide some background on the situation and proceeded to reveal some of the chaotic details of Mike's life. An additional variable was thrown into the mix. If Mike were suspended, there would be no coach and therefore no team. The players had absolutely no one in the community who could intervene; the program would have to be cancelled. The committee was faced with a complex array of variables yet they had to make a decision quickly for the sake of the players, for Mike, for the village, and for the public. The local press was eager to report the details of the story, which had the potential to make national news.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. What do you think of the power position between the coach and athlete in general?
2. Is this case of violence an isolated incident or is there an aspect of the culture of sport that would allow Mike to believe that he could strike an athlete?
3. How would you describe the actions of Mike's significant others?
4. Should Mike be asked to coach again in the near future? At all?

Case 9.4

Walden Sportplex—Fighting Change

In many urban centers around the world, population demographics are rapidly and radically changing as we become more and more multicultural and multiracial. With the increasing heterogeneity of cultures, the need to accept alternative paradigms becomes necessary if the evolving community is to survive and prosper. The case of Walden Sportplex was developed to have the reader explore, not only the reality of changing societal demographics and their effect

upon organization dynamics, but also upon the nature of cross-cultural relations and ethical behavior.

The Walden Sportplex was build in 1985 in the middle of one of the country's major urban centers. The staff of the Sportplex was made up of individuals recruited locally and internationally from Canada, the United Kingdom, and the U.S. Ten years had passed and the Sportplex clientele had begun to decline in numbers. The executive director, Jake, felt that the "problem" was a function of the downturn in the economy and that if things were going the way they always had all would be well in the next few fiscal quarters. There were those who disagreed. Jake, 61, was the first ED of the Sportsplex. He had retired from the navy and then from his position of intramural director at one of the country's larger universities. His philosophy for the Sportsplex seemed to be quite similar to his former position at the university. His programming, as a result, was extremely popular for the middle- and upper-middle-class professional clientele that accessed the facility before and after work as well as during noon hour. However, during the day and on weekends, the building was gradually becoming more and more dormant.

In the 1970s and 1980s the population demographics of the city steadily began to shift from the dominance of the white, 30-something, middle class of European descent to an increasingly young Asian mix. Nearing the twenty-first century, the city had changed drastically from its profile of 10 years earlier. In particular, the demographics of center town, where the Sportsplex was located, indicated that it was a mecca for a variety of ethnic groups.

Despite the fact that Jake believed the declining numbers to be economically based, he also believed that much of the problem was due to the "ethnic" teenagers hanging around the building after school and during the weekend. The assistant director, Zoe, had another perspective. She believed that rather than being an unwanted nuisance, the youth were in fact a group that the Sportplex had traditionally neglected and could be very successfully integrated into the center. She believed that not only could these youth be welcomed into current programming, but also new and culturally relevant opportunities could be made available to them. Further, she believed that this segment of the population was the key to the future of the Sportsplex as the population statistics demonstrated. Programming must therefore be developed to include this group as well as their parents in the ethnic community. Zoe was able to convince many of her co-workers as well as the majority of the board of directors.

Jake became quite disturbed with this shift in focus and considered it to be, in fact, a mutiny of his staff. He became so incensed at one staff meeting that he completely lost control and blew up at his staff, in particular at Zoe, whom he blamed for much of the new

thinking. He went so far as to suggest that Zoe was doing all of this because she herself was of aboriginal descent and was trying "to get back at the white man." With this, he left in a huff. The incident was reported to the board of directors.

Questions for to Consider for Discussion

1. What demographic changes have you noticed in your community?
2. Have these changes affected you directly? How?
3. How would you go about learning more about the demographic profile of your community?
4. How do the philosophies of existentialism, deontology, and Utilitarianism differ in their approach to this dilemma?

Case 9.5

SPORTPLAY—The Lure and Peril

The trend in many nations, such as Canada, in recent years has been to supplement government funding for sport, recreation, health, education, and cultural programs through a variety of fundraising strategies. One of the more popular and successful methods has been lottery ticket sales. The revenue generated by the lotteries has been the savior of many not-for-profit organizations. However, has there been a subliminal cost connected to this method of survival? This case was developed to allow the reader to explore the ethics of lotteries. The reader will be able to test deontological, existential, and teleological theories in this very contentious realm of not-for-profit fundraising.

The Provincial Arts Board (PAB) had been hit recently by substantial government funding cutbacks. It failed to meet three of five of the fundamental categories for full federal funding based upon the newly developed funding criteria. As a result, the executive director, Chris, had to begin looking for alternative sources to keep the PAB running. As a child he had been a national award winner in piano and was well on his way to a career in music. His ambitions changed after his first degree and recently he had completed a graduate degree in arts marketing at the largest university in the country.

The membership had traditionally been made up of the extremely well-to-do. For years, money had not been an object of concern for the board of directors. Recently, however, there seemed to be many more "middle class" members and, as a result, seeking external funding sources for daily operations became a dominant issue for the membership. The culture of the board was indeed in a state of flux. When the federal funding was cut, Chris knew that something drastic

had to occur because the old money that had historically kept the board viable was no longer guaranteed; in the 1990s, art was no longer for the so-called upper crust of society.

Chris, thinking beyond the PAB's traditional views of fundraising, came up with the idea of connecting with sport. He felt that if he could garner the support from the sport community (which was always in a state of need) then in partnership they could use legalized gambling on sporting events to satisfy both their financial woes. All wagers and payouts would be controlled by a centralized not-for-profit organization. He mentioned this idea to his colleagues in the national sport center and it took off. After four months of hard work and a great deal of lobbying, 33 associations, art and sport alike, had jumped on the bandwagon as well as several politicians who saw the potential of such a scheme to replace eventually all government support for the art community as well as elite sport.

After one year of extremely hard work, the government agreed to seed the initiative with money to assist in the marketing and advertising of the gambling "game" called *Sportplay*. In the first few months *Sportplay* created quite a stir throughout the country. Sales were unbelievably successful as people flocked to various locations to purchase *Sportplay* forms. The public was told that only a bit of sport knowledge was required in order to make them instantly wealthy, or so they hoped. The advertisements encouraged people to play often to give them a chance to quit working, to insult their boss, to sit by the beach and relax for the rest of their life, to be with beautiful men or women, to be "free," and so on. Despite the fact that the odds of being hit by lightning were better than winning substantially in *Sportplay*, the advertisements emphatically stated that it was impossible to win without "BT-PG," that is, Buy a Ticket and Play the Game. Further, you were "a miserly unpatriotic sod if you didn't play at least once a month to support the arts and amateur sport."

Sportplay was a financial savior for the PAB as well as sport in general. It allowed for the development of new artists as well as teachers, coaches, officials, and administrators; it provided funding for supplies, equipment, and national and international travel; it allowed associations to further enhance their marketability to attract other sponsors; it was directly linked to the country's National Arts Festival and the best showing at the last Olympic Games.

It was not until several years into this scheme that anyone cared to investigate the effect of *Sportplay* upon variables other than arts and sport. For example, government statistics tracking client's seeking counseling for gambling addiction increased by approximately 43% in the second year of the lottery to 64% in the third year. Stories abounded of families that were being broken, juvenile crime was up, and family fortunes were being lost. Several studies correlated these

statistics to the new wave of gambling brought on by *Sportplay*. The somewhat imprudent response of the “stewards” of *Sportplay* was that it was the individual’s excessive gambling, not *Sportplay*, that was to blame. An additional finding was that primarily members of the lower socio-economic class were the most frequent players—seeking the ultimate escape from their poverty. It appeared that *Sportplay*, not religion, was the new “opiate of the masses.”

Chris had, in the meantime, received overwhelming support for his efforts in developing this new manner to fund national artistic and sport programs; he had saved many associations from closure as a result of his initiative. Chris was no longer convinced that his idea was in fact such a marvelous thing. He was having a difficult time justifying the benefits reaped by the art and sport communities (generally consisting of the upper and middle class) as compared to the burden of the optimistic lower class, who generally did not benefit from the elite system. The rich were indeed getting richer and the poor were providing funding. Was the advertising deceptive? Was the typical buyer making informed decisions? Chris wondered if there wasn’t something that he could do to make this situation seem more just for all.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. Are lotteries ethical?
2. What do you think about lottery support for not-for-profit organizations?
3. Who are the winners and who are the losers?
4. Are you aware of any social disorders that have been caused by gambling—legal or sanctioned?
5. What is the alternative to lottery revenue?
6. What are the competing principles in this case?
7. What is the greatest good for the greatest number?

Case 9.6

A Little Help from Her Friends

Unscrupulous people and naive people do exist. In many cases, for a variety of reasons (i.e., personal relations), we tend to be unable to perceive the ulterior motives (e.g., personal gain or personal friendships) of individuals that may result in personal or organizational damage. In this case the reader will be able to explore the ethics of

organizational nepotism and careerism. The often conflicting concepts of objective justice and subjective relationships may provide a useful backdrop for the analysis of this particular case.

Britt was a relatively new administrator in the Sport Centre, a federation of sport-governing organizations. She was liked by more or less everyone in her work setting and in the professional associations to which she belonged. She had been employed by the Sport Centre for several years and had gradually worked her way up the ranks to the administrative level. She had one flaw: she found it difficult to say "no." As a result she was part of virtually every committee, every fundraiser, and every social function that she was asked to attend.

This "flaw" became rather serious when her department's computer system finally broke down after years of glitches. Replacing the system was going to be expensive. News got out to the computer sales network that a rather lucrative contract could be had at the Sport Centre and, needless to say, the "sharks sensed a feeding frenzy." One of these "sharks" was an old friend of Britt's from university. This former roommate, Beth, felt that she definitely had the inside track to this contract because Britt was, to no surprise, the chair of the computer committee.

