

Czech University of Life Sciences Prague

Faculty of Economics and Management

Department of Humanities



Master's Thesis

Exploitation and Discrimination in Business Ethics

Bc. Michal Voves

© 2022 CZU Prague

CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Economics and Management

DIPLOMA THESIS ASSIGNMENT

Bc. Michal Voves

Economics and Management

Economics and Management

Thesis title

Exploitation and Discrimination in Business Ethics

Objectives of thesis

This thesis will focus on understandings of the concepts of exploitation and discrimination in business ethics. These concepts are important in defining both external and internal regulation of businesses and market relationships, but their precise meaning and application is a subject of intense debate. There is disagreement among academics, lawmakers and the general public about what precisely counts as discrimination and exploitation, and how (and even whether) they should be addressed and prevented. The thesis will discuss the main features of this debate, and investigate attitudes towards and understandings of these concepts among employers, employees and the self-employed using exploratory, quantitative research methods.

Methodology

The thesis will:

- Develop a literature review outlining contemporary debates and understandings of the place of discrimination and exploitation within business ethics.
- Undertake exploratory research into attitudes towards these concepts among three groups of stakeholders: Business owners, employees, and the self-employed.

The proposed extent of the thesis

50-60 pages

Keywords

Exploitation, Discrimination, Business Ethics, Law, Social Attitudes

Recommended information sources

FREDERICK, Robert. (2008). A Companion to Business Ethics. London: Wiley-Blackwell

JONES, Campbell, et al. (2005) For Business Ethics: A Critical Approach. London: Taylor & Francis Group.

LIPPERT-RASMUSSEN, Kasper (Ed.). (2017). The Routledge Handbook of the Ethics of Discrimination. London: Routledge.

ZWOLINSKI, Matt and Alan WERTHEIMER. (2017). "Exploitation" in The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/exploitation/>.

Expected date of thesis defence

2021/22 SS – FEM

The Diploma Thesis Supervisor

Daniel Rosenhaft Swain, Ph.D., MA

Supervising department

Department of Humanities

Electronic approval: 15. 11. 2021

prof. PhDr. Michal Lošťák, Ph.D.

Head of department

Electronic approval: 18. 11. 2021

Ing. Martin Pelikán, Ph.D.

Dean

Prague on 16. 03. 2022

Declaration

I declare that I have worked on my master's thesis titled "Exploitation and Discrimination in Business Ethics" by myself and I have used only the sources mentioned at the end of the thesis. As the author of the master's thesis, I declare that the thesis does not break any copyrights.

In Prague on 31.03.2022

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Daniel Rosenhaft Swain, Ph.D., MA for advice and support during my work on this thesis. I would also like to thank my respondents for providing interviews.

Exploitation and Discrimination in Business Ethics

Abstract

This diploma thesis concentrates on the issues of discrimination and exploitation, which are concepts connected to business ethics. The thesis is divided into two sections. The theoretical part serves as an informational review regarding topics such as: exploitation and unfairness, exploitation and other connected wrongdoings, applied issues in exploitation theory, concept of discrimination, types of discrimination and discrimination and the job market.

The practical part of the thesis then focuses on the attitudes of my respondents, who are divided into three groups: employees, employers and self-employed people. Respondents will show their attitudes towards these concepts through interviews, which will be utilized and transcribed. Following the interviews, the thesis will provide comparison of theorists' attitudes from my literature review with the attitudes of the asked stakeholders.

Keywords: Exploitation, Discrimination, Business Ethics, Sweatshops, Law, Social attitudes, Stakeholders

Vykořisťování a Diskriminace v Podnikatelské Etice

Abstrakt

Tato diplomová práce se zaměřuje na problematiku vykořisťování a diskriminace, což jsou koncepty spojovány s etikou podnikání. Práce je rozdělena na dvě části. Teoretická část slouží jako informační přehled. Tato část se následně zabývá tématy jako jsou: vykořisťování a férovost, vykořisťování a další provinění, problémy vykořisťování aplikované do reálných příkladů, koncept diskriminace, typy diskriminace a diskriminace na trhu práce.

Praktická část se dále zabývá sociálními postoji mých respondentů k této problematice. Respondenti jsou rozděleni do tří skupin podle jejich postavení na trhu práce. Konkrétně na zaměstnance, zaměstnavatele a osoby pracující na živnostenský list. Obsahem praktické části bude také ukázání postojů mých respondentů na problematiku vykořisťování a diskriminace, data budou sbírána za pomoci rozhovorů a výsledky budou shrnuty a přepsány do anglického jazyka. Konec praktické části se bude zaměřovat na porovnání těchto postojů v závislosti na postojích odborníků, které jsou obsaženy v teoretické části.

