**Case Study 1: Djokvic VS Australia**

The tennis star Novak Djokovic was cleared to travel to Australia even though he does not have the vaccination. Australia gave him an exemption that he was able to play in the Australian Open even though everyone else needs the Covid vaccination. When Djolvic got to Australia his visa was expireid so he was not allowed to enter the country. Many people are furious that he got an exemption just to come play tennis. Djokvic is still not guaranteed in the tournament because he still has to go back to court and if the court cancels his visa again he will have to leave Australia. Australia has not opened up their borders yet because they want 80% of the country vaccinated to let visitors in.

People are very furious because Australians were not allowed to see their loved ones and their dying family memebers for the last two years. But Djokvic got cleared just to come play tennis, many fans said they “would tune out of the tournament”(Elbaum,LI Pg 2). People would tune out the tournament because they don’t want to cheer on someone who shouldn’t be in their country. Australians were not happy with Djokvic because they think it’s ridiculous that he can come into their country without a vaccine just to play in a tennis tournament. Australians are mad about this because it’s unfair that someone famous can just come into the country without a vaccination when they have been on strict lockdown for the past two years! It’s unfair because these people have not been able to go anywhere because of covid.

The people that support Djovicks exemption for him to come into Australia are people that are fans of him and people that run the Australian Open. Promoters that run the Open are very happy because he is one of the biggest names in tennis. When people see that he is playing in this tournament it draws people in to watch the tournament. This helps the Austrilian open make a lot of money because people come from all over the world to watch him. Australia should be excited for him to come because this tournament has made over $2.71 billion in the last 10 years.

Is Djovick going to win his court case? Djovick is very lucky he is in Australia right now. He’s lucky because his visa has already been canceled once and he still stayed in Australia. Djovicks court case is about whether immigration minister Alex Hawke will cancel his visa for a second time. If Djovick loses his court case he will have to leave the country and won’t be able to play in the Open because his visa will be cancled again.

**Study Questions**

1. Is it ethical for Australia to take Djovicks visa?
2. Should Djovick get the vaccine to avoid this in the future?
3. Is Djokovic in the wrong for going to Australia?
4. Does Australia have the right to deport Djovick from their country?
5. What would you do if you travled to Australia and had to go back home because you had no vaccination
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**Case Study 2: Failing to Bond**

A Major League Baseball legend and a household name, Barry Bonds is still not inducted into the National Baseball Hall of Fame (HOF). Bonds meets all of the qualifications of a HOF player. He dominated in the batter’s box, with a batting average of 0.298. Bonds is known for his 762 home run record, which still stands today. He has also won many accolades, including 7-time MVP and 12-time Silver Slugger.(ESPN) Despite his outstanding career on the field, he has one thing holding him back year after year, steroids. Anabolic steroids increase the size of muscle tissues due to physical activities, it can also boost testosterone in the body. (Mayo Clinic)It is considered a performance-enhancing drug (PED). Any supplements that help improve an athlete’s speed, strength, size, etc. PEDs are illegal in MLB.

 Barry Bonds played in a time known as the Steroids Era. Multiple players like Bonds were using or accused of using PEDs. However, Bonds was one of the very few who outperformed the rest of the league ( and Alex Rodriguez, Nelson Cruz, Bartolo Colon, a few big-time star players). (Lang & The Guardian) Since many players were using PEDs, making MLB a leveled playing field. Those who weren’t using steroids did not survive long in the MLB, because they could not match the PED users. So they gave in to PEDs or were cut and replaced by a PEDs player. Some say it isn’t cheating if everyone is doing the same thing. The definition of cheating is “act dishonestly or unfairly in order to gain an advantage, especially in a game or examination.” If the majority of the players seek a way for unfair advantage in the game of baseball, then who really has the advantage when cheaters play against each other? The steroids will cancel out because it has become a common factor.

 People argue that Bonds and others ruined the integrity of the game and sports. Athletes are the best at what they do because of the physical and mental traits of 99% of the world. Professional athletes are actual examples of the phrase “Built Different.” However, if they need to take supplements to be on top of their competition it takes away your natural capabilities. The HOF is supposed to be a sacred place where only the dominant forces of the best of the best are welcome. Though Bonds was a dominant force during his time at MLB, his predecessors weren’t caught using PEDs to beat out their competition, whether they were using it or not.

 Every January MLB committee of voters goes through cases of HOF eligible players. A player needs 75% of the votes to get into Cooperstown. But unfortunately, each player only gets ten ballots. So Bonds is forever left out of the HOF with the rule of only ten polls spent.

Imagine if the committee did change its practices that would allow Bonds and others another opportunity to be voted in one last time. You are one of the members of the HOF committee voting. They present Bonds' case to you and your fellow voters. Would you vote for Barry Bonds to be inducted into the Major League Baseball Hall of Fame?

**Study Questions:**

1. Should Bonds be accepted into the hall of fame?
2. Is it ethical or morally acceptable to seek an illegal advantage to a game if everyone is doing it too?
3. Who does it benefit other than Bonds player status if he gets in?
4. Who does it harm if Bonds gets in?
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**Case Study 3: Privacy or Not**

 Many schools around the world have unofficial school accounts on Instagram.

For example, Grosse Pointe North has the Worst Parking account, University Liggett has a school Sleeping account, and Grosse Pointe South has a Bathroom Shoe account. When a new trend comes out about a school having a funny account, students start doing it. One student will make an account, without anyone knowing who made it. Other students send pictures of people sleeping to the owner of the account and the owner will post them. A high school student at Liggett University made a sleeping Instagram account and posted pictures of people sleeping around the school. Obviously, the owner of the account doesn’t have the other students' permission to post them. Some people might find that invasion of privacy. But other people might find the account really funny and they want their picture on there. If you ask most kids if they think these kinds of accounts are funny, they would say yes. But if you ask other people's perspectives on this situation, they are going to have different responses.