Britt's department was relatively new and many of the managerial functions were carried out in a less-than-administratively-pristine manner. Many of the decisions that could have been handled by a general manager were made by committee because only as a collective would the best decisions be made, or so they felt. In reality not one of the administrators had the background to make such a purchase, yet they were afraid to seek outside help for fear that others would perceive that the department was not being run effectively. As a result, they relied upon the safety of numbers—decision by consensus. The work environment was extremely positive, yet not terribly efficient.

Beth was a careerist in the full meaning of the word. She was prepared to use every bit of influence and old history to convince Britt to buy from her company in order to reap the substantial commission. It may be interesting to note that Beth had not contacted Britt since university seven years ago, despite the fact that they had both been living in the same city for the past six years—this was known to Beth and unknown to Britt.

Beth began to lobby Britt in a most dramatic way. Lunches, dinners, squash games, movies—life seemed just like it had been in the good old days at school when they were roomies (the "good old days," unknown to Britt, did include the fact that Beth constantly chased after all of the men that ever showed any interest in Britt). The date for tendering fast approached, and Beth was relentless. Britt was so overwhelmed by the reunion with her friend that she lost

sight of her objectivity relative to the tender. She provided Beth with information to which Beth should not have been privy. When the bids came in Beth's lobbying intensified, including an offer to help Britt with some of the technical information she lacked and was directed, obviously, to Beth's product.

Britt and the committee met several times to discuss the merits of each tender. The decision came down to three, one of which was Beth's. Thanks to her many in-depth and informal discussions with Beth, Britt was able to answer many of the questions the committee had about Beth's product—this was not the case with the other two. The result—Beth won the contract.

It was at least six months after the installation of the computer system before the staff became extremely concerned with the quality of the product. It seemed inordinately slow and would often shut down without warning or cause. Britt had been attempting for months now to calm the staff and assure them that it was only the bugs of a new system that had to be worked out. As time passed, the poor service that Beth's company provided became even worse and created a great deal of frustration and anger among the staff.

Rumor began to escalate regarding the original deal. It was suggested that Britt had been "taken," that the tendering process was flawed, that Britt was involved romantically with Beth, that Britt had, in fact, taken a "kickback" from Beth. Britt herself was feeling increasingly uncomfortable with the entire situation. Strangely, Beth had not called her since the sale, and when Britt tried to call Beth at work or home she spoke only to voice mail and an answering machine, respectively. Where had her old roommate gone? What was she to do about the computer system?

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. What is Beth's value orientation? What is Britt's?
2. At what level of moral development would you place each of the two women?
3. How could this dilemma be avoided in the future?
4. Who is to blame? Why?

Case 9.7

Pulling at Heart Strings?

The phrase “the ends justify the means” can often be associated with the organizational functions of marketing and public relations. Particularly in the setting of not-for-profit organizations, the good outcome that is achieved may, for some, provide significant rationale for condoning questionable methods to achieve that “good” end. In this case, readers are encouraged to explore the lengths individuals will go to in order to accomplish “good” ends. This case is richly utilitarian in its theme and demands full use of other ethical theories for its resolution.

The Special People Association (SPA) is a not-for-profit organization that provides programming for individuals with disabilities leading towards local, regional, national, and international arts and cultural events. It is a very active fundraiser, and must be, because the SPA receives proportionally fewer dollars from government sources than other “mainstream” organizations.

Traditionally the SPA’s fundraising strategies have not involved high-profile marketing. Rather they have relied on bingo, dinners, and raffles. Until recently, these avenues have been enough to meet the financial demands of the association. However, it is now apparent that the current level of support from external sources is not enough to allow the association to keep up with its ever-increasing program demands. New ideas for fundraising have to be developed and implemented quickly.

Sargit is the executive director of the SPA. He is 38, a graduate of a small university, with a B.A. in Religious Studies from the University of Madras in India and an M.A. in Human Movement Studies from the University of Southern Cross in Australia. He is married and has three children, aged 3, 5, and 9. The eldest child, James, has Down’s Syndrome. Sargit and his wife, Helen, are rather vocal supporters of integration for their child in all aspects of his life.

Sargit had lobbied his rather conservative board of directors for years to allow him to be a bit more aggressive in the ways in which he sought external sources of funding. Now that the economy was pressing, the board was willing to take some chances with his creative ideas.

Sargit believed that the faces of their clients had to be exposed to the public—that these special people should not be hidden away or feared or simply tolerated. He felt that the community should be involved in their successes and be proud of their participation at all levels of art and cultural festivals and competitions—local and international. He decided that he would begin with a city-wide billboard

campaign. A salesman for a billboard company was a good friend of Sargit and had offered him three free billboards if he were able to sign a contract to pay for five over the next 18 months. This was a very generous offer. However, it was a gamble because it would empty the advertising budget for the association. Sargit felt that it was worth the gamble and proceeded to work on the content of the message that these posters would display.

He met several times with the staff to discuss the strategy and encountered a wide range of opinions regarding the orientation and intent of the billboard. Two camps formed. The first believed that the billboard should be created to show how the younger individuals with the more serious disabilities struggled to overcome tremendous odds to compete. The donations of the public would allow these disadvantaged kids to overcome one less hurdle. This was the "pull at the public's heart strings" orientation, and market research had shown that this was the most effective means for acquiring emotional and financial support among the public. The second camp was not in favor of going for the sympathy donation. Rather they believed that these people, young and old, could warrant public support without using an approach that appealed to public sympathy and guilt. This position was the one that was generally favored by those actually caring for children with disabilities. The committee was at a stalemate—pragmatism versus idealism. Sargit had to present the decision to the board for approval. His was the deciding vote.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. What are the competing ethical principles in this case?
2. Do the ends justify the means?
3. What are other examples of "social marketing"? Are they ethically contentious?

Case 9.8

Winning

A common contemporary indictment against elite sport has been its basic assumption to "win at all cost." As a consequence of this dominant value, the abuse of athletes by coaches is not an uncommon incident. This case is clearly one of power and the abuse of position in the pursuit of victory. The reader may feel compelled to re-examine his or her own local or national sport system to question the tacit or latent philosophy of elite and recreational sport systems.

In 1992 Attila immigrated to this country from eastern Europe. He had been his national team coach and was hired by our national program. He was, without question, an extremely knowledgeable coach, perhaps one of the best technicians in world. His success in his former country was impressive and the potential of his impact upon the national team was tremendous.

The national program had undergone a number of coaching changes in recent years. It seemed as though the athletes were not progressing as quickly as many in the gymnastics community believed that they should be. The community was adamant about producing a medallist for the next Olympic Games and the pressure for high performance was becoming more intense. Additional pressure came from the sport's major corporate sponsor. They had recently joined the gymnastics program under the assumption that exposure of their product in an Olympic context would make their annual investment of \$250,000 U.S. worthwhile. If a solid performance was not realized in the next Olympics and World championships, the sponsor threatened withdrawal.

As far as the athletes were concerned, they were extremely motivated to be in the run for medals in all of their international competitions. The atmosphere among them was highly competitive. As a result there were some athletes who had gone over the edge and were suffering from various maladies, ranging from anorexia and bulimia to chronic stress injuries.

Prior to Attila's arrival, the former coach had had a very close relationship with most of his athletes. He was technically very good, yet his real forte was his ability to demonstrate concern and empathy for the athletes; he was very much a father figure to many. However, he was not getting results and therefore lost his position to Attila.

Attila wasted no time in taking control of the program. He fired two of the assistant coaches and completely rearranged practice schedules, competition dates, and instituted a spartan regime of diet, sleep, and controlled socializing for the entire team. This, of course, was in addition to the qualitative and quantitative shift in the manner in which the team trained.

Initially, this new approach was accepted by the athletes, who were aware of Attila's successes in his home country and felt that this shift would result in a positive outcome at the World championships and the Olympics. This optimism was, however, short-lived as the morale of the team steadily declined. Attila abused the athletes both physically and mentally. He constantly ridiculed their ability to perform as well as their appearance, and spent much of his time calling most of the females "fat." One athlete, who was a recovering anorexic, ended up in hospital after collapsing in practice. She had been fasting for days following an abusive comment from Attila.

The board was made aware of the situation and opted to do nothing. The team had returned from a dual meet with China where they had nearly upset this gymnastics powerhouse. Despite the complaining of the team members, results were being achieved. The team continued facing the grueling training regime and the abuse at the hands of Attila.

Following another successful dual meet in Europe, the seven senior members of the team wrote a letter to the Gymnastics Association requesting the termination of Attila's contract. The athletes stated that they could no longer continue with the abuse and the pressure that Attila was putting them through. The board responded by threatening to revoke the athletes' funding if they didn't follow the leadership of Attila, who was obviously taking them to competitive heights they could never have hoped to reach without his kind of coaching. The matter was dropped.

The team was still touring Europe when the most unfortunate incident occurred. One of the younger athletes, who showed a great deal of promise, performed exceedingly well throughout the competition until she fell from the uneven bars, thus losing the overall competition for the team. Attila was furious. He chastised the young woman for a full three minutes in front of everyone in the arena. He then roughly escorted her back to the locker room to continue his tirade. The young woman was overwhelmed with shame, embarrassment, and tears; she was completely distraught. Two hours later she was found in her hotel room, having overdosed on sleeping pills. The young woman survived this suicide attempt and was flown home immediately after her release from the hospital.

At this point the team had had enough. All members signed a petition to have Attila ousted from his position. The petition was delivered to the national office upon the return of the team from the most successful gymnastics competition the country had ever experienced.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. What ethical theory seems to be the basis for elite sport?
2. How could existentialism be incorporated into the culture of sport?
3. Is the behavior of Attila unique? Why?
4. What external variables influence the current culture of the sport world? What do you think of this trend?