Klíčová slova: Vykořisťování, diskriminace, etika v podnikání, sociální postoje, právo, manufaktury, zúčastněné strany

Table of content

1 Introduction	11
2 Objectives and Methodology	12
2.1 Objectives.....	12
2.2 Methodology	12
3 Literature Review	13
3.1 Business Ethics.....	13
3.1.1 Definition of Business ethics	13
3.1.2 The History of Business ethics	13
3.2 Exploitation	14
3.2.1 The concept of exploitation	15
3.2.2 Exploitation and other wrongdoings	15
3.2.3 Exploitation and harm.....	16
3.2.4 Exploitation and unfairness	18
3.2.5 Moral weight and moral force of exploitation	19
3.2.6 Applied issues in exploitation theory	20
3.3 Discrimination	23
3.3.1 A First approximation of discrimination	24
3.3.2 Moralized concept of discrimination	25
3.3.3 Types of discrimination	26
3.3.3.1 Direct discrimination	26
3.3.3.2 Indirect discrimination.....	27
3.3.3.3 Organizational and institutional discrimination	28
3.3.4 The wrongdoings of discrimination	29
3.3.5 Discrimination and the job market.....	30
4 Practical Part	33
4.1 Respondents	34
4.2 List of questions	35
4.3 Responses from the interviews.....	36
4.3.1 Are you familiar with the concept of discrimination and exploitation in regards with business ethics?.....	36
4.3.2 Have you ever faced exploitation?.....	37
4.3.3 How would you react to this problem?	38
4.3.4 Do you feel any difference between the discrimination and exploitation, if so, what is the main difference you see?.....	39
4.3.5 It is said, that sometimes the exploitation might be beneficial and wrong, do you see any real-life situation, when this might happen, and would you be able to justify it in that case?	40

4.3.6	There is said by theorists that, if there is a transaction between two parties, where one party is selling something under special circumstances, which is irrelevantly more expensive than in normal circumstances, then the exploitation occurs, what is your attitude towards this example?	41
4.3.7	Exploitation is often connected to unfairness, substantive unfairness is a term, which might happen to everyone, how would you react if such situation happens to you?	42
4.3.8	Non-Worseness claim is a term, which was challenged by theorists, where both sides pointed out some pros and cons, is there in your opinion some benefit or is it rather just a term, which is trying to justify exploitation?	44
4.3.9	Is there in your opinion a possibility how to prevent exploitation or how to eradicate it completely?	45
4.3.10	What would be your reaction towards the company, which was accused of being exploitative, would you still buy their goods and services or rather buy from the competition?	46
4.3.11	What would be your feelings, if the state would establish Universal Basic Income?	47
4.3.12	The problematic case of sweatshops is known to take place within developing countries, however there is an argue among theorists, if these practices are overall good for the society of that country or not, could you give me your opinion on this issue?.....	48
4.3.13	Would you agree that discrimination might be unintentional?	49
4.3.14	When do you think one can face institutional discrimination, can you provide some example?	50
4.3.15	Theorists argue on both sides on the topic if the discrimination is justifiable (case of blind person getting driving license), then it can be dismissed, do you feel this case to be a discrimination at all?	51
4.3.16	Discrimination in regards with hiring process is a big issue for a long time, moreover there were institutions, which were hiring according to the stereotypes of gender, what is your opinion on hiring according to the stereotypes?	52
4.3.17	Do you see hiring process according to the merits as a fair one or could you imagine being able to claim a job according to something else?	54
4.3.18	Have you ever faced prejudice within the hiring process and being refused as the correct candidate for the position?.....	54
4.3.19	What would be your action, if the most adequate candidate would be accused of some wrongdoing regarding business ethics?	56
4.3.20	When considering two real life examples of casino dress code and nursing home, do you agree with the Hellman's theory?	57
5	Results and Discussion.....	59
5.1	Attitudes towards exploitation	59
5.2	Attitudes towards discrimination	60
5.3	Interesting findings.....	61
6	Conclusion.....	62
7	References	64

1 Introduction

As the world of business is evolving every day, so are the issues connected to this world. The concept of business ethics as well as the corporate social responsibility is getting more and more popular in recent years. However, one could think of these concepts as something, which is automatically agreed on, the opposite is the true.