 Some students' views on this position, it is okay to post students on a school account because if you don’t want to be there then just ask the owner. At Liggett, a student wasn’t comfortable with being posted on the account, so they DM’d (sent a message to them on Instagram) to the owner. The student asked the owner to please stop posting because they weren’t comfortable. The owner DM’d them back and said they were sorry and they would delete the post of the student. After deleting the post, the owner posted on the account telling everyone not to send pictures of that student because they would be posting them anymore and if they don’t want to be on the account then tell them. Another example is North's worst parking, the owner of that account blocks everyone's license plate out of the picture.

The contrasting argument parents and other students may see this as against my position is all about invasion of privacy. On Instagram, your account can either be private or public. People make their accounts private, to keep other people that they don’t know from looking at their accounts. When a person from school posts them on an account that anyone sees, that can make that person feel uncomfortable. Another reason is students may feel like they don't feel safe in school and when they think they are alone and have privacy, all of a sudden they see a picture of them on an unofficial school social media account. Some parents wouldn’t want their kids to be on an account where they are posted when their kids don’t know and didn't give permission. Parents know the consequences when kids are being exposed. They do not want their kids to be bullied because of a picture someone else posted of them. Parents just want their children to be happy and most importantly safe, they don’t want to find out that their kids have been exposed and have no privacy.

 In addition, some who might oppose these accounts are principals and teachers. The principal of high schools might be concerned about how the school is viewed and The principal of Liggett was asked what he thought about these accounts. He said that he knows that they are for fun and there is nothing wrong with that, but the school has to think about other people's perspectives on the account. He talked about the sleeping account and said that parents or anyone who sees the account could say that Liggett is overworking the kids. (Lapolla, Matt 1-11-22)

Teachers in high school might also be concerned about how they teach the kids about responsibility. A Liggett teacher was asked what they thought about this situation. She said she knows it all for fun but there is always a line that could be crossed. She knows on the account that there is nothing inappropriate but if there was an account that did have inappropriate pictures. Those pictures could always come back and interfere with your future. She also said When teachers hear about this stuff, sometimes they feel like they aren't teaching their students how to use technology responsibly and they want their students to know that whatever they put on the internet is there forever, it could ruin someone's life and it is a huge invasion of privacy. (Hibbs, Kristen 1-11-22)

 There are many different perspectives on how people view these school accounts. Students, Parents, Teachers, and Principles, they are all right in their own way, but which one has the most convincing reasoning. This unofficial account raises many questions such as, Do students have the right to do whatever they want on a fun school account? Why or why not?

**Study Questions**

1. Do students have the right to post people without their permission if it's on a fun school account?
2. Should post students without their permission determine it wrong whether it is for a fun school account? Why or why not?
3. Do students have the right to do whatever they want on a fun school account? Why or why not?
4. What should students do when making a fun social media account and posting others without their permission?
5. Have students done anything wrong in posting people without their permission on a fun school account? Why or why not?

**Case Study 4: Gifts galore**

Holiday gift giving can be very exhilarating and fun or filled with stress and anxiety. But for these good friends in their 20's, it was both fun and stressful. Nick met his friend Joe at a barbeque 6 months ago and they really clicked, a​​nd since then they have been really good friends. But we haven’t seen each other in a while due to COVID-19. Christmas is in a couple of weeks and they both agreed that they would do something for each other, but the difficult thing is that they had totally different hobbies and interests. Nick is more of an outdoor activity type of person. He likes to get out and enjoy the sweet breeze of the wonderful outdoors. Joe, on the other hand, likes more indoor activities like gaming and watching movies and TV series, and is also really intrigued with technology.

A few days go by and they haven't really found anything specific yet. Now both of them are just doing their own thing, doing their hobbies and not worrying about the gifts. But in reality, Christmas is not that far away and since COVID is still a thing, shipments of all types of stuff are on backorder and taking a long time to come. Which puts more pressure and stress on Nick and Joe. It could take weeks or months, depending on what they get for each other. At this point, they are starting to get a little nervous and worrisome about what to get for each other. And now the stress is starting to hit a little harder, and they are scrambling from store to store to try and find something to buy. Joe went to four stores to try and find something that a 20-year-old would want, but he didn't have any luck finding anything.

A week goes by, and now it's about another week and a half till the gift exchange on Christmas Day. But miraculously, an ad comes up while Joe is watching television about the brand new airpods that have noise cancellation ability. Joe then says to himself, "*This would be a great gift for a twenty-something, especially for music and watching videos. I think I'm going to buy this." It feels morally right too. But is it wrong to buy him these knowing that they have the possibility of not coming in on time due to COVID and then have him not open anything on Christmas?* " But I did indeed purchase the airpods and they were being delivered. On the flip side, Nick was really struggling to find his gift and ended up winging it and ordered Joe a brand new basketball so that they could play basketball together sometime. Due to COVID, the basketball wasn’t supposed to be delivered and show up until the day after Christmas. Finally, Christmas Day comes around. It's time for Nick and Joe to exchange gifts. Joe, in his mind, says, "*What if I didn’t get enough for Nick? What if he bought way more for me?"* Then Nick says to himself, "*I feel terrible. The gift isn't here yet and he has nothing to open."* So Nick tells Joe that his gift hasn’t come in yet and that he is very sorry and that he apologizes. Nick proceeds to open his gift and realizes what he bought for him. Nick says, "Wow, the brand new airpods. This is a lot of money. Thank you so much." Nick says to Joe, "Do you want to know what I got you?" Joe says sure, and Nick tells him that he got him a basketball and wants to play basketball with him sometime. Joe mentions to himself in his head, "This isn’t something I'm really going to use." But Joe says, "Thank you. I really appreciate your getting something for me." Nick and Joe are now contemplating whether or not they should exchange gifts in the future for Christmas.