Case 9.9

Everyone Else Is Doing It

“The way we do things around here” is often used as the layperson’s definition of organizational culture. This common understanding of organizational behavior provides the background for all socialization of new members. The problem arises when the culture fosters behavior that is perceived to be counterproductive for the overall survival of the organization. If the norms of the organization encourage budget embellishment or a poor work ethic, then the responsibility lies with the leadership to transform the culture to support more positive organizational behavior and commitment. This case is focused upon careerism and situational ethics. The challenge for the reader concerns not only the general analysis of this particular case but also the notion of socialization within any organizational context to prevent the status quo from being ethically unsound.

Lila is a coach of a intercollegiate field hockey team. She is a graduate and former player on the field hockey team of the university which now employs her. Lila, at the time of these events, was completing a postgraduate diploma in coaching from the country’s coaching center housed at a large university in the east. Lila had inherited a team that had not won a game in three years. Pressure was being exerted to cancel this sport as it was not achieving any form of athletic excellence nor was it enhancing the reputation of the university. Lila, being a well-credentialed alumna, was expected by many to be the savior of the team. The enthusiasm generated by the athletic director over Lila’s interest in the position seemed to bias a thorough search of her professional conduct since she had, after all, graduated from the university.

Lila, as a rookie coach, was given some room to make errors in terms of the administration of her program. Her excuse was, “After all, I’m a coach, not a paper pusher. Where I used to coach someone always did this for me.” This behavior was also overlooked because she was winning, a phenomenon unusual with this team. The athletic director, Karen, was reluctant to get rid of a good coach simply because she wasn’t filling out forms on time or at all.

Lila began her second year with a successful first season’s record to her credit coupled, however, with a disastrous administrative record. The latter was a significant burden for Karen and her administrative staff, who were constantly required to do Lila’s work for her. There also seemed to be some growing suspicion that Lila was taking some extreme liberties with her program budget. She was a relatively free-spending entertainer when she was supposedly on university business. Trips away for the weekend with her partner were

"expensed" (i.e., charged to her university account) as recruiting trips. Purchases of the most outlandish nature were often slipped through as team expenses (e.g., costly computer screensavers, framed sport posters, and a telephone headset for her office).

At this time, the university was under pressure to reduce its funding and sport always seemed to be the first target for the accountants. The dean of the faculty, Dr. Smith, had to use every ounce of political moxie to prevent the accounting axe from falling on the programs. He made it quite clear that any cut in funding would result in some teams being eliminated from the university completely. Efficiency and effectiveness in all programs was the driving force in the university in these tight economic times. This pressure filtered down to Karen who had to make the teams accountable to the university and to the public.

Karen was becoming extremely upset with Lila's behavior—its effect upon the budget and its influence upon some of the other coaches in the varsity program. Initially, Karen believed that Lila was just a focused and perhaps an eccentric coach. However she soon became convinced that Lila was very shrewd and was using the "Gee, I didn't know I couldn't do that—nobody told me" routine for her personal benefit. Finally Karen had had enough. She was willing to take action.

Lila was asked to make an appointment with Karen. They met and Karen explained how Lila's behavior was and had been unacceptable for the 19 months of her employment. She itemized why Lila's behavior was unacceptable with special reference to her near-fraudulent expense claims. Lila was informed that if there was any hint of the behavior continuing she would be fired. Lila, in true Lila form, feigned shock and assured Karen that she was not aware of these expectations. She promised to shape up and walked to the door. Before she left, however, she said, "Karen, you may be right, but everyone else is doing it."

A month later Karen was informed that Lila had taken on a part-time job without informing the administration. She was also told that Lila was using her university budget to pay for trips she was taking as part of her outside involvement with the soccer association. Further, it was reported that Lila had been overheard as saying, "I'm not paid what I'm worth. I have a master's degree and should be the highest paid coach in this place (she, in fact, was still taking courses and had been saying she was "almost" finished for 19 months). If they can't pay me, I'll *expense* everything."

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. What does the behavior and attitude of Karen imply about the organizational climate of the athletic department?
2. As a "professional" is Karen's conduct ethical?
3. What factors bred this attitude?
4. How should the athletic director handle this case? To what values should the director appeal in order to enhance Karen's responsibility and professionalism?

Case 9.10**Groupthink**

Organizational psychology theorists have assigned the term *groupthink* to the situation in which individuals in a participatory decision-making context will think in uncharacteristically similar ways and resolve problems with rather narrow views. More often than not, the result of groupthink will be weak decisions that have been based upon the informal leader's perceptions. In this case we encourage the reader to consider the potential weaknesses of group decision making. Here the reader will see in action the potential pitfalls in the notion that the majority may be wrong (utilitarianism) or that the traditional view is correct (deontology).

The Sport Federation (FD), in preparation for the next Olympics, was searching for a marketing plan that would generate revenue to support the nation's Olympic team in its final year of training. The FD relied heavily upon public and corporate philanthropy, yet was in need of more funding to meet the expanded demands of pre-Olympic training. For years the FD had been extremely conservative in its marketing strategies. It depended largely upon federal funding, gifts from the country's major corporations, and some very subtle attempts at public fundraising. Despite these sources, the FD needed more money.

The current president of the FD had been appointed in 1998 after the retirement of Colonel "Johnny" Fitzpatrick, a highly respected figure in the international sport community. Johnny had operated the FD for 17 years, very much as benevolent autocrat. He structured the FD not unlike an extension of the military bureaucracy (in which he had served with distinction in World War II). As a result, the FD had always operated with surprising precision in a culture of quasi-autocracy.

The new president, Winston Michael Moore, was appointed to continue the corporate philosophy established by Fitzpatrick. His

was not a mandate for change. The appointment of Moore was not met with overwhelming enthusiasm. A core of sport administrators in the FD, though they highly respected and even loved the Colonel, felt that his philosophy was no longer representative of the FD as they neared the twenty-first century. However, this desire for change was not shared by all.

The senior management committee decided to establish a sub-committee devoted to resolving the FD's financial needs. This committee was made up of 12 individuals, 8 of whom were staunch supporters of the FD's "old guard." The first meeting established the tone for what was to follow in the next six weeks of planning.

Moore, as the chair, explained to the members that the planning stage would be consensually based. Each member should speak his or her mind without thought to its immediate relevance to the problem. He suggested that "free thinking is the basic premise of this phase. I encourage each one of you to throw off the chains of what is possible or impossible. Let us all be as creative as we can!" The immediate reaction of at least four members of the committee was one of shock. Since their interaction with Moore had not been positive and free thinking, this was the last concept they expected would leave his lips.

After this first statement, Winston Michael Moore asked if he could make a few comments as a member of the group, *not* as the chair. He stood up and proceeded to lecture the committee on the evils of corporate sponsorships for the next 30 minutes. He argued that to accept anything from a corporation that was not philanthropic was virtual slavery to the will of the corporate agenda. If sport was to remain free of immorality and be the bastion of character building, it *must* stay clear of the hazards of the business realm. To do otherwise was to contravene the successful culture that the Colonel had taken so long to build. The destruction of this culture would be something that Winston Michael Moore would not tolerate. Winston Michael Moore resumed his position as chair as eight individuals sat nodding their heads in agreement; the remaining members were silent and dumbstruck.

Olivia, a newly appointed sport administrator, was speechless. She had just arrived at the FD and had been hoping to build her career with this organization. Her background was in sport fundraising and marketing and she was thrilled to be chosen as a member of this committee. She had spent many hours developing ideas for some very aggressive campaigns for sponsorships. She was prepared at this first meeting with charts, overheads, slides, and computer graphics for a completely new strategy for the FD. She had shared her ideas with two other members of the committee who were equally excited with the prospect of a much-needed new vision for the FD.

These three individuals were the most junior members of the committee. All of them were relatively recent graduates (still paying student loans) and all were parents of very young children.

The fourth member of the group, Tastuhiko, was not a firm believer in the old guard. He was a veteran of the FD and had been in conflict with the Colonel as well as with Moore on several occasions. He was tolerated by the old guard and by the current regime not only because of his abilities as an administrator but also because of his sheer popularity among the employees of the FD. He was, unfortunately, soon to retire.

At the first coffee break, the four members of the “outgroup” met in the hallway. Tastuhiko implored the other members to present their ideas and not let “old Moore-the-bore” scare them. As they returned to the meeting they were thinking of a variety of scenarios—not the least of which included their children, their loans, and their mortgages.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. Is there a relationship between Utilitarianism and the concept of groupthink?
2. How does the notion of “intent” influence the ultimate behavior of the outgroup? What factors will influence their “ideal” resolution? Why?
3. What is the culture of the organization? How could it be changed or transformed?

Case 9.11

Sweatshops and Not-for-Profit Fundraisers

It is not uncommon for companies from industrialized nations to make use of Third World production environments in order to save costs and make a profit. For example, the price of the running shoes you are wearing might be substantially higher if a particular firm were not able to manufacture their product using the extremely cheap labor of Third World people. Your benefit? Their exploitation? A variety of arguments can and ought to be made concerning the potential benefit or exploitation that “industrialized” nations bring to these contexts. In developing this case, we hope that the reader will challenge the assumptions and breadth of the utilitarian stance (that is, the greatest good for whom?), the deontological argument of Kant, and the existential role as demonstrated by Donna, who must overcome the lure of organizational efficiency and cultural relativism.

The city of Rideau is a mid-size metropolitan center with a population of approximately 1.5 million people. An estimated one-quarter of the population is of aboriginal descent and generally falls into the lower socio-economic strata. Rideau has a very well developed municipal culture and recreation council that attempts to provide programming for all clientele within the city's core area.