Theorists all-around the world as well as the society cannot agree, what should be already considered as moral wrongdoing and therefore be condemned as something wrong to the human beings.

Because of the fact that these issues are more discussed on the social medias, televisions, radios and news, one should think about, what can already be considered as moral wrongdoing and on the other hand, what could be the justifiable act by the society.

Thanks to these disagreements, I have decided to summarize the statements from the theorists, which are focused on the concept of exploitation and discrimination. These two moral wrongdoings are making problems in several aspects of humans' life.

The concepts of exploitation and discrimination might be faced by everyone in the everyday life, but it is up to the people, how they will withstand these wrongs if being used against them. For the purpose of finding out people's attitudes towards these two concepts, this diploma thesis is made.

People selected into my practical part are separated into three groups according to their position on the labor market, these people will be answering question, which will be created in accordance to the statements and issues regarding exploitation and discrimination from my theoretical part of the thesis.

2 Objectives and Methodology

2.1 Objectives

This thesis will focus on understandings of the concepts of exploitation and discrimination in business ethics. These concepts are important in defining both external and internal regulation of businesses and market relationships, but their precise meaning and application is a subject of intense debate. There is disagreement among academics, lawmakers and the general public about what precisely counts as discrimination and exploitation, and how (and even whether) they should be addressed and prevented. The thesis will discuss the main features of this debate and investigate attitudes towards and understandings of these concepts among employers, employees and the self-employed using exploratory, quantitative research methods.

2.2 Methodology

The thesis will:

- Develop a literature review outlining contemporary debates and understandings of the place of discrimination and exploitation within business ethics.
- Undertake exploratory research into attitudes towards these concepts among three groups of stakeholders: Business owners, employees, and the self-employed.

3 Literature Review

3.1 Business Ethics

3.1.1 Definition of Business ethics

Business ethics is a part of the corporate social responsibility and it is a practice, which is focused to extinguish discrimination, exploitation, insider trading and bribery.

The main goal of business ethics is to maintain high moral attitude towards the vendors, employees as well as clients. It should have been used among the whole company from the top-level management to new hires. (INDEED,2022)

There is no exact definition for business ethics rather than how one is considering, how business ethics definition should have been formulated.

3.1.2 The History of Business ethics

The history of ethics in business could be dated back to the times of earliest bartering and principle of equal exchange, however the term business ethics have become famous after 1970s in the United states. It was a result of the Civil right movements as well as the beginning of environmental movements. After the term have been in the people consciousness, it has spread to the rest of the world. Other states have come to this term differently according to the political situation in each country. (BBVAOPENMIND,2022)

3.2 Exploitation

Although this term was not commonly used before the 19th century, there were several discussions among philosophers. These discussions were related to the Justice and injustice in economic exchange, what is the role of labor connected to the value, justification and abuses of private property.

The most influential theory that saw the light of the world in the past was from Karl Marx, who had a negative attitude towards the capitalist society and said that workers are exploited, because they are forced to sell their labor power to capitalists for the value, which is not considered fair in contrast with the commodities, services and goods they produce with their labor.

Marx had the opinion that exploitation in capitalist world exists and will not disappear, because people are not working fully voluntarily, due to the lack of ownership, therefore they have two options. First one is to sell their labor to the capitalist and second one is to starve to death.

Although Karl Marx was against the capitalists, he saw exploitation as a phenomenon in all class-based societies. The clearest exploitation could be seen in Feudalism, where one serves to the Feudal lord, while others might have served just for their own benefit. (Zwolinski, 2017)

3.2.1 The concept of exploitation

In the most common concept of the exploitation, let's have a person A, who is taking an unfair advantage of another person B. This can be understood in two ways. First way can refer to the outcome of the exploitative act or transaction. In this case there might be said that the transaction is substantively unfair.

Let's have an example of the employer, who is taking advantage of his employee by making his/her job more difficult than it is supposed to be and if this employee eventually makes small mistake during the worktime, then the employer is using disproportionately tools on the employee.

Second way of understanding might be the case of person A takes unfair advantage of person B, by defrauding, manipulating or coercing, in this case the transaction or the act is procedurally unfair. (Zwolinski, 2017)

3.2.2 Exploitation and other wrongdoings

When person A exploits person B, A gains some benefit on the behalf of another person. There might be seen a relevance between exploitation and other forms of wrongdoings such as abuse, discrimination or oppression. First relevant example is that person A wrongly deprives person B of some opportunity or benefit, due to the characteristics of person B, which is not relevant to person A actions made.

