

# Physical privacy

Business



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

PHYSICAL PRIVACY Physical Privacy Utilitarianism refers to the principle that encourages the taking of the correct form of action in order to benefit several people. On the other hand, deontology refers to the branch of ethics that deals with moral duty, commitment and responsibility of an individual (Boss, 2005). In simple words, utilitarianism entails making right decisions and doing right actions for the benefit of the society at large; while deontology entails the practice and understanding that there is honesty, respect for life, and fairness despite the consequences of any action and the effect on the majority or minority of people involved (Boss, 2005). From this, it is worth noting that utilitarianism and deontology plays an integral role in the physical privacy right issues of employees in a workplace. Therefore, in order to clearly elaborate how the utilitarianism and deontology influences workers in a workplace, our discussion will be based on drug testing.

Several concerns have been raised in regards to employees being given drug tests in their places. The main bone of contention arises with the question as to whether using such program would be socially desirable and ethically correct, or would it be an infringement on the employees' privacy rights.

Normally, the first argument that comes into play is the fact that administering drug tests to employees is related to the job functions, and secondly, the safety of other employees, the employer, as well as the general public (Verstraete, 2011). Several groups of individuals argue that employers violate the privacy rights of employees of when they request, collect or use personal information in a way that is not related to the existing relationship between the employer and the employees (Verstraete, 2011).

Therefore, before employers subject its employees to a drug test, then they must prove the relevant need for the test. This is because subjecting

employees to drug testing without sound reasoning is subject to flouting federal and state laws.

However, it is important for employers to understand that knowing drug usage of their employees is job-relevant information. This is attributed to the fact that a person using drugs can be a huge liability to the employer, themselves, co-workers, as well as the general public. Drug users normally have low productivity compared to the non-drug users (Verstraete, 2011). Additionally, drug users also have high work injuries compared to those who do not use drugs. This implies that the employer will incur high unnecessary costs. These costs can be viewed in terms of injuries, loss of productivity, absenteeism expenses, health insurance claims, theft, fatalities, and low employee morale. However, it is essential to note that these are not all the reasons that encourage business to conduct trust testing. It is a fact that drug problem is a serious problem being faced by many countries all over the world, and it is not likely to be solved in our lifetime. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the firm to provide a safe work environment for the greater good of the public and the general public.

In conclusion, I strongly believe that prospective and current employees should not be treated the same as far as drug testing is concerned. When both (prospective and current employees) are doing drugs and their impairment pose threats; they should not be employed. However, I have a feeling that current employees should be offered drug treatment in order to help them with their drug problems (Verstraete, 2011). On the contrary, I feel that this should not be offered to prospective employees since they have not become part and parcel of the employer's labor force, and they have not added any value to the company.

<https://assignbuster.com/physical-privacy/>

## References

Boss, J. A. (2005). *Analyzing moral issues*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Verstraete, A. (2011). *Workplace Drug Testing*. London, UK: Pharmaceutical Press.