The council's theme for the twenty-first century was "Healthy Activity-for-All." The intent was to encourage everyone within the community to find some form of healthy activity to which they could commit at least 15 or 20 minutes every day or every second day. In order to promote this theme and raise funds to support it, a variety of marketing strategies were initiated. One was the sale of a T-shirt with a very brightly colored design on both the front and back. The initial sales of the shirt were overwhelming. It seemed as though the council had inadvertently created a new fad among the teenagers of Rideau. The result was that they couldn't keep enough shirts in stock. In fact, there was a demand for sweatshirts, shorts, and even socks that had the same design on them as the original T-shirt. Based upon this new market for clothing, the council felt that they could create a clothing store and expand their sales significantly. Space was available in a vacant municipal office. All they had to do was hire a few employees and spend a minimal amount of money to design and stock the store and they were away!

Coincidentally, Tom, one of the members of the council, was about to go on holiday. His plan was to tour a number of countries in Asia and Southeast Asia. He offered to look around for any deals on clothing while he was there. Tom was very much a machiavellian sort and had always been quite vocal about his missed calling as a businessman—he wanted the store to be his "baby." He was determined to bring back a "sweet deal" on clothing for the council's newly developed clothing venture.

When Tom returned, he indeed had the makings of a very lucrative deal with a company operating in a Southeast Asian country. With all taxes and import fees included, the purchase of clothing from this company was extraordinarily inexpensive, less than half the local price. The store would make a significant profit from its sales (better than would result from a local firm) and as a result actually be able to *enhance its support for its cultural and recreation programming for the underprivileged individuals of the city's inner core.*

The store was prepared, the clothing was imported, and sales were better than expected. This phenomenon turned out to be a rather stable and very successful source of revenue for the council. They soon needed to expand their quota from their Asian supplier.

It was decided that the executive director of the store, Donna, would make a special trip to the supplier to further enhance the

existing arrangement. Upon her arrival there, she was immediately taken aback by the outright poverty of the country. She had never traveled to a Third World country and was not prepared mentally or physically for what she was now experiencing.

Donna contacted the supplier and was picked up by the owner, Skip, at her hotel. They quickly made their way to the factory in a village about 30 kilometers from the nation's capital. During the trip, Donna had so many questions about the living conditions of the people in the country that Skip was barely able to keep up with her. They finally arrived at the factory and Donna was astonished. The workers of the company were all children. The conditions were, from her point of view, deplorable. She asked how much they were being paid and was told about 25 cents per day, for 12 hours per day, six and a half days per week. Her next question was about the children's schooling; the response was that it was taken care of on the half day off. Skip then proceeded to discuss the business at hand—expanded imports for her store.

Donna feigned having to call her superior (she had none) to confirm the deal and asked if she could be taken back to her hotel.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. What is cultural relativism and how does it apply to this case?
2. What effect will Donna's behavior have on the children in this Third World country?
3. What ethical principles are in conflict?
4. If you knew that your running shoes were made by children in poor working conditions in a land far away, what would you do? What ought you to do? Why?

Case 9.12

Harassment and Chivalry

Our conscience can be a very powerful force in our behavior. Authentic behavior is often pitted against other teleological or deontological standards. The existentialist's challenge has always been to consider the deontological and the teleological and choose the genuine. This case of harassment and chivalry is an interesting one, illustrating the conflict between duty and existential authenticity. The "hero" of the case finds himself in a very pressing and ethically laden position from a variety of angles.

In 1994, Lee Ward attended an international fitness equipment conference in Mexico representing the vice-president of his

company, who was unable to attend. Lee, as a manager and as a person, was not well respected by his peers and by members within the organization. He displayed few leadership qualities and was held in disdain by most, but he was tolerated. He also had a very nasty side to his character and was extremely jealous of those who had risen through the ranks of the company faster than he had. He would take every opportunity to criticize those who were successful, those who were innovative, those who demonstrated any sort of enthusiasm. His style of conflict resolution was never to confront face-to-face. Rather, he sent memos. In fact, much of his day was spent sending memos to the president of the company indicating how various individuals were not doing their job. Despite the fact that he was considered to be a bit of a joke, he was described by many as a "dangerous little man."

At the conference he followed the "in" group of sales personnel to the various functions and visited the same sights and took the same tours just to be part of the action. One afternoon, a group decided to venture out to the beach to relax while there was a lull in the three-day event. On this occasion, Janice, an individual that was held in extremely high regard both professionally and socially, joined the group to swim and lie in the sun. She also happened to be a very attractive woman.

During the afternoon Lee was busy trying to be part of the group. He decided to get his camera out to take some picture for the company's newsletter. His ulterior motive was to get as many shots of Janice in her bathing suit as possible and was successful, unbeknownst to Janice.

Several months later Lee met Janice at a show. She was there with her partner, Errol. Lee proceeded to tell Janice how great she looked in the pictures he took of her. Janice was speechless. She told the story of the afternoon on the beach to Errol, who was noticeably upset but agreed not to do or say anything. Janice said that she would handle it in her own way.

The incident bothered Errol considerably. He was a rather old-fashioned sort, and he felt that Janice's honor and reputation had been impugned by Lee. He thought of many ways to resolve the issue, one of which was to fatten Lee's lip, an option he rejected despite relishing it. The matter was dropped.

Later that year, Lee happened to be in Errol's organization on business. As Errol was returning to his office, he spotted Lee leaving the building. Errol reacted quickly, not really caring about the reputation of the "dangerous little man." He turned on his heels and ran after Lee. He caught up with him and introduced himself with extreme formality. Errol began by stating that he was aware that Lee had in his possession (in fact on his wall at work) pictures of a friend

taken without her consent. Further, Errol suggested, Lee would be wise to deliver the pictures and the negatives to Janice and then the matter would be dropped. Lee was quick to agree to Errol's request.

Following this confrontation, Errol felt that he had done the right thing. Janice's honor was in some way restored, he felt. He called Janice and told her of his action, knowing that she may not see things the same way he did. He was right. Janice was extremely upset. She was worried about the repercussions of Errol's actions. Janice knew that Lee was rather spineless and would take revenge on her in subtle ways for his own embarrassment at the hands of Errol. She was also upset because Errol had taken action after they had agreed none would be taken. Errol had no excuse other than his somewhat lingering sense of chivalry, which told him that it was the *only thing* he could have done as a "gentleman."

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. Was Errol being authentic? How?
2. What other ethical view did his behavior reflect?
3. What circumstances exist in the workplace or in society that would allow Lee to believe that his behavior was acceptable? Why is this? How could it change?
4. What do you think of Errol's belief in the concept of "chivalry"?
5. How does Lee view women? Using ethical theory, how would you describe or critique his behavior?

Case 9.13

Faculty of Kinesiology Student Society: Freedom and Responsibility

In any educational setting, regardless of the level, it is up to the educator to foster independent critical thinking and individual responsibility and accountability. Only when students feel this sense of responsibility do they begin to mature socially. However, "letting go" has its pitfalls. What if the student makes a bad decision—to what extent is he or she held accountable? Can the educator stand by while mistakes are made? This case centers around the notions of freedom and responsibility and the paternal tension experienced when it is supported by administrators, coaches, and parents alike.

The Faculty of Kinesiology was established in 1945 at the university, and it has supported a student society for the past 15 years. The society had been operated by the students and a faculty member whose task it was to oversee on- and off-campus activities. The

society had been successful in conducting its own business and felt that faculty involvement was becoming a bit too patronizing. In 1990, the students felt that they were capable of "running their own show."

The executive committee of the society met with the assistant dean of the faculty and provided her with the details and rationale for their request for more autonomy. The assistant dean was pleased to see the students taking this initiative and agreed wholeheartedly to this new arms-length relationship—let the students take responsibility and learn from their decisions and mistakes.

All was well for the society for several years. They were active in a variety of aspects of campus life. From the first-year orientation to the graduating dinner-dance, society-run events were overwhelming successes among the students as well as with their parents. Pre-game pubs were well attended and were never allowed to get too rowdy. The relationship with the faculty was excellent.

In the fall of 1995, a request came to the society from a student seeking assistance in a fundraising scheme. The student, Jane, told the society that she was a volunteer member of the International Sport Management Case Study Association (ISMCA) that was meeting in Spain in December of that year. The student, an extremely charismatic individual, wanted the society to pay for her travel in return for a very vague promise to include the society, the faculty, and the university in a promotional campaign supported by the ISMCA. Jane never presented any formal plan or provided any contract. Despite this, the society was still keen to continue negotiations with her.

Jane had asked the dean for special consideration with regard to writing final exams as they would be taking place while she was in Spain. Her letter of request was on the dean's desk but no action would be taken until all details were made available.

In October an unfortunate incident occurred. Jane was implicated in a drug-peddling scheme (steroids) involving both male and female body builders. The charges were laid against her and three friends who were regulars at the local Bodyplus gym. As soon as the news became public, a variety of stories began circulating about Jane and her questionable past. She was charismatic and machiavellian because she had to keep one step ahead of the trouble she had created in her last job, her last school, or her last relationship.

Certain members of the society fast became rather uneasy about the fundraising scheme that Jane had more or less convinced the society to orchestrate. There were however, several members of the executive committee who still believed that Jane merited financial support. It is important to mention that, in general, the committee members in support of Jane were males, and those who suspected her, females.