This is connected to the case in the American history, when women had to become School teachers, due to the fact that they were denied the opportunity to enter different industry on the job market, such as medicine or law. In this case the society faced some benefits, due to the big supply of high qualified teacher on public schools.

There might be said that discrimination can be exploitative, even unintentionally, on the other hand if one person refuses to give a job to the other, solely because of the race or religion, then there is just discrimination.

Another example of benefit might be abuse of medical students in the hospitals. It is commonly known that medical interns are working more than one full time job for low wages. This is also amplified with the fact that they are often being abused at workplace from the regular doctors, who are screaming at them, which causes long lasting emotional scars on the students. As far written, there could be said that students are being abused and exploited, but as mentioned above, in the case of the exploitation one person or group needs to gain on behalf of another. In this case there could be seen a gain of the hospital or patients of the hospital, who gain on the behalf of the students, even though there is no intention of exploitation.

Third example would be oppression, which would be connected if person A deprives another person of freedoms or opportunities, which should be automatically entitled to every human being, If one person gains from the oppression, there might be an example of oppress and exploit simultaneously, but if one person does not gain by doing that, there can only be talk about oppression, but not exploitation.

Last thing in this chapter will be focused on what can be already taken as an exploitation. We might consider of example of person A trying to benefit from another person, but eventually ends up on the wrong side and suffers horrible loss, when considering business standpoint. Is it still exploitation, when there was just intention, but the overall result ended up wrong for the person, who wanted to exploit? (Ferguson, 2016)

3.2.3 Exploitation and harm

This subchapter will be focused on the harm connected to the exploitation, as mentioned before, when considering exploitative behavior, one must benefit on the behalf of someone else, but let us have a situation when both parties involved might benefit simultaneously, but there is still exploitation on point. Allan Buchanan defines exploitation as “the harmful, merely instrumental utilization of him or his capacities, for one’s own advantage or for the sake of one’s own ends” (Buchanan, 1985)

Some paradigmatic cases of exploitation correlate with this analysis. In instance, when considering slavery, it is exploitative relationship, where one side is exploit and harmed and the second party benefits from their actions. On the other hand, there might be seen exploitation, which might be beneficial for both parties involved.

Let us have a person A, who is stuck in the desert alone and without water, but eventually finds another person who is selling waters. The price of the water is 1000 USD, which is ridiculously high, but both parties involved know that they need this trade to happen. Person stuck in the desert does not want to die and the other person knows it, therefore the price for the water is this high. In this case it is clear that one person is taking unfair advantage of another, but if the other person will deny this offer there is a possibility of death, therefore this trade will probably happen and both sides have simultaneously benefit, however one has taken unfair advantage of another. In this case exploitation probably occurred, however there was no coercion.

There might be a case, where coercion happens simultaneously with exploitation. Let's have an example of mugger, who have chosen a victim and eventually is trying to steal money from this victim. The mugger has a knife and gives options to the victim either to handle all the money or lose his or her life. It is clear that handling the money is the better option and in doing so both sides faces benefits, one is not losing life and second being richer on behalf of the victim, however the victim would be still better off, when there would be no mugger, this is making contrast with previous example where the person in the desert would not be better if the exploiter never showed up. (Weirtheimer, 1996)

To summarize this, coercion is the act, which often includes threats and following coercer demands, in contrast with exploitation, which often include offers made by exploiter, which are being interpreted by such person to induce a feeling in the victim that they will be better off, if they follow exploiter proposals. Therefore, exploitation does not necessarily harm the victim physically or mentally, due to the fact that the victim could end up worse, if the exploiter would have never showed up.

3.2.4 Exploitation and unfairness

When considering the term exploitation, the most common feeling connected to that is unfairness, but there could be several cases of unfairness, which are needed to mention and describe, we might face procedural unfairness or substantive unfairness.

Procedural unfairness is a term, when person A unfairly utilizes or creates defect during the transaction with person B. This could be better shown on the examples such as having two brothers, when one of them is trying to change the money with another, however one of them is too young to understand the value of money given. In this case the older brother will change with him 5 cents for 25 cents, taking advantage of younger brother and his lack of knowledge. This might be interpreted such as one brother created a defect within the transaction and gain benefit on behalf of the younger one.