**Study Questions**

1. Is it ethical that Joe and Nick, with totally opposite hobbies and interests, exchange gifts without really knowing each other too well?
2. Should Joe take the risk of buying those expensive airpods knowing that he is a 20-year-old who has a very low budget and not a lot of money?
3. Do the pros outweigh the cons when it comes to gift giving?
4. Should Joe tell Nick that he does not really want that gift?

**Case Study 5: Are True Crime Shows a True Crime?**

True crime shows are many people's favorite genre of shows to watch, but is there a point when the show becomes too much? A lot of controversies has risen recently over these types of shows: should they even be aired, are they too graphic for viewers to watch, and do they glorify things that shouldn’t be glorified? These types of shows also can have an impact on your daily life if you are an avid watcher. The shows display unimaginable stuff that you never want to think about happening to you or anyone you know. Watching these shows can leave people with bad thoughts in their heads about what could potentially happen to them, often leaving them on edge and with an uneasy feeling throughout the day (“Is Love of True Crime Impacting Mental Health?”).

True crime shows can have a huge impact on people’s mental health and affect how they feel when going out in public. These shows often times show very graphic scenes of people getting kidnapped, murdered, etc. This often looks very real, which can give people the idea of this awful reality that some people have experienced. Although these are fictional stories, these are still things that can happen in real life. Because of the possibility of these things happening in real life, it can often keep people on edge throughout their day worrying about whether or not it will happen to them. Not only can these shows keep people on edge, but it can also bother people while being in their own homes. Seeing the different types of break-ins that can happen can make people double, and even triple check to make sure that their windows and doors are all locked. It can also keep them up at night while they worry about if someone is going to break into their house or not, furthermore filling them with anxiety.

Critics of true crime shows believe that these shows do not portray all police and law officials the way that they should be (Lawler). These shows often have the cops as these heroic characters who manage to always find a way to save the victim at the last minute and lock up the suspect. This can lead to false hope for people who have kids or people they know and care about in these types of situations. In the shows, the cops are always a hero and someone who you can count on throughout the situation that is happening, which is not always the case in real life. Police brutality is a very real thing that has risen in popularity in the past few years making true crime shows even more controversial. With police officers in real life abusing their power in certain situations and not following the law themselves, the true-crime shows often do not show this side of the police force. Also in the shows, the officers who are the main characters always find a way to save the victims just in time before they get killed. This is not always the case in real life but can lead viewers of the show to think it is possible to happen if they or someone they know is in a situation similar to the one in the show. This situation again leads to an unrealistic expectation and difference of on-screen police officers versus real-life police officers.

On the opposing side, true crime shows can be very beneficial for people to watch and learn from. When watching these shows, you can learn about the different types of people, and certain signs to look out for when talking to or meeting someone new. Although most of the time they are fictional shows, they are based on real things that can happen to you or someone you know in real life and can help bring awareness to these situations.

True crime shows have many pros and cons, but sometimes what is being shown during the episode can just be too much for certain viewers. From raising anxiety and giving a false portrayal of law enforcement, to helping people know what to look out for when talking to people. But with all of these things is it possible to create a medium that can be good for both sides of the spectrum, and furthermore allowing people to watch these shows.

**Study Questions:**

1. Do the true-crime show producers have a moral obligation to put a disclaimer before the show starts?
2. Are the viewers who watch these shows and then experience the rise in anxiety at fault for watching these shows?
3. Should these types of shows be aired on normal television for anyone to see?
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**Case Study 6: Kids Should Experience Adversity?**

All throughout life people face times of adversity. This can be good or bad, or even both in some instances. But especially at a younger ages and in more controlled environments people can actually control things like this and prevent it from happening. The real question is though, should they always step in? If the teasing or razzing is not too harmful or life threatening is it okay for it to happen? Or should it always just be stopped and cut out of situations? This issue hovers the line of right and wrong, and does not always have a clear answer. In school should teachers always step in the way of any non-extreme bullying situations, or should they leave it alone at times to let kids handle it themselves?

If for instance, to a certain extent, that light teasing or “bullying” were allowed it could and likely would help kids. The reason for this is that at some point in your life you will be faced with this and not always have someone to stop it from happening. People need to be prepared for these types of situations, and nothing can help more than experiencing it. If people are prepared and ready for these situations they can act accordingly and especially be able to let go of these things. In the moment it can definitely hurt someone or be hurtful, but in the end it really can go a long way to help people grow. Kids cannot be sheltered their whole lives, and a step in this direction can help them to grow up and understand the reality of the sometimes cruel world we live in.

But on the other hand if a kid is not ready for this type of situation at a young age, they could react very poorly and end up very hurt; the teacher should prevent and stop these situations from playing out. Perhaps it is not on the teacher or other students to help a kid be prepared for situations like these in life, but instead on the parents. The parents should talk and teach their child about the hard parts of life like these and help them to prepare for it. They shouldn’t be thrown right into the water and face it head on at such a young age, often times with no preparation or guide on how to respond. Teachers can stop and prevent these situations from happening or going any further than it has to be and perhaps they should do so.