A growing body of anecdotal evidence was mounting to suggest that Jane was not trustworthy. The dean was pleased that she had delayed her response to Jane regarding the deferment of exams. The society was, interestingly enough, still willing to pursue the fundraiser for Jane's travel. The assistant dean was made aware of the society's dilemma and was prepared to intervene and put a stop to the fundraiser altogether. However, she remembered the agreement she had made with the students—to let them carry out the operations and learn from their decisions and mistakes.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. How does this case represent the existentialist values of freedom and responsibility?
2. How can one be an existential leader? Is the assistant dean acting existentially?
3. Why do you think Jane received as much support from the student society as she did?
4. Should the society be allowed to continue in this independent manner? Why?

Case 9.14

A Free Ride

In all walks of life there are those who are committed to their jobs, their profession, or their organization, and there are those who are not. This case focuses upon professional responsibility. A question arises concerning the individual's duty to an organization and profession, and presumably the organization's and the profession's duty to instill a sense of responsibility in its members.

Gary is a graduate of a mid-size university with an undergraduate degree in botany. He has been working in the field for 28 years. He has always worked for the Municipal Horticultural Department, where the basis for moving through the ranks was and continues to be seniority. This philosophy of management was a result of very strong influence from a provincial government that had traditionally been socialist in nature. The notion of meritorious service was an expected (but not necessarily rewarded) characteristic of every unionized public servant—this was lost on many who adopted the “it's a free ride once you're in” attitude. Ralph Gimli, the administrator of Gary's department, had been extremely frustrated by this attitude and was looking for some way to alter the status quo culture of this organization.

In the 1960s the government had hired a number of graduates in an effort to replenish the organization following a wave of retiring senior managers. Gary had given up trying to improve himself academically or technically almost immediately after receiving his permanent position in the municipal government.

He contributed very little to the organization—but always enough to keep himself from being fired. He refused to take on new tasks, to learn new technologies, and to adhere to any concerted attempts to change the “work ethic” and organizational culture. His cynical perception of any of these initiatives was that it was just another theory—it would not work and it would go away. And so it went for years.

The next wave of mandatory retirements from the city was approximately five years away. This caused mixed reactions among the employees. For some this meant that some very capable and experienced administrators, who had been mentors to so many, would be forced to leave while they still had a tremendous amount to offer. For others, in particular Ralph, this meant that a number of individuals would finally, and thankfully, be leaving the organization after a career that was uninspiring at best, a drain on the rest of the employees at worst. Gary was one of the worst offenders from this latter group.

Graduates from recent years were desperate for positions in a field where few jobs existed. Many opted out in favor of jobs in the insurance industry, the military, sales, and other unrelated occupations. Gary continued on, doing almost nothing, learning little, contributing less, collecting his checks, drawing on the system, and taking up space. In addition, Gary had three years remaining before he could collect full pension and was bound and determined to collect it.

With a new retirement package now available, Ralph felt that he had an opportunity to finally rid the system of Gary. The file that Ralph had been keeping for the past five years was full of documentation indicating that Gary was incompetent. Ralph believed that the union would have put up too much of a fuss with the accusations Ralph wanted to make and so he had not pursued the matter. Now that a retirement package was available to Gary, Ralph wondered whether he should present the file to Gary and suggest that he should take the package (which would be significantly less than what he would receive at full retirement).

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. How would you define professional ethics?
2. What are the responsibilities of the professional in our field?
3. What could Gary's supervisor do to enhance this behavior of Gary's?

4. How would Kohlberg describe Gary's behavior?
5. Is there any responsibility on the part of the organization for Gary's outcome?

Case 6.15

Academic Fraud

In the academic world, particularly today when the Internet provides the student and researcher alike with the opportunity to cut corners and submit work that is less than academically or ethically sound, academic fraud has become a concern. Individuals commit acts of fraud for a variety of reasons. Professors under the gun of "publish or perish" and students attempting to get the marks to pass or go on to graduate school and well-paying jobs are often tempted to forgo the *right* means to succeed at university. In this case duty is split between a number of masters.

Sam is a graduate student in the second year of his master's program. He is very hard working and has been a strong addition to the faculty as an instructor, a developing scholar, and as a personable and honorable young man. Sam is the student of one of the country's leading scholars in his area. His ambition is to continue his education to the doctoral level in the hope of becoming a professor. His advisor, Dr. Milton, is known as a thorough and caring mentor to all of her students.

Sam's thesis was well on its way. Three chapters were completed and he was preparing to begin his data collection when a personal tragedy occurred. In June, Sam's brother James announced to the family that he had been diagnosed as having cancer, and was not expected to survive past Christmas. This news was a terrible shock to the family.

The news was devastating to Sam, who revered his older brother. James had always been a strong supporter of Sam, who had become a solid student more by his hard work and tenacity than by his natural abilities. Sam wanted to finish his degree before James died. He wanted James to be present at his convocation as a way to thank him for all that he had done for Sam in his all-too-brief life. Sam had a problem. Analyzing the data and writing the final chapters was possible. However, he worried that he would not be able to collect his data in time to make all the pieces fit together.

Sam's data collection involved both surveys and interviews of individuals involved in elite sport. The focus was on the individual's perception of himself or herself through the periods of injury. Sam

believed that the only way that he was going to make the September deadline for fall convocation was to "cook" his data. He decided to arrange, as planned, 30 interviews from the sample he and Dr. Milton had accessed. However, the accompanying questionnaires would be "fudged" by him prior to conducting the interviews. He believed that Dr. Milton would never find out about this bit of fraud as long as he did a solid job of making up the findings.

By the time the interviews were completed, Sam's survey data had been analyzed and he was half-way through his discussion chapter. Sam let Dr. Milton believe that he was anxious to begin data input and that he was planning to work night and day to get things finished in time for the convocation deadline. Dr. Milton had her doubts about Sam meeting this date. However she said that she would work as hard as Sam needed her to work since she was aware of his brother's condition and wanted to help.

Sam, in his efforts, went so far as to make the occasional phone call to Dr. Milton's office very late at night to ask a statistical question or one regarding qualitative interpretation. He was well aware that her answering machine automatically told her the time of the call. The intent of all of this was to try to convince her that he was in fact working night and day and could conceivably finish on time.

From Sam's perspective all seemed to be going well. He was leaking just enough information to Dr. Milton in order to keep his lie alive. In the first week of September, Dr. Milton received a phone call from a former graduate student with whom she had spoken about Sam's research several months ago. The person was quite interested in Sam's work and was aware of the triangulated methodology that was being used. He had been expecting a questionnaire from Sam but had not received it. Dr. Milton was puzzled by this omission and was about to dial Sam's number at home to ask him about it when a disturbing thought popped into her mind: Had the data been made up? If this was the case, not only would Sam not graduate while his brother was still alive, but he would also be tossed out of graduate school for academic fraud. Sam answered the phone and Dr. Milton said ...

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. What factors led to Sam's decision to commit academic fraud?
2. What was Sam's intent? What do you think of it?
3. What alternative courses of action could he have taken?
4. How could this have been prevented from Sam's perspective?
From Dr. Milton's perspective?
5. Is Sam's behavior authentic or hedonistic?

Case 9.16

Code of Ethics: Is It Enough?

In the last decade the concern for ethical conduct or at least for the appearance of ethical conduct in a variety of organizational sectors has been pervasive. As organizations attempt to demonstrate that they are indeed ethical in order to gain the trust of stakeholders, many have opted to develop codes of ethics or conduct to guide the behavior of employees and volunteers. The adoption of a code of ethics was thought by some to be sufficient to handle all the ethical ills of the organization. As the reader will see in the following case, a code alone will not result in ethical behavior. In this case, the focus is the inculcation of the notion of corporate ethics into a firm where no such culture exists. The concepts of climate and culture may be useful for the reader in resolving this particular case.

Tony B. was the general sales manager of Grendal Inc., a small and innovative company that had been surviving well in the very competitive world of recreation and fitness software technology. Tony felt himself to be an extremely progressive leader. He was constantly reading the current trade journals and the occasional academic journal to keep up with current trends in the technology as well as management styles (e.g., Japanese management methods, TQM, chaos theory, leadership styles of Attila the Hun, and so on). He attended all the management seminar "road shows" that passed through the city. He was, as the old adage goes "always sharpening the saw."

The latest "tool" that he felt was worthy of implementing was a code of ethics. He read that a code of ethics would provide his employees with moral guidance in the workplace, which would result in more trust, honesty, productivity, and meaning for the employees as well as less turnover, absenteeism, and sabotage. Tony, without delay, gathered his business partners together and began to develop the code, which was to be implemented before the next quarter began in two months. The committee of four worked quickly and efficiently. They developed a comprehensive list of ethical do's and don'ts that seemed to cover the relative universe of questionable conduct in the realm of software production and sales. It was printed, distributed, and placed on the wall of the coffee room, locker room, production room, and it was bronzed and hung on the wall in Grendal's boardroom. "There," Tony thought, "it's done, now I've got to get on with that joint venture with Malaysia. We're falling behind and the boys in KL don't like to be kept waiting."

Grendal Inc. had not been known externally as an icon of moral conduct in the software industry, but neither had it experienced internally the flagrant acts of corporate sabotage and spying that some

of its larger competitors had faced recently. It was a dynamic business whose basic premise was *sales, sales, sales*, and therefore survival.

Grendal's primary competitor for its new product was a Brazilian company, Beawulf Inc. It was a relatively new player in the market and was trying desperately to obtain a significant market share. Beawulf had had a number of incidents of corporate sabotage in the last three months, none of which had been uncovered. These acts were starting to hurt the company more from a perspective of morale and production than from sales.

Joan A., an employee in her first year with Grendal, was at home one Sunday morning when she received a rather unusual call from Beawulf. They offered her a position, a substantial raise, and a signing bonus if she would join their firm and assist them in competing against Grendal.