Another example could be connected to the psychotherapist, who takes advantage of the patient mental disbalance and induces a romantic feeling with the patient to engage sexual relation. Even though that there is no fraud or threatening whatsoever, there is clearly visible of the doctor taking advantage on patient behalf, due to the fact that the patient's mental conditions are not at 100% and that is the reason, why he or she looked for medical help. (Jansen and Wall, 2013)

Substantive unfairness is a term, where one person did not follow fair and equitable reasons to dismiss, fire or benefit on behalf of another person. When considering example of substantive unfairness, which might be connected to the labor market, there could be a person, who have not done anything wrong, but eventually has been fired, without relevant reasons.

Among these reasons of being relevantly fired could be, if there was any misconduct from employee, which is substantiated by any proof or if the dismissal is appropriate for breaking any rule: e.g. having lunchbreak 5 minute longer than allowed, but there is no harm for the company in doing so. This is rather more subjective than the procedural and one cannot say for sure if the exploitation has taken place if not proven otherwise. (Pagelschulenburg.co.za, 2022)

3.2.5 Moral weight and moral force of exploitation

The main goal for this part of the thesis was to set conditions about exploitation theory and to understand meaning of person A exploits person B, however there is needed to also write about normative tasks (based on social norms) than purely conceptual. For this reason, adopting Alan Wertheimer terminology will be necessity. This terminology is divided into two subgroups one of them is called moral weight of exploitation and the second one is called moral force of exploitation.

Moral weight of exploitation refers to the intensity of this wrongdoing, where moral force is more likely to describe reasons for action that exploitation might or might not involve for parties to the transaction or for society. There are no doubts that exploitation in its determined meaning is harmful and nonconsensual, but when exploitation happens in the context of mutually advantageous and consensual transactions, there might be seen quite difference if this practice is really bad. (Wertheimer, 1996)

Let's have two parties on the labor market, employer and employee, the employer is offering for the job 5 dollars, but employee is willing to be paid 3 dollars, however not knowing that when the job is done the employer will get for the good or service 12 dollars, therefore both sides will agree for the 5 dollar salary, however the employer benefit is bigger than the one of the employee, but both parties agreed on the mutual transaction and no one can say what would happened if there would not be any transaction and if there would be none it might cause more damage than the one which occurred. This was also recently formulated as NON-WORSENESS CLAIM.

According to Wertheimer and Zwolinski in their published article, they have said that: "Interaction between A and B cannot be worse than non-interaction when A has a right not to interact with B at all, and when the interaction is mutually advantageous, consensual, and free from negative externalities." (Wertheimer 1996, Zwolinski 2009)

This phrase has been examined later on by other exploitation theorists, who are against any form of exploitation, but even though they think that NWC might be the right thing, therefore

it would be a mistake to punish individuals, who were part or initiated exploitation, which eventually helped both parties. Example of non-worseness claim could be pointed out in the situations of natural disasters, let us have earthquake, due to this disaster there are people with damaged or broken electricity in the house, sellers of these generators go from the house to the house and trying to sell it for higher prices than normal. From one perspective this might be unethical, but from the other hand, if the people are willing to buy these goods for higher prices, we could say that both sides mutually benefited, because there are in better conditions with generators than without it. The moral question pops up, if it is morally worse to provide customers benefits for higher price or not to provide any benefit at all?

Moral force of exploitation is a term, which refers if and in what circumstances should the state intervene, when the exploitation occurs. Theorists argue that, if the transaction between person A and person B is mutually advantageous and one party is not violating the others party rights, then the state should not intervene , because such intervention could end up in the failed transaction and the person B could experience more harm than being exploited in the case of mutual beneficiary situation. (Zwolinski, 2017)

Exploitation theorist Woods suggested that instead of state intervene by tools such as prohibition or fines, the state might think of redistribution, which might prevent exploitation. It might be said that addressing a react to the vulnerability problems of one party and eventually remove the hardship, which makes the party vulnerable could lead to removal of exploitation as well. If the workers in the third world had an acceptable life conditions with social security and option to save at least some money, they would be less inclined to accept the job in the sweatshop and eventually be less vulnerable to exploitation. (Wood, 1995)

3.2.6 Applied issues in exploitation theory

This last subchapter from the exploitation will be focused on the issues commonly known in the world, where the exploitation occurs on the daily basis.