The people at stake in this situation are the parents of the children involved, bystanders, the children involved (both enforcing and receiving ends), and the teachers involved. The most important role is that of the teacher in this situation and how they should act or respond to a situation like this. They have the responsibility of keeping their students safe both physically and emotionally, but they also are supposed to teach their students, including life lessons and things like these. While at school their students’ safety and education are completely in their hands and they have to make the right decision on how to best do both of those things.

The next people who have responsibility are the parents who have to both keep their child safe and teach them what is right and wrong. This is along with teaching them what to do in a certain situation. Another potential stakeholder is the children involved as their well-being and happiness is also at stake as they could be hurt by what other kids think or say. This even goes for the kid who commits the possible harm to the other kid. As a result of the situation, it could help or hurt the kids. This all creates a tricky situation for everyone involved and sometimes without a clear answer to the problem. The variables and unknowns in this entire circumstance are ever-changing and differ based on many factors creating a problem with no real solution.

Should teachers always step in the way of a kid being teased or razzed at young ages, or any age in school; or should they let the situation play out unless taken to an extreme level that has clear consequences for those involved? There are benefits and detriments to things like these happening, and the correct way to respond is not always the same for everyone. An example of one of these situations include when a kid is being teased about something he says that is wrong, or for the way he does something or says something. Even as harsh as it may seem perhaps the way a kid does his hair or the clothes he chooses to wear. But these things are what make you, you. Everyone’s differences are what makes them unique from another person, and loving yourself for who you are is an important part of life to be happy.

**Study Questions:**

1. Should teachers interfere with student interactions if there is potential harm involved?
2. and if so… When should a teacher step into to stop or prevent a situation like this?
3. Should parents teach and prepare their kids with appropriate responses to a situations like these?
4. Whose responsibility is it to handle or defuse the situaitons like this?
5. Should kids go through situations like these or is too hurtful for them?

**Case Study 7: The Principles of Job Termination**

Sherry, a principal at a high school, has made multiple problematic remarks regarding race and abuses her power, creating an unwelcoming school environment. While Sherry’s remarks seemingly come from a place of ignorance, the microaggressions create an uncomfortable relationship between her and the students. Because Sharry continues to make problematic remarks, it seems that no one has brought the issue to her attention and she is unaware of her actions’ impacts on the students. This situation has raised concerns amongst those in the school community regarding how the situation should be handled.

Those in support of Sherry’s removal acknowledge the emotions of the student body. As high schoolers, the students have multiple sources of stress from assignments, societal expectations, and their peers. As a principal, Sherry constantly interacts with the students. Because of her problematic behavior, her presence and interactions create an additional, unnecessary source of stress and trepidation for the students. Students also feel that Sherry’s problematic behavior is disrespectful towards their emotions. Students are expected to treat the faculty and staff with respect. If not, they are looked down upon and could potentially face disciplinary action. By ignoring their emotions and treating Sherry opposite of the way they see fit, students could begin to believe that their emotions are meaningless, damaging the students’ self-view, which could harm them in their adult lives. Additionally, If Sherry were to remain at the school, it would be a complete dismal of those who wish Sherry be removed from her position at the school. This would make the school appear like they have no regard for their students’ opinions and serious concerns.

Sharry frequently talks about her negative experiences as a person of color and has given multiple presentations encouraging equality and fair treatment within the school community. Because of this, her problematic actions seem to be done without malicious intent. While some say that Sherry is unfit to be a principal because of her actions, a majority of the school community believes that serious disciplinary action is not necessary. Those who are against Sherry’s removal believe that she is good at her job and deeply cares for the students and faculty. They also believe that it would be unfair to fire Sherry because she requires the financial income to support her family. They also believe that it is illogical to fire Sherry in the middle of the school year, especially considering it would be extremely difficult to find a replacement of her caliber, and if a replacement was found, the school community would need to adapt to the new leadership.

Some suggest that Sherry be removed from her position as principal and, because she has teaching experience, become a teacher. This way, Sherry still has a dependable income to support her family with, those who support Sherry are pleased because she will remain at the school, and those against Sherry will be partially pleased because the main reason for their consternation (Sherry's power and influence over the school) is taken away from her.

**Study questions:**

1. When is it okay to put a problematic person’s career in jeopardy?
2. How should we consider Sherry’s position as principal when deciding whether or not to fire her? Would your opinion change if she had a different position (such as a teacher) in the school?
3. If Sherry hasn’t acted out of malicious intent, should she be fired?
4. What are alternatives to firing Sherry?
5. Should students be held accountable for not bringing the issue forward to Sherry so she could change?
6. How much trust should we put in the complaints made about Sherry? What if the problematic actions mentioned in the complaints were justified or exaggerated?
7. Is it ethical to fire Sherry when she has a family to support?
8. How should we consider the students’ and their families’ emotions when deciding whether or not to fire Sherry?
* Do we hold people in positions of power too accountable or not accountable enough because of their power

**Case Study 8: Britney Spears Conservatorship**

The princess of pop star Britney Spears has had her adult freedoms taken away from her for 14 years. This means that she was not able to see her own kids, talk to whoever she wanted to, and couldn't leave her own house without her dad’s approval from the ages of 26 to 40. This striking event had many people furious and has been trending all over social media with the hashtag, “FreeBritney” movement. Although many have been recently shocked, this conservatorship didn’t just happen out of nowhere. Briney’s father, James P. Spears became her conservator in 2008 after her public breakdown, many people noticed this breakdown when she started acting different, first off, she shaved her whole head bald, and second, she even went off right in front of the paparazzi (Trepany). She was then put into a psychiatric hospital for mental health evaluation and substance abuse. Her meltdown had concerned her father and allowed him to take control as a “solution”.