Joan was excited and a little frightened. Why was she, of all people, being contacted? What would her co-workers think of her? What would happen to her own career? How would the information she had benefit the competitor? How would it damage Grendal? Joan knew that the owners had recently developed and distributed a code of conduct or ethics or something and that all employees were to read it and supposedly act morally though this was never observed in the behavior of Tony and the other managers. Most of the employees did not give it much thought—another dictum from the golf course, they sarcastically believed. Joan asked herself, "What is it that is truly valued in this company?" She was able to answer this question with little hesitation. The ultimate values of Grendal were market share and profit—all else was "window dressing" (i.e., the concern for the well-being and growth of each individual). Profit was *the* basic assumption that was implicitly and explicitly drilled into the head of every new employee, regardless of their status within the organization.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. What is the purpose of a code of ethics?
2. What are the limitations of organizational codes of ethics? Why?
3. How can a code be put into action?
4. From what value orientation is Joan coming?
5. Is Tony committed to the code of ethics? Why? Does he understand the concept fully?
6. What could he have done differently? What is missing in this organizational culture?

Case 9.17

Vices and Fundraising: Compatibility Paradox?

Corporate sponsorship, like lottery sales, can become a very contentious issue for organizations wishing to raise funds for their survival. Sponsorships can create at least two difficulties for the recipient. The first problem may be that when a corporation gives an organization money, it will inevitably expect input in the manner in which the organization conducts its business. This is problematic when the sponsor may wish to move in directions that are antithetical to the mission or vision of the organization. Second, what the sponsor represents (i.e., the product they manufacture) may be problematic for a recipient. This case raises the questions of the ethics of organizational survival, corporate sponsorship, and individual values.

Lea was a newly hired "communications" officer for the National Arts Alliance (NAA). She had recently graduated with her M.B.A. with a focus on marketing. Lea's previous connection with the arts was non-existent, with the exception of her enjoying a good play or listening to the odd opera CD as she studied for exams. She was hired by the NAA because she demonstrated a great deal of knowledge and enthusiasm throughout the interview process. The NAA hoped that Lea could breathe some life into the chronically poor financial health of the Alliance.

Lea immediately began to review the mandate of the NAA, its values, and its philosophy. She found that the organization had been run, more or less, from the kitchen table of the board of directors. Few formal policies existed and a state of administrative chaos was the accepted and perhaps the preferred mode of operation. This situation did not dissuade Lea. In fact, she believed that as a result of this perceived chaos she could explore just about any avenue to raise funds and she would not be hampered by an organizational dictum stating, "Policy does not allow us to do A, B, or C." The environment, she thought, was perfect to develop her own career and allow her to move up to a larger marketing firm, with the NAA as her first major success.

Lea took the lead from the realm of sports. She arranged a meeting with three of the largest beer companies in the province as well as the district managers of two tobacco companies. Her feeling was that if sports fundraisers can access companies that sell products considered to be rather unhealthy, then why in the world could the arts not jump on the alcohol and cigarette bandwagon? Lea's meetings were initially very successful. One tobacco company was interested in sponsoring an upcoming jazz festival; two of the beer companies were very interested in making some headway into the arts world—a

realm they had not yet explored because their focus had been traditionally on sports.

Lea reported the results of her meetings to the board and the reaction was, to say the very least, diverse. Nigel M. was outraged that the NAA had to look for sponsorship at all—he questioned the very existence of Lea's position. He believed it was the responsibility of the public (i.e., the government) to support the arts in all their endeavors. Supporting all cultural projects was to him self-evident. Yukio S. was thrilled with the prospect of "big, dirty companies" wanting to give the NAA money. She perceived it to be their moral obligation to support the arts because they had done so much damage to the health of consumers of their products—a fundraising quid pro quo. Julia P. also supported the idea but purely for pragmatic reasons—the bottom line was her primary concern. Whose money was made available was not relevant—the survival of the NAA was the primary objective. James N. thought that alcohol and tobacco and the arts had always gone hand in hand as part of the lifestyle of the community. He had a hard time justifying their partnership with sport, but who among them would be first to cast the stone when everyone in the room was smoking. The meeting continued in this fashion for hours. In the end they decided that more information should be presented at the next meeting and the matter was tabled.

Lea had never considered any of these arguments. She, like Julia, was only concerned with the bottom line for the NAA and for her own career. However, the debate about partnerships with debatable social consequences made Lea seriously consider her own values, her own paradigm of what she was and what she wanted to become. The next meeting of the board was held the following month and the motion to pursue these ventures was passed by a slim majority. Lea resigned after the meeting.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. What was Lea's dilemma? What principles were in conflict for her? For the organization? Why?
2. What factor led her to rethink her own standards?
3. What do you think of sponsorship? Where would you draw the line?
4. Can an organization be altruistic? Is there always an agenda or an ulterior motive?

Case 9.18

Put on Your Administrative Hat

This case is about “whistle blowing.” The main character, Jim, must decide whether or not he is willing to follow his conscience or the “party line,” despite the very difficult outcomes that may result from either course of action.

Jim was a senior manager in a steel company. He was a professional engineer with a M.B.A. and had been in charge of the production end of Southern Aero Inc. (SAI) for 15 years. Jim was married with children. He was a devoted father, member of the school’s PTA, and an active member in the church. Jim tended to be rather conventional in his political leanings and this characteristic spilled over into his work-related behavior; he was cautious and conservative. He was never one to jump on the bandwagon when a new idea was mentioned. In fact, he had held a great many younger, more aggressive employees back because their schemes were a bit too reckless for the company as Jim perceived it. Nonetheless, Jim was extremely well respected by most employees and was often the focus of attention when new employees were being told the history and “myths” of SAI.

SAI had been the nation’s leading manufacturer of aircraft frames for the past 20 years. However, in the last five years their dominant position in the market had begun to erode as several multinational companies jumped into the competition with lower prices, faster deliveries, and, some believed, a better product. SAI’s board of directors was more than a little concerned at the loss of market share and called a meeting early in January to get some answers from the senior management team. The meeting was held and the atmosphere seemed to be panic-stricken. This giant was not accustomed to being threatened and no one really knew how to handle such a crisis. Halfway through the morning of the second day of meetings, one of Jim’s senior researchers boldly raised her hand and asked if she could address the meeting. Susan was a brilliant scientist in her own right. She had a Ph.D. in chemical engineering and was sought after by every major company prior to the completion of her doctoral research on aluminum alloy. She had been with SAI for five years and had been working in her lab without a great deal of pressure to produce. She often felt that she was just “window dressing” for Southern because they believed that they really didn’t need any new ideas—they had been, after all (until recently), the giant of the industry. Despite the fact that SAI placed little pressure on Susan, she had been extremely busy. She had continued her research where her doctorate left off, attempting to design a better aluminum alloy that could be used not

only for aircraft engines but also for the hull of the national team's bobsled in the next Olympics (SAI had been forced to diversify its range of products to keep in the market). Perhaps not surprisingly, the development of a new bobsled material was a very lucrative venture, particularly in Europe where the sport is much more popular.

Susan approached the podium with a prepared presentation, complete with computer graphics that would make any marketer proud. She presented the results of her past five years of research and stunned the board with her proposal. They had been in such a state of panic that any new idea would have been accepted. However, Susan's was an unbelievable departure from anything the industry in general had known.

Susan's proposal called for a complete change in the chemical structure of the steel that SAI was using to build its products. It demanded some reorganizing of the production process but, as it turns out, not a radical departure from the flow of production. Yet the product, as Susan suggested would be similar in structural strength but twice as light as anything currently on the market, foreign competitors included. The advantage of lighter aircraft engines and bobsled frames with similar qualities was obvious to the board who, more or less, dropped everything to endorse Susan's work. Susan was given carte blanche for her research and the board quickly began setting its strategy for retaking the lead in the industry.

Jim was skeptical. Susan's work seemed thorough, the results appeared, thus far, to be plausible, but he was not ready to join in the sudden sense of organizational euphoria. The production line was reorganized and ready to begin the new process in April, four months after the initial meeting. A news conference was held to introduce the new revolutionary product and it was to be Jim's responsibility, as senior engineer, to make the announcement and answer questions from the media. Prior to the meeting Jim received two reports on the new product. Both reports identified the steel as being lighter, and both found the steel to be similar in structural strength. However, one of the reports found that the steel failed at 120% of recommended torque. In other words, under normal flying conditions, the SAI steel frame was superior to that of other manufacturers. However, under unusual conditions, it was less superior. In a dive situation, it would break up faster than the old SAI frame and that of the competitors. While this stress would not be experienced by the bobsled competitors, the implication of aircraft failure would most certainly influence the purchase of the material for a sport context.

The industry standards allowed for this margin of error, that is, 20% over limits, but SAI had never accepted safety at the status quo level. Were they to do so now? Jim knew that he did not have to raise this point at the press conference since the steel was within accept-

able legal limits. But to Jim, this was simply not what he believed SAI was about. It seemed to him to be a contradiction in company philosophy. He was well aware that the board was extremely excited about the possibilities of the new steel and the repercussions that he might face if he were publicly to cast some doubt on its quality and safety.

Jim asked SAI's president, Sam Takahashi, if he could meet with him to discuss his concerns about the new product. Mr. Takahashi listened carefully to Jim's concerns, not only about the minimally safe steel but also about the perceived contradiction in the philosophy of SAI. Mr. Takahashi was silent for a few uncomfortable minutes after Jim had finished and then said, "Jim, you are an engineer and a good one, but for this situation, you've got to put your *managerial hat* on and take your *engineering hat* off."

