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| MGT610 AssiGnMenT no 1 soluTion FAll2023  **Question 1: Universalizability Evaluation**  Universalizability, as proposed by Immanuel Kant, suggests that an action is morally acceptable if its principle can be applied universally without leading to a logical contradiction. In the case of Company XeeTech’s policy on returning old TechMate gadgets, the policy can be evaluated through this principle.  The policy allows customers to return their old TechMate gadgets, irrespective of their condition, in exchange for a 25% discount on a new purchase. This, in principle, aligns with the commitment to sustainability by encouraging recycling and reducing electronic waste. However, when assessing its universalizability, a potential issue arises.  If every customer were to take advantage of this policy and return their old TechMate gadgets, the workload on the recycling and refurbishing teams would increase substantially. If this were a universal practice across all users of TechMate gadgets, it could lead to an overwhelming burden on the company’s workforce dedicated to recycling and refurbishing.  Therefore, while the policy’s intention is aligned with sustainability, it may not be universally applicable without causing strain on the company’s resources and employees. It might lead to an unsustainable burden on the recycling and refurbishing teams, creating a contradiction if everyone were to follow suit. Hence, the policy, when universally applied, might not be feasible without negative consequences.    **Question 2: Reversibility Assessment**  The principle of reversibility in ethics implies that an action should be reversible without causing harm or injustice. In the case of Company XeeTech’s policy, the ability to reverse or undo the action without causing harm needs to be considered.  While the policy of accepting old TechMate gadgets for recycling or refurbishing is aligned with sustainability, the concern raised by employees about increased stress and longer working hours for the recycling and refurbishing teams points to a potential issue with reversibility.  If the policy is implemented without changes and then reconsidered due to the negative impact on the workforce, retracting or reversing the policy might not necessarily alleviate the stress and increased workload that has already been imposed on the teams. This could result in potential harm to the employees who have been affected by the policy’s initial implementation. |
| **Question 3: Suggested Alternative Policy**  To align with the principles of universalizability and reversibility while maintaining the commitment to sustainability, a revised policy could be introduced: Instead of a flat 25% discount for returning old TechMate gadgets regardless of condition, the company could introduce a tiered discount system. For instance:   * A 25% discount for returning fully functional gadgets. * A 15% discount for returning gadgets that need minor refurbishment. * A 5% discount for gadgets that need extensive recycling efforts due to severe damage.   This tiered system incentivizes customers to return gadgets in better condition while still offering discounts for any returned gadgets. This could potentially reduce the workload on the recycling and refurbishing teams, as gadgets in better condition would require less effort. Additionally, implementing a cap or limit on the number of returned gadgets per purchase could prevent an overwhelming influx and ensure a more manageable workload for the teams. This alternative policy aims to promote sustainability while considering the workload of the employees and ensuring that the policy is more universally applicable and reversible without causing excessive strain on the workforce. |