Britney Spears has had her ups and down growing up with her father. He had struggled with alcoholism while Britney was just a little girl. Lynne Spears, Britney’s mother, had no power to split the family apart because she did not want to have a “broken” family. Later, in May of 2002, her parent’s marriage reached the limit to where they had decided to get a divorce because it was, “for the better” (Hautman). Britney at the time had even suggested for him to get rehab, which he had agreed to. Britney’s father was in control of her until just recently on November 12, 2021. This conservatorship “traumatized and exploited her” and she was just sick of feeling like she’s getting taken advantage of (Stark). Britney was forced into taking medications that she didn’t want to, wasn’t allowed to get married again, couldn’t have another child after her two sons, and couldn’t get her IUD removed (Blistein). James Spears states out to the public that he’s just doing it out of love and care for his daughter.

Conservatorships were established for people to have legal guardianship over an adult, families. They often use conservatorships as a way to help with the medical, financial, and mental health needs of a parent (Reed). Some adults aren’t capable of being in the right state of mind for making their own decisions so they need a guardian or someone who will make the best decisions that they think are right for that individual. Clearly, Britney’s father knew she wasn’t in the right state of mind so he felt like this would be the best solution for her crisis. When people are under conservatorship, in most situations they lose all their basic adult rights, it’s similar to being a child all over again. The majority of the people who are under this either have an illness, are in a kind of coma or have a disability. There are four types of conservatorships, the first one is financial, this is when your conservatory has full authority over your finances. The second kind is physical, which is when the conservator is in control of your health and living space. The third kind is general, this is when the conservator is in control of finances, health, autonomy, and all other big decisions. The last kind is limited, this is when your conservator only has authority over certain things in your life (Reed). Britney Spears had a general conservatorship but it was only temporary because it wasn't for her whole life, but it did in fact last around 14 years.

Jamie always stayed with Britney after the divorce and while she had a “public breakdown” he played the role of her conservator. This did have some kind of a good impact on Britney, even though she felt trapped, this prevented her mental health from becoming worse, he was there for her at her low. At the same time, not having freedom for 14 years could also have a negative impact on Britney, not having freedom for that long could make someone go crazy, she even said it herself that she felt trapped. In her situation, after a little bit of recovery, Britney just needed to have had the freedom to see her own kids at least whenever she wanted, and also find the right partner for her, which could have also helped her recover and become a happier person. Her father had a lot of power over her life while she was fighting for a slight bit of freedom. From this Ethical Dilemma, one question still remains unknown and that is, do you think the conservatorship was the best decision to better Britney Spears’s mental health?

**Study questions:**

1. Was it ethically wrong for Britney’s father to have had conservatorship over her?
2. How should Britney’s friends or family members have helped her fight out of this?
3. Could Britney’s father have done something better for helping her through her crisis?
4. Was the way Britneys fans were fighting for her on social media the right and most effective way?
5. If anyone was in the wrong in this situation, who would it be?
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**Case Study 9: The Debate about Sticky Fingers**

Fingerprint usage has always been considered a controversial topic (Dale). Overall most forensic analysts use them to prove crimes and other devious plots. But why are fingerprints so important? The reason is that they provide identification. Fingerprints allow people to identify who is who in a crazy world of sleuthing and discovering murders and plots. By using the fingerprint identification system, forensic analysts can make matches between suspects and their possible fingerprints left at a crime scene to solve a case. This leaves another question. If fingerprints are helping solve cases in the forensic world, why are they considered to be not reliable by reports and other sources? The reason is because fingerprints in our current world are not only the least valuable piece of evidence, but they are considered to be class evidence. Class evidence are pieces of evidence that are similar to others, not individual to a certain source. Also courtroom testimony and reports state that fingerprints collected from a crime scene belonging to a single person lack scientific foundation (Hoy). This leads to the ethical debate that will be discussed here: Are fingerprints actually helpful pieces of evidence, or should they be thrown out and never used again?

No matter who believes what, like everything in life, fingerprints have some pros and cons. Fingerprints again are pieces of evidence that allow us to identify certain suspects that could have possibly been at a crime scene. With enough information fingerprints can actually lead to a perfect match and no other information is needed. Also identifying matches between suspects and collected fingerprints is quite simple with the ever growing technology that exists today. Unfortunately fingerprints come with a cost, if you cannot find a match then they are completely useless and can only possibly eliminate some suspects (Crime Museum). They also have been used as the only piece of evidence in court cases which were deemed completely illogical by reports from the American Association for the Advancement of Science (Hoy). An example of this was the case reviewed by Trina Arpin. The case placed Stephen Cowens in jail for accused murder. Arpin states that “Six and a half years is a long time to spend in prison. For Stephen Cowens of Roxbury, Massachusetts, it was six and a half years too long. In January of 2004 Boston police and prosecutors admitted they were wrong when, at Cowens 1998 trial for murder, they claimed that fingerprints found at the crime scene unquestionably belonged to him (Arpin).” Overall fingerprints can be used correctly but they lack the full sophistication and accuracy to be the only piece of evidence used in not only court cases, but in any forensic case in general.

 Fingerprints were the first major system of categorization and identification in the Forensic world and without them, multiple cases in the past would never have been solved. But in today’s world it is believed that the new more accurate pieces of technology are stronger methods of identification then counting ridges in suspects fingers (Deutsche). No matter what some people even in the future will question if fingerprints are useful, others will ban together and stick behind the methods of the past. A possible solution would be to continue using fingerprints since they still provide information but to not use them as the only type of evidence in forensic cases. But what do you think? Should fingerprints be off the evidence list? After all, if you were to become a forensic scientist you would have to deal with this question everyday!