First example is about Universal Basic Income. There was said by some theorists, for instance Philippe van Parijs. Universal basic income is a tool, similar to cash transfer, funded

by taxpayers. It is paid to every citizen within the country, regardless of being employed or even have the will to work at all. However, the UBI might look like a great idea, there are some skeptical opinions that it might facilitate a form of exploitation. (van Parijs, 1995)

One of the critics, Stuart White, have argued that people, who are willing to work and be a part of cooperation within society are being exploited by those, who have no intention to get a job, therefore they are not willing to bear the cost and contribute on the scheme of cooperation in return for UBI.

To have a better understanding, one should collect some empirical and normative claims. On the empirical side, there might rise a question, if the UBI would really lead in more cases, where the transfer was violated or if the reciprocity has risen. (White, 1997)

In contrast with the theorists, who were accepting the UBI and were emphasizing with the idea of unpaid labor, where the universal basic income would lead to fairer application of the reciprocity principle than welfare systems that condition benefits on doing paid work, there were also those, who did not agreed with such idea and argued that it would just increase incentives to work part-time and use welfare programs such as the UBI, which would eventually lead to lowering tax revenues for the state. On the normative side, one should think about, what is the ideal of reciprocity, what it requires and how it fits within the broader picture of distributive justice. (Zwolinski, 2017)

Second example will be focused on Sweatshop labor. This term is usually connected with the places, where employers utilize low-skilled workers. This term refers to places within developing countries, characterized by long working hours without any rest, overtimes for minimum hour rate, low sometimes less than minimum salaries and unsaved working conditions. The majority of cases, where the term sweatshop occurs is connected with contracts for multinational level companies, who are afterwards selling those goods to customers in the wealthier countries.

Such practices often face a lot of critics and this is not an exception due to their high exploitative motives. The major part in this issue is focused on low wages, which are being in the sight of the critics, according to them, the sweatshops have the moral obligation to pay their workers at least the living wages. The critics see the duty to pay the employees dignified

salary, because of the high need of the workers as well as the fact that a majority of the multinational level companies are enough profitable to increase the salaries without harming the company. (Meyers, 2004)

Other critics have a different opinion on the sweatshops, they see it as a one symptom of the broader failure for the respect towards the people. The failure of respect than eventually manifests into sweatshops and things connected to it, such as: violation of legal labor standards, endangering employees in bad physical conditions, coercion of the workers and their abuse. (Arnold and Bowie, 2003)

As mentioned in the first example, there comes several empirical and normative points of view. From the empirical side, one can ask questions about the conditions within the sweatshop, other question is, what would be the adequate wages, when comparing sweatshops and other companies in the third world, would there be a high difference? Would it be helpful for the workers and their being to increase minimum legal wage or would it lead to layoffs and plant allocation?

On the normative side, there pops a question about topic already mentioned and that is Non-worseness condition. In this case sweatshops are providing jobs and are injecting money into the developing countries, therefore if the companies are providing at least some benefits for the people within the country, is it morally worse than the companies, which are not outsourcing their production in other countries at all?

If we would agree with the statement that exploitation occurs within the sweatshops, should the people justify it and eventually what weight would they put, if the exploitation would be present, but on the other hand, if they would be well aware of the benefits for the overall economy and economic growth?

The last example from the applied issues in exploitation theory will focus on commercial surrogacies. This is a practice, where women are paid to become pregnant and as a result of artificial insemination or implementation of the already fertilized egg, the women have to sign the document, where they are abandoning all their parental rights. Even though that most surrogacies are domestic, which means that future parents and the surrogate is from the

same country, there is still significant number of international surrogacies, where intended parents are mostly from the wealthier country than the surrogate is.

Either domestic or international surrogacy, both of them have faced challenging criticism from several point of views. Some of the critics have argued that surrogacy is making objectionable form of commodification, on the other hand some have argued that surrogacy is harmful to the children and to women as a class. However, most of them have agreed that this practice is often exploiting the women, who serve as surrogates. When considering international surrogacy, the lack of employment and any alternate sources of income has undermined the women to undergo this process and have been often paid as low as 10% for the same service when comparing to domestic surrogacies.

The critics did not stop just on the international level, but also pointed out few disturbing charges against domestic surrogacies as well. One of them was that the artificial mothers are often too young to be a part of such process, due to the fact that they cannot fully understand the physical and psychological risks connected to such action, moreover the worries of getting inadequate compensations for the cost they incur, seems on point. (Zwolinski, 2017)

Questions and debates over the surrogacies seem similar to those of the sweatshop problem, however some critics believe that surrogacies are intrinsically wrong. They have argued that women reproductive labor should not have been sold at any price, although it might be mutually beneficial. They see commercial surrogacy as a tool, which might involve kind of exploitation, due to the fact that it entitles women in the activity, which is harmful to their moral character. (Anderson, 1990)

3.3 Discrimination

In this chapter I would like to focus on another issue within the business ethics. In the next several subchapters the concept of discrimination will be described as well as what does it meant to discriminate against an individual or the group of people.