The following day, Jim welcomed the press to the conference, made his official introduction and overview of the new SAI product, then took a deep breath, introduced Susan, and left the podium.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. What is meant by switching hats? Is there a third hat that is you? Is this one ever taken off? Should it be?
2. What has happened to this organization? What moderator is at work and changing the climate?
3. How would you describe Susan? Is she at fault? What is her culture? How is it different?

Case 9.19

Playing the Big Leagues

This case deals with interpersonal conflict and ethics in the "hard-nosed" world of corporate finance and sport marketing. Once again, personal integrity is challenged by organizational climate.

Chris James was an "up-and-coming" manager in a very large multinational corporation, Atlas-Rand Inc., which specialized in sport apparel and equipment. It had originally made its name in the world of running shoes in the early 1970s and had since expanded to become a huge multinational company with annual profits exceeding \$4 billion. It had several very lucrative contracts with sport superstars in tennis, golf, football (i.e., soccer, American, Australian, and Canadian rules football), basketball, baseball, hockey, and so on. Chris was extremely happy to be involved with such a prestigious company; it was her first "real" job after graduating with her B.A. in

Commerce. Her parents were also very pleased with her career progress though they really didn't know a great deal about the world of business. Her mother had stayed at home with five children and her father was a career naval officer who tended to shun all financial matters. He believed the navy would look after his family from "cradle to grave." Although both her mother and father were role models to Chris, it was her father who had planted the seeds for her drive to succeed in a "man's world," her desire to travel, and her respect for the "chain-of-command."

Chris believed that Atlas-Rand represented and demonstrated important values and notions of community responsibility. Chris was not of the mind that the business world had its own set of values or ethics that were separate and distinct from the rest of the society or other professions. She was under the impression that Atlas-Rand believed in this premise as well. In other words, her ethical conscience was rarely challenged by being a loyal employee of Atlas-Rand.

The senior management of Atlas-Rand had been watching Chris' progress very carefully as she was being groomed for a very important position in the international trade division. Her enthusiasm, work ethic, and managerial skills were excellent as was her potential to grow and be a role model to male and female employees alike (she was also fluent in French and Spanish and semi-fluent in Cantonese).

Upon her return to work following winter holidays with her family, Chris was invited to the office of the CEO of domestic operations and was introduced to the vice-president of personnel of Atlas-Rand's international office. Chris' initial nervousness was soon replaced with extreme joy as she was offered a position at the head office as assistant director of joint ventures. Chris was thrilled: she would be traveling internationally, she would be able to experience many of the places her father had traveled to with the navy, and her salary would be monumentally increased. Her career was well on its way!

After six months, Chris was beginning to feel a bit more comfortable in her new position. She had made four trips to offices in Malaysia, Japan, Australia, and Singapore and was already making progress on a number of ventures that had been left dormant in the early stages of negotiation by her predecessor. Chris received an e-mail from her boss, the director of joint ventures, who was returning to the head office from recent conferences. She wanted to meet with Chris about their strategies for an important negotiation because she said she wanted Chris to be involved in a new dimension of the business. Chris felt that this message was somewhat mysterious, but was excited by the prospect of a new challenge as well as the faith that her boss, Darlene, seemed to place in her.

Darlene arrived and they met for breakfast prior to their meeting with an unnamed group of individuals. Darlene, who had very much taken Chris under her "wing," stated that she wanted Chris simply to observe what transpired at the meeting and they would talk afterwards. The meeting was in a large conference room in a hotel in the outskirts of the city with few of the trappings or formalities that were usually associated with important clientele. As the meeting progressed, Chris became aware that the individuals in the room were three of Atlas-Rand's fiercest competitors, yet the conversations were far from confrontational.

After the meeting, Chris was dumbfounded. She had no idea what to say or do. Chris' conscience was screaming, "I was just involved in price-fixing!" Darlene and Chris met for dinner that evening. Chris was still in a state of shock. Darlene, somewhat anticipating Chris' reaction, was prepared. "Business," she said, "has its own code of ethics. It's not like anything else. We all play the game and we play by our rules, our ethics, our values. All of those guys around the table understand this, it's how we all have to survive, how we all make a profit that, in the end, allows us to do all the good things that Atlas-Rand is known for throughout the world." Chris reacted by stating, "But we say that we don't do this sort of thing, it's in our code of ethics, for crying out loud! The guys in the legal department spend half their lives drawing up policies on this! Damn it, I thought that we were the good guys, with values and corporate responsibility and all the rest of it." Darlene responded, "Chris, it's true, but the guys in legal don't run the business. They are not making the deals, they are not in the trenches, and what they don't know and what the public doesn't know won't hurt them. In fact, the more money we all make the better it is for the public anyway. It's like bad cough medicine—it might taste bad now but in the end it's good for you. These are the big leagues, Chris, and all the players know the rules—written and unwritten. If you don't play by our rules, well, you don't survive. Chris, your future is incredibly bright, you know you will go far in this company, farther than I will. I suppose you've got to make the choice: do you play to win for the company, for the shareholders, and for yourself? Or do you quit the game and do whatever the average Jane does out there? Have you ever read *Atlas Shrugged*? You should!"

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. Is there a difference between business ethics and ethics generally? Should there be?
2. Can you survive in the world of business and keep your own ethical position intact? Why? Or why not? Can you defend your position?

3. What alternatives does Chris have?
4. Can anything be done to change this? Is this unrealistic?

Case 9.20

Marketing High-Schoolers

Obtaining an athletic scholarship to an American college is highly desirable for many high school students due, in part, to the high cost of tuition fees. It is also desirable because being on a varsity college team is the best venue for attracting attention from the major league scouts. In today's market, being drafted into that level means riches for the young athlete with \$1 million signing bonuses almost routine in contemporary times.

A new company, College Baseball Advisers Inc., charges \$600 "to enhance high school player's college scholarship prospects by analyzing his playing ability and devising a marketing plan for him" (Editorial, 2002, p.32). Since high-school players are scouted by the colleges, what benefit would there be for the player to have his playing ability analyzed by the company? Why would a high-school player need a marketing plan?

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. How ethical is it for the family of a high-school student to pay a company to analyze the student's playing ability?
2. How ethical is it to pay a company to devise a marketing plan for a high-school student?
3. From an ethical perspective, has this company crossed the line separating education and business?

Reference

- Editorial. (2002). Go figure. *Sports Illustrated*, 14 January.

Case 9.21

Stealing Signals

To receive satellite TV programs, a monthly fee is paid by the viewer. In addition, from time to time pay-per-view programs are offered. In order to receive the signal, an encoded card is needed so that the viewer (household) can be charged for watching the program.

New York radio host S.R. is being sued by satellite services provider Direct TV for alleged piracy. He had boasted on a nationally

syndicated show that he had used an illegally modified access card to steal sports and movie programming. By having his card “zapped,” he was able to avoid paying for the programs.

Using a “zapped” card is illegal. However, a person using such a card does so in the privacy of his or her own home. Hence, the likelihood of being caught is very slight, if at all. The use of, or abstaining from using, such a card then becomes an ethical matter.

Question to Consider for Discussion

1. Is it ethical to obtain satellite programming by using a “zapped” card when other people are paying for it?

Reference

- Editorial. (2002). Blotter. *Sports Illustrated*, April 1, p.28.

Case 9.22

Cyberbodies, Cyborgs, or Clean Athletes

With the mapping of the human DNA through the Human Genome Project, advances in digital, electronically controlled prostheses, and ongoing research by pharmaceutical companies the possibilities for the way sport is performed in the future take on more intrigue. The history of sport is rife with athletes using performance-enhancing substances and practices (see Hoberman, 1992, and Todd, 1987). The issue of use of performance-enhancing substances and practices is likely to be overtaken by issues of cyberbodies and cyborgs.

Michael Featherstone (1991) identifies cyberbodies as a result of research leading to the manufacturing and cloning of humans. It will not be long before in vitro fertilization “designer babies” are born. The genetic factors sought in these babies could potentially be those necessary to produce top sport performers (Cole, 1994). Featherstone (1991, cited in Cole, 1994) noted that

the potential consequences here for, to take an example, sport are tremendous. Not only is there the capacity to enhance performance and repair, or replace body parts to produce cyberbodies. There is also the potential to genetically design optimum types of bodies best suited for particular sports. (p.22)

Here the notion of repaired and replaced body parts is the focus. The “cyberathletes” will be fundamentally human but might have man-made body parts, as distinct from cyborgs.

We are familiar with the notion of cyborgs from, among others, Arnold Schwarzenegger’s *Terminator* films. Cole (1994) discussed the

concept of cyborgs in terms of man producing humanoids that might supplant humans or cyberathletes in sport competitions.

Both of these future possibilities do not, however, seem as pre-scient as those of genetic identification and manipulation. While this discussion has been around since the early 1980s, it is only with the completion of the Human Genome Project in June 2000 that genetic engineering became reality. An Australian television program (Willis, 2002) reported that identifying sport scientists had identified two of many possible genes that make for better athletic success, one related to heart function and the other to explosive muscle function. If these and other discovered genes can be "turned on" or a person's gene extracted, modified, and replaced in that person to produce better function, then sport takes on a different identity. In other words, manipulation of a person's natural genetic endowment to possibly create better athletes results, and genetically modified (GM) athletes are created.

A number of ethical issues have been identified by Miah (2001), mainly around protecting the athlete's genotype but also ensuring that genetic modification has not occurred. Here again sport faces a type of cheating that might be difficult to detect. While research continues on genetic modification and humans genes, it might not be that far in the future that sport will face an insurmountable question.

Each of these future possibilities points to a change in the fundamental way in which humans participate and perform in sport. The very nature of sport continues to be challenged by science. Science, both as the rational method to improve sport (better training regimes, diet, etc.), but also as the way to produce non-natural participants and performers, continues to provide challenges for sport, sport management, and sport organizations (especially to ensure a "level playing field").