**Study Questions:**

1. Have the reporters done anything wrong in siding with removing fingerprints?
2. What should Forensic Scientists do now?
3. Should the usefulness of fingerprints determine if they should be used or not?
4. Do Fingerprint analysts have a moral obligation to continue using fingerprints why or why not?
5. How does your response change if we were debating about a different type of evidence such as hair?
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**Case Study 10: Career or Children?**

In 2022, should women still feel obligated to choose between having children or furthering their career? Forbes magazine reported that along with making this decision over 50,000 women in the past 10 years reported cases of pregnancy discrimination (Robinson). Which does not include the incidents that went unreported and unnoticed by others. The article classified the term ‘pregnancy discrimination’ as “treating a woman (an applicant or employee) unfavorably because of pregnancy, childbirth or a medical condition related to pregnancy or childbirth” (Robinson). For some women choosing between their career or children was easy, due to their circumstances. For others it seems like the decision is between putting their needs first or their childrens.

 This is a complicated situation and adds stress that most women do not want. For a 29 year old firefighter, Anna, and a 32 year old lawyer, Jennifer, it was hard for them to weigh the pros and cons. Anna, who has a very active job, only receives the same amount of time as a temporarily disabled employee. Women are leaving for maternity leave later than usual and coming back sooner than ever before (Robinson). At the moment most places can't risk losing another employee. Although Anna loves her job, she worries about the limited time she will have after her pregnancy and whether she will be able to spend enough time with her daughter during crucial developmental years (Rayed). She is not quite sure if she is ready to leave her position permanently. Working as a firefighter is fulfilling and has always been a dream of hers. She had to work hard and gain the respect of her coworkers to get to the position she is in today. For Anna, leaving her job feels like she is losing a part of herself. Jennifer faces a similar problem, both her and anna have worked so hard to get to high level positions. When Jennifer was offered a new, better position in the firm, she was very excited. Soon after it was offered, her boss asked about her pregnancy and her future at the company. Although she would love to take the position she is worried about how she will feel coming back after her maternity leave (Schank and Wallace). Many of her friends with similar jobs said they felt lost as a stay at home mom after quitting their job. As a lawyer, Jenn worked hard in college and even harder in law school. She works with mainly men who expect her to not return after her pregnancy. Jenn worries, she loves her job and wants to stay but she feels guilty prioritizing herself over her children (Schank and Wallace). A new position would require more hours in the office, more phone calls and work responsibilities even when she is home, and arriving home from work after the children are asleep.

 Many women are able to make the decision to stay home with their kids on their own terms. While it is very beneficial to have a stay at home parent for kids, it can either go really well or poorly for parents. Studies show that moms are more likely to feel social isolation and have higher levels of anger and sadness. Other moms have reported feeling happier when spending more time with their kids. Choosing to be a stay at home parent does not have to mean mothers are putting their children's needs before theirs. Gracy Olmstead wrote, “Many brilliant women out there choose children over a degree, because they see their children as the best investment of their time and talents” (Rayed). They are able to cherish memories with their children, build a relationship with them early on, and be a reliable figure for them (Dhar). Children need more interactions and love from their parents when they are younger to be able to develop confidence and learn how to build relationships. As a stay at home parent you are more aware of your child's behavior and are less likely to neglect their needs that they have trouble expressing. For children, it improves their school performance and reduces stress and aggression. A 2014 study found that children benefit from having a stay at home parent all throughout their lives, into highschool (Duncan). Children tend to feel more social approval from others and their parents when they have a full time stay at home parent. It provides a type of validation from the parent. Additionally, families with a stay at home parent avoid daycare costs and full time babysitters (Dhar).

 It can be argued that more women would have an easier time choosing between children or their career if more accommodations were made for pregnant women. Beneficial accommodations could include longer maternity leaves and more awareness of pregnancy discrimination. Women should not feel pressure from society that they must be the stay at home parent or that they are neglecting their children if they do not choose to quit their job.

**Study Questions**

1. Do moms like Jennifer and Anna have a moral obligation to put their children before their career? Or vice versa.
2. How can mothers be there for their children without feeling an obligation to be the stay at home parent?
3. Does your response change based on the different jobs these women have?
4. Suppose both Anna and Jennifer's husbands make the same amount of money as their wives, should the mother still feel an obligation to be at home with her child?
5. What should be done to make more women able to balance motherhood and having children?
6. How should an individual respond to pregnancy discrimination?
7. How can women step down from a position after facing pregnancy discrimination without feeling like they have given into the effects of the discrimination?
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**Case Study 11: Baseball’s Unwritten Rules Respect or Disrespect?**

Baseball is one of the greatest sports in America if not the greatest sport in America. There are certain things to the game of baseball that make it so amazing: The respect between the two teams, the fact that at any part of the game a team can storm back and take the lead, unlike most sports where there is a clock and whoever gets the most points in that amount of time wins the game. This makes baseball different from other sports, the thrill of tides being able to shift at any point in the game. In the game of baseball, there are two different types of rules in the game: The written rules such as a pitcher are not allowed to pick off a runner at first until he takes his foot off the mound. The second type is the unwritten rules of baseball such as “Don’t bunt to break up a no-hitter. Don’t stand at home plate, admiring your home runs. Don’t stand on the dirt near home plate when a pitcher is warming up. Don’t steal bases with a big lead. Don’t swing at a 3-0 pitch with a big lead.” The unwritten rules of baseball have many controversial opinions on them and there has not been a set right answer on the fine line of whether someone is showing respect or disrespect.