3.3.1 A First approximation of discrimination

In the review of the international treaties, theorist Wouter Vandenhole points out that there is no universal definition of discrimination, moreover the human rights fail to define discrimination at all, there is just said a set of rules providing, why the discrimination is prohibited. (Vandenhole, 2005)

However the International covenant on Civil and political rights declares following: the law shall prohibit any discrimination and guarantee to all persons equal and effective protection against discrimination on any ground such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status” (Article 26)

Also the European convention for the protection of Human rights declares that : The enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in this Convention shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, color, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status”
(Article 14)

Standardized approaches to discrimination consist of actions, practices or policies, which are in particular sense based on the social group to which those, who are discriminated belong. Discrimination against other human being is necessarily oriented, due to the fact of being a member in a certain type of social group, however it is important to mention that discriminatory conduct is imposing some harm or wrongdoing, disadvantages towards the people at whom it is directed.

The important milestone within discrimination was the opinion of the U.S. supreme court in the case *Brown v. Board of education*, the Court writes following: Segregation with the sanction of law ... has a tendency to retard the educational and mental development of negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system” (Law.cornell.edu, 2022)

Following the case of Brown, the disadvantaged group has to be under comparison to appropriate another social group. In our case the comparable society would be the same as the disadvantaged group. Typical relevant comparison could therefore be white citizens of the same state. It would be a mistake to compare black citizens of Kansas and black citizens of South Africa due to the fact that it is not proper class comparison.

The valid comparable class is determined by normative principles. To prove it in our case of Brown, all American states are obliged to provide education to black race that is no worse than the education for the white citizens and all other comparison in different countries are not relevant. Needed to mention that American states have also the obligation to provide education to every citizen, therefore the discrimination occurs, if some of the states fail to provide education, which is equally good to the black citizens, if the state provide it to the white citizens.

If the situation like that would have happened again, there would be therefore double wrongdoing, first one would be how are black citizens treated in comparison to whites and the other wrong would be the denial black citizens education at all. (Altman, 2020)

3.3.2 Moralized concept of discrimination

The moralized concept of discrimination is picking out acts, policies or practices, which are badly imposed towards the specific social group and making this group disadvantaged in comparison with other groups, on the other hand the non-moralized concept is arguing with the term wrongfully, without any specific clarification.

When applying these two concepts towards the sentence “discrimination is wrong”, it can be either tautology, which would mean that one has a proof that the discrimination really occurred and that would be the moralized concept or it can be substantive moral judgment of the person and that would be the non-moralized concept.

If there are argues about the action or practices, one should always consider using the moralized concept of discrimination, due to the fact that only hard proven evidence might actually challenge such a problem in the society. (Altman, 2020)

3.3.3 Types of discrimination

Many legal theorists as well as legal systems are distinguishing several types of discrimination, among these types we can find direct and indirect discrimination, intentional and institutional, individual and structural.

3.3.3.1 Direct discrimination

Direct discrimination is a type of action, where one party is aiming to disadvantage another people for being in different social group. Let's have an example, which happened in 2002 in a Romanian bar. Several men of Roma descent have decided to enter the bar, however the bartender refused to serve them anything and just pointed out a sign on the door, where the sign was saying "we do not serve Roma". (Schiek; Waddington; Bell, 2007)

After being accused of the discrimination the court made a decision, that the bar's policy has been intentionally and explicitly disadvantageous towards the Roma descent, moreover the bar has been proven guilty of direct discrimination.

Even though that the example of the bar was obvious with the reference of the discrimination, there might be cases which are not such explicit as the one mentioned earlier. There was an era of Jim Crow, where the southern states in the US used literacy tests for the purpose of excluding African-Americans from certain activities and to make them disadvantaged.

Due to the fact that African-Americans were denied to be educated, that was the main reason, why they could not pass the literacy tests and the people, who were making the tests did know this fact, however there was no sign or any other explicit tool, which would make it more public.