All of this echoes a criticism that Ross (1994) leveled against the field of sport sciences in general. He suggested that the athlete is perceived to be little more than a machine to do the bidding of the coach, the scientist, the nation, and now the corporation (i.e., *homo mechanicus*). As a result, the "whole" person, that is, an existential individual with freedom and responsibility or the Kantian person as an end in oneself, is not considered or developed. The focus is on outcome, and process is lost.

Questions to Consider for Discuss

1. Aside from issues of "scientific possibilities," what does the production of cyberbodies, cyborgs, and advanced pharmaceuticals hold for the future of sport?

2. Most of the issues around steroid use and other substances and practices to enhance sport performance have challenged the basic premise of what sport is. How do these newer forms of enhancement challenge sport?
3. What does the GM athlete present to sport?
4. To what degree might GM or cyberbody enhancement be condoned?
5. How can we understand what would make an athlete seek the above-mentioned modifications to their body?
6. What does the culture of sport do to foster this?
7. If we feel the need to change this perception, how would we do it?
8. Describe what you think *homo mechanicus* means in your sport?
9. Can there be an existential athlete? Why or why not?

References

- Chester, R. (2002). Future shocks: Science-fiction fantasies, such as robotic maids and talking kitchen utensils maybe only a few years away. *The Courier-Mail*, Brisbane, Australia, February 23, p. 29.
- Cole, C. (1994). Resisting the canon: Feminist cultural studies, sport, and technologies of the body. In C. Cole & S. Birrell (Eds.), *Women, Sport, and Culture*. Champaign-Urbana, Ill.: Human Kinetics.
- Featherstone, M. (1xxx).
- Hoberman, J. (1992). *Mortal engines: The science of performance and the dehumanization of sport*. New York: Free Press.
- Miah, A. (2001). Genetics, privacy, and athletes' rights. *Sports Law Bulletin*, 4, 5. (Accessed online at <http://www.sportslawbulletin.com/Current/Analysis/Analysis.htm> on 2/22/02).
- Sports threat: Gene transferring. (2001). Associated Press (Accessed online at <http://www.wired.com/news/print/0,1294,41428,00.html> on 2/22/02).
- Ross, S. (1994). Sport sciences and the whole person. *CAHPER Research Supplement*, 1, 1:109-115.
- Todd, T. (1987). Anabolic steroids: The gremlins of sport. *Journal of Sport History*, 14:87-107.
- Willis, P. (2002). Gene sport. *Catalyst*, ABC-TV, producer L. Heywood, February 21. (accessed online at <http://www.abc.net.au/catalyst/stories/s479512.htm> on 2/22/02).

Case 9.23

Should Equal Rights Work Both Ways?

In 1993 the Massachusetts State Superior Court ruled that the Equal Rights Amendment applies to athletics. "That meant boys could not be barred from playing on girls' teams" (Reilly, 2001, p.100). In most instances it has been girls who have petitioned the courts to be allowed to play on boys' teams, but in Massachusetts, the effect of the court ruling has been to allow boys to play on girls' field hockey teams. Boys are bigger and faster than girls and hence their participation seems to have altered the girls' games considerably. Since there are no boys' field hockey teams in U.S. high schools, the only venue available to boys who are interested in playing this sport is the girls' team.

Many girls, their coaches, organizers and supporters have protested the presence of boys on the girls' teams.

A court ruling established the legal right of boys to play on girls' high-school field hockey teams but that does not decide the ethical issue involved.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. What is the ethical status of the legal arguments provided by girls who petitioned to play on boys' teams?
2. If girls are allowed to play on boys' teams based on the ethical and legal premises of equal rights, what ethical basis can be involved to prohibit boys from playing on girls' field hockey teams?
3. From an ethical perspective, how valid is the argument that the presence of boys on the girls' field hockey team alters the nature of the game?

Reference

- Reilly, R. (2001). Not your average skirt chaser. *Sports Illustrated*, November 26.

Case 9.24

Spilling the Beans on Major League Baseball

A bold and revealing quotation stands out on the cover of the June 3, 2002, issue of *Sports Illustrated*. Under the heading, "Confession of an MVP," we find, "At first I felt like a cheater. But I looked around, and everyone was doing it," attributed to former MVP Ken Caminiti. This issue contains a special report on steroids in baseball.

"Totally Juiced" is the title of the special report. Far more telling is the subtitle: "With the use of steroids and other performance enhancers rampant, according to a former MVP and other sources, baseball players and their reliance on drugs have grown to alarming proportions" (Verducci, 2002, p.34).

According to some sources, baseball players did not resort to using performance-enhancing substances in the past. There was a time when the use of chewing tobacco was fairly prevalent, which became a focus of attention when the anti-smoking campaign was introduced. However, that is much different from the current concern. "Steroid use, which a decade ago was considered a taboo violated by a few renegade sluggers, is now so rampant in baseball that even pitchers and wispy outfielders are juicing up and talking openly among themselves about it" (p.36). That assertion is based on interviews with players, trainers, and executives conducted over a three-month period. Along with an increasing reliance on steroids, other performance-enhancing drugs used include human growth hormone (HGH), and legal and illegal stimulants ranging from amphetamines to Ritalin to Ephedrine-laced dietary supplements. It is the use of illegal steroids that is growing the fastest and having the most profound impact on the game.

Not only is its use rampant but the attitude toward its use has changed radically, from clandestine use and emphatic denial to open discussion on what to use and where to obtain the requisite substances. "The surest sign that steroids are gaining acceptance in baseball: the first public admission of steroid use-without remorse-by a former prominent player. Ken Caminiti, whose 15-year big league career ended after a stint with the Atlanta Braves last season, revealed to *Sports Illustrated* that he won the 1996 National League Most Valuable Player Award while on steroids he purchased from a pharmacy in Tijuana, Mexico" (ibid.). He also confessed that the heavy use of steroids cause his testicles to shrink and retract; tests showed that his body had virtually stopped producing its own testosterone, having fallen to only 20 percent of normal.

He showed no remorse over his use of steroids and, in reply to a question, admitted that he would not discourage any player, veteran or rookie, from using steroids. His rationale: the money is so good it would be foolish not to go that route. He also estimated that at least half of the players are using steroids and that they talk about it openly. Other observers place the use at 85 percent of the players.

There are both legal and ethical issues involved. "Steroids are illegal in the U.S. unless prescribed by a physician for medical condition such as AIDS or Hypogonadism (an inability to produce testosterone)" (ibid.). Major League Baseball has no steroid policy or testing program for its players. To inaugurate a testing program would re-

quire the desire and resolve of the owners and, through collective bargaining, the agreement of the Major League Players' Association, which traditionally has resisted any form of drug testing.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. Was it ethical for Sports Illustrated to "spill the beans" about the rampant use of steroids in Major League Baseball?
2. Was it right for retired MVP Ken Caminiti to confess that he had used steroids during his playing career?
3. Was it right for Ken Caminiti to report publicly that the use of steroids is rampant among Major League Baseball players?
4. Is it ethical for the Major League Baseball team owners to have no policy regarding drug testing?
5. What is the ethical status of the Major League Players' Association in resisting any form of drug testing?

Reference

- Verducci, T. (2002). Totally juiced. *Sports Illustrated*, June 3, pp.34-40, 42, 44, 46, 48.

Case 9.25

Private and Public Responsibility or Private versus Public Responsibility

Generally speaking it is the responsibility of governments-national, state, and municipal-to build certain recreation facilities. There are many national parks, countless state parks, and campgrounds. At the municipal level, there are playgrounds, arenas, parks, and recreation centres. The need for municipally provided recreation facilities, it could be posited, is less in affluent neighborhoods since the residents have the resources to purchase services from the private sector. However, in low- and lower-income areas, discretionary funds for recreational activities are much more limited for many families, if they exist at all. These areas, often in inner cities, all too often have no recreation facilities provided by local government.

Highly successful former sports agent Dennis Gilbert (he set salary records for clients such as Jose Canseco) grew up in South Central Los Angeles with "guys like Bobby Tolan, Reggie Smith and Bob Watson" (Editorial, 2002, p.22). They played sandlot baseball on a dirt field with a wooden backstop and no fences. At one time baseball played by local youth was vibrant. However, this has not been the case in the recent past because there wasn't anywhere decent to play.

In mid-January 2002, Dennis Gilbert Field opened "less than 3 miles from the sandlot where Gilbert, 54, played as a boy" (ibid.). With funds supplied by Gilbert (\$1.5 million), who was approached by a representative of Major League Baseball's Reviving Baseball in Inner Cities (RBI) program, the field was built upon what was a garbage-strewn lot. Gilbert classified his philanthropy as a way of giving something back to his childhood neighborhood.

Questions to Consider for Discussion

1. What is the ethical status of Dennis Gilbert's contribution that helped create a recreation facility in an area where he played as a boy?
2. How ethical is it for the local municipality to allow a private group to usurp their responsibility to provide recreation facilities?
3. What is the ethical status of Major League Baseball's Reviving Baseball in Inner Cities (RBI) program?
4. What is the ethical status of Major League Baseball's RBI program if it only approaches wealthy individuals to the exclusion of municipal governments?
5. From a fairness perspective, what happens to those countless neighborhoods who have not produced a wealthy individual who could be approached to donate funds for a recreation facility?
6. What is the ethical status of an individual who, like Dennis Gilbert, came from a poor neighborhood, became wealthy but, when asked for financial assistance, refused to contribute?

Reference

- Editorial. (2002). Good sports. *Sports Illustrated*, January 28.