The unwritten rules of baseball have been taken lightly as of the past few years of pro baseball and a lot of people feel that the etiquette of the game has changed too much in a sense that is a disrespect to the players that came before them. One instance when the “unwritten” rules have been broken, was when a Rookie in the 2021 MLB season named Yermin Mercedes, had a 3-0 count in a 15-4 game and he got a good pitch to smash and him being a hitter, of course, he hit it out of the park. His manager Tony LaRussa a 76-year-old man had an issue with his own player, hitting a home run off of the Twins while they were up big “LaRussa called Mercedes’ swing a “big mistake,” then was fine with the Twins throwing at Mercedes the next day.” A lot of younger people say that Yermin was in the right, and a lot of older people say that LaRussa is in the right. They say this because the younger generation of baseball is changing the game. Adding a little more “swagger” or some “flare” to the game of baseball, and some people see it as a disrespect to the game of baseball because it breaks some of the unwritten rules: But if the game is changing should some of these “unwritten rules be changed?

There are a lot of aspects that we need to take into consideration with this Dilemma: first is how much the game of baseball has changed over the years. In the article  **“[[1]](#footnote-1)**Baseball's unwritten rules are disrespecting the game” The article brings up the point “In 1913, 3-1 was a big lead. In 2013, a 13-1 lead is not automatically safe. A rally from a 13-1 deficit wouldn’t top SportsCenter and might not be the biggest story in baseball that day.” with this being said baseball has changed a lot and many aspects of the game are changing. Does this make what Yermin did okay? Here is one way to look at it, professional baseball players are not being paid based on how they treat the other team: they’re strictly paid off of their stats.

**Study Questions:**

1. If Yermin is strictly doing what he did just to help his pay, does that put him in the right or LaRussa in the wrong?

2. Does LaRussa have the right to be upset with Yermin?

3. When and who can draw the line of respect and disrespect with baseball's unwritten rules?

**Case Study 12: Reluctant Hero**

On September 22, 1975 at the St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco, a good samaritan foiled the attempted assasination of Gerald Ford. Just as Sara Jane Moore attempted to shoot the president, Oliver Sipple, a Vietnam veteran who just happened to be in the crowd that day, pushed her down. Though he was hesitant to accept the label, Sipple was lauded as a national hero. There was just one problem: he was gay.

Sipple was out to his friends in San Francisco, but was still closeted from his family in Detroit. He had asked reporters to not comment on his sexuality for fear of estrangement. However, Harvey Milk, a prominent gay activist and Sipple’s friend, intentionally outed Sipple to Herb Caen at the *San Francisco Chronicle*. Caen published the story, it was picked up across the nation, and his family in Detroit was hounded by reporters and harassed by neighbors. Though some in his family came to accept Sipple, most continued to be uneasy with his sexuality up until his death in 1989.

Sipple had worked on Milk’s campaign for mayor, and Sipple was active in the gay community. Milk had even loaned Sipple money when he was between jobs. Still, Sipple knew his family wouldn’t be able to accept his life and didn’t want to be outed to them. At a time when gay men were seen as perverts by society, Milk justified outing Sipple because he thought it was important to promote gay people in the media. He said, “It's too good an opportunity. For once we can show that gays do heroic things."1 For Milk, Sipple's hesitance to share his sexuality was doing a disservice to his identity. To him, pushing aside your sexuality means abandoning a core aspect of yourself–something that is completely unacceptable. He said in a 1978 speech, “Every gay person must come out...As difficult as it is, you must tell your immediate family, you must tell your relatives, you must tell your friends if indeed they are your friends…once you do, you will feel so much better.”2

Sipple didn’t see it this way. He said in a statement to reporters, “My sexual orientation has nothing at all to do with saving the president's life, just as the color of my eyes or my race has nothing to do with what happened in front of the St. Francis Hotel on Tuesday. My sexuality is a part of my private life, and has no bearing on my response to the act of a person seeking to take the life of another. I am first and foremost a human being who enjoys and respects life. I feel that a person’s worth is determined by how he or she responds to the world in which they live, not on how or what—or with whom a private life is shared.”3

**Study Questions:**

1. Did Caen have an obligation not to run the story? In what circumstances is it morally acceptable to divulge information about someone against their will?
2. To what extent did Sipple have an obligation to support the gay community, especially given his heightened platform? More generally, what obligation do people with larger audiences have to support social causes?
3. What inherent moral value is there to authenticity, if any? How does this factor into Milk's decision to out Sipple?

1 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/12/30/AR2006123000160.html>

2 <https://www.onearchives.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/1978_harvey_milk_gay_freedom_day_speech.pdf>

3 <https://www.wnycstudios.org/podcasts/radiolab/articles/oliver-sipple>

Note: the third reference expertly goes over this entire series of events in far more detail including more about Sipple's life, relationships, and death.

**Case Study 13: School Sports**

The athletic director is approached by a student who is new to his school. The student wants to play girls' soccer. The athletic director is excited that someone, especially a new student, wants to join a team. The athletic director and the student make small talk about the sports she has played in her old school.

As the conversation progresses the athletic director becomes unsure of the student's gender. Though the student wants to play girls’ sports, there are certain characteristics that imply that the student's gender might not match the one she identifies with. The rules of the school say only girls can play girls' sports. Although in the past, the school has allowed girls to play on boys' teams. A girl was the football team's kicker and a girl played on the boys' tennis team, but there is no precedent for a boy participating in a girls’ sport where physicality might be a distinct advantage.

After the conversation, the athletic director signs the person up for girls' soccer and tells her to report to the coach. However, the athletic director is left with lingering questions about the gender of the person to whom he talked, and wonders if he should have been more inquisitive. Since physicality is a major part of soccer, he is concerned about possible injuries or unfairness to other players if the student is allowed to play. Although he has never required proof of any student's gender before he is now wondering what his responsibilities are.

**Study questions:**

1. If the student identified as a boy, with characteristics that suggest otherwise, and wanted to play boys' sports would the situation be different?
2. The school code does say that only girls can play girls' sports, but what does that mean? Is there a difference between biological sex and gender? If so, which one applies?
3. If the athletic director asks about the student's gender and she reveals it doesn’t match the one she was born with, does the athletic director have an ethical duty to inform any of the following parties?
* Other coaches at the school
* Other coaches and athletic programs from other schools
* The parents of the student
* The players from their school and other schools

What could be the effects if he informs any of these groups of the student's situation?

1. What should the athletic director do if he asks the question and the student doesn’t wish to comment? What if the athletic director follows up and the student replies “have you asked anyone else that?”
2. If the student wanted to play a sport such as swimming or tennis where there is no physical contact with other players whatsoever, is the situation different?

**References:**

<https://www.freep.com/story/sports/high-school/2021/08/17/michigan-high-school-transgender-athlete-bill-laura-theis-jeff-irwin/8126319002/>

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2022/03/30/transgender-discrimination-title-ix-rule-students/>

<https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/articles/2021-12-01/these-states-restrict-how-transgender-students-participate-in-school-sports>

**Case Study 14: Banning Books**

A school district is having a board meeting and angry elementary school parents are in attendance. They make a compelling case to board saying that their children have been disturbed by aspects of the book that are violent and frightening. As a result, the book in question is deemed inappropriate by the school board for that age group. The book leaves the shelves along with others that contain similar violence.

At the next board meeting the same parents return with a new list of books to be removed. These books do not have scenes of violence but examine themes of gender and sexuality. There is no book that explicitly mentions sex but do portray nontraditional families such as same-sex families and nongender conforming families. They make the same argument that these themes are inappropriate and upsetting to elementary kids. The board of education rejects the second request.

**Study Questions:**

1. Was it ethical for the board of education to ban the first one but not the second one?
2. What if the board of education accepts the request and the parents show up again requesting to ban more books this time that feature inter-racial marriage or other themes involving race?
3. Should the parents have any say about what their children should read in class?
4. If the age group changed to middle schoolers or high schoolers, would that affect any part of the school board's decision? Should the parents have more or less say in what their children should read?
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**Case Study 15: To Test, or Not To Test?**

Beginning in the 1950’s, any United States high school graduate planning to continue their education would likely be familiar with a certain standardized test called the SAT. This test, originally known as the Scholastic Aptitude test, was developed in 1926 based on Army IQ tests from World War 1 and it would go on to become the standard for college entry three decades later. Originally, it was designed to measure intelligence rather than learned knowledge through various questions focused on math and reading. Over the years, both the content and supposed intent of the SAT have changed dramatically, frequently in response to harsh criticism.

 Despite their popularity, standardized tests like the SAT have frequently come under fire for being a product of and continuing to uphold systemic racism and classism in education. The 1920s, when the SAT was created, were an era of racial discrimination and eugenics in both acidemic circles and broader society and intelligence tests were used to back up these ideas. Since the test was intended to be an independent indicator of intelligence and future performance, it could claim to be unaffected by differences in the quality of education or resources that may have been available to any particular student. However, wealthy, white students typically scored the highest on this kind of test, and these results were used to push the idea that whites were genetically smarter and helped to keep higher education predominantly white. Though the test has been significantly altered to be more fair to those from different backgrounds, including a rebranding from an aptitude test to academic test in 1993, it has continued to be criticized for favoring white students with money. A major part of this is the industry built around SAT test prep. Beginning in the 1960s, expensive coaches, books, and classes popped up to help students improve their test scores. These resources are unaffordable for many and rigorous coaching or studying takes time that students who have to work or care for family may not have. The combination of these factors has made standardized tests like the SAT into a barrier for Black, Brown, and Indegenous people as well as for those who are low-income or without generational wealth.

In response to criticism of testing as well as the pandemic’s impact, some colleges have decided to go “test optional” and are not requiring SAT (or similar standardized test) results in their admissions process, this includes many Ivy league schools. These schools are instead focusing on other aspects of a prospective student’s application, including grade point average and extracurricular activities. While this sounds like it could be a solution to the systemic inequality of the SAT, it poses another problem: wealthy, white students are more likely to have participated in programs outside of school. Things like clubs, sports, and volunteer work are often inaccessible to kids from lower-income families because of expense, parent’s tight work schedule, or simply lack of availability. Plus, extracurricular activities are one of the first things that get cut when school’s budgets are reduced, further affecting students in poorer areas. This inequality issue has led some colleges, including MIT and Georgetown, to reconsider the SAT. Since the test is the same for everyone regardless of background or location and it relies on knowledge from school, it is believed by some to be a more equitable admissions tool.

**Study Questions:**

1. Should the racist or eugenicist history of an institution or tool impact how we view it today whether or not it continues to cause harm?
2. What kind of obligations do colleges and universities have when determining criteria for admission requirements and to whom are they obligated? Should private and public institutions be held to the same standards?
3. Is it permissible for private companies to profit off study materials and tutoring for standardized tests like the SAT? Furthermore, does College Board, the organization producing the SAT, have a responsibility to provide free test prep?
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