To clarify it even more, even though that there was no explicit reference to the race, their usage was case of direct discrimination. The reason for that roots in the point that the people, who were working on the test or the people who implemented it. Therefore, the tests looked racially neutral, however in the real world the test excluded African-Americans and left white race unaffected. (Altman, 2020)

In contrast with these examples, theorist Lippert-Rasmussen, have pointed out the fact that there is a possibility of having direct discrimination, however it is not intentional, moreover there is no intention to disadvantage anyone, because of the fact that he or she is part of a group. The case of unintentional, but still direct discrimination might be an employer, who refuses to hire women for a specific job, not because they are women, but because of the hiring criteria for the job. Let's have a company, which are moving people furniture, the probability of having a woman in such a company is minimal, due to the fact of possible entry requirements, which might be to lift specific weight. In this case the men will be more successful than women thanks to the different physiology of the body. One can ask a question how many employers would give a regular chance to a woman to show her skills and capabilities, however if that would not be a case then the employer is guilty of direct discrimination. (Lippert-Rasmussen, 2014)

3.3.3.2 Indirect discrimination

Indirect discrimination might be the action, which is imposing disproportionate disadvantage towards specific group of people, although there might be no intention to do so.

The European Court of Human rights have said that “when a general policy or measure has disproportionately prejudicial effects on a particular group, it is not excluded that this may be considered as discriminatory notwithstanding that it is not specifically aimed or directed at that group” (Shanagan v. U.K., 2001)

The ECHR has pronounced following criterion: a policy with disproportionate effects counts as indirect discrimination “if it does not pursue a legitimate aim or if there is not a reasonable relation of proportionality between means and aim” (Abdulaziz et al. v. U.K., 1985)

Even though that there are some criteria written down, it seems that institutions, which are deciding, whether the discrimination occurred or not, cannot fully agree, however all the criterions have a common thought that action, which has disadvantageous impact towards any social group cannot be dismissed just as a mere accident, but rather to be justified.

For the illustration of the example regarding indirect discrimination, there was a case in the U.S. Supreme court called Griggs v. Duke power.

The point of the case was in the issue that the company Duke power used written tests and according to the results the company decided about promotions. The overall results from the tests caused that majority of black employees failed to qualify for the better position within the company, however the company was not accused of the issue of direct discrimination, the court found out that the tests are not measuring the essential skills needed for the job as well as that the state of North Carolina had a long history regarding bad treatment towards the black people. After further consideration, the court has decided that the tests had disproportionate racial impact combined with the unnecessary of the tests at all, because they were not relevant with the fact of who is the best candidate for the promotion. (Griggs v. Duke power)

3.3.3.3 Organizational and institutional discrimination

When considering the concept of discrimination, one should be aware of not just individual concept of discrimination but also the concept, where the organization or institution might be the one, who is doing this moral wrongdoing.

Corporations, universities and other group agents can also act in discriminatory ways, if this is the case then the discrimination is organizational. There are argues among public, whether institutions are capable of doing such thing and the answer is debatable and cannot be straightly answered. Let's have an example of the board within university, which might vote for adaption of certain policy, if the people, who are members of the board, will have negative attitudes towards some social group and the adoption of certain policy will be accepted and is affecting the group, then the university have been acting in the discriminatory way. (Altman, 2020)

On the other hand, from organizational discrimination, there is also institutional, which is sometimes called structural discrimination. The institutional discrimination is often connected to legislative bodies or executive officials, these types of discrimination is usually regulating the rights, among these regulations one can count, property ownership, family relationships as well as everyday transactions. Also Fred Pincus has written that: "the key element in structural discrimination is not the intent but the effect of keeping minority groups in a subordinate position" (Pincus, 1994).

3.3.4 The wrongdoings of discrimination

When considering all the wrongdoings in regard with direct discrimination, one should look at it from the several points of view.

The first view about the wrong of direct discrimination is that the one discriminating is acting at expense of others, even though that the one who is being discriminated cannot change the traits moreover is incapable to change them. Majority of theorists has agreed with this concept, however Boxill argued with this view, due to the fact that he thought about cases, when the discrimination is justifiable, even though that these people cannot change the traits. (Kahlenberg, 1996)

Let's have an example of blind person, who is trying to gain driving license. There might be people saying that this is form of direct discrimination, however it is justifiable not to give such a person driving license, because in doing so other people might get harmed by that decision. Even though that this is a discrimination, there is a possibility of justifying, when considering safety of others. (Boxill, 1992)

The second point of view lies within the attitude to discriminate according to the stereotypes. The example of such a case have happened in the state of Virginia, where the State was trying to defend hiring just men for the job at Virginia Military Institute. The defense in this case was testifying for the Institute in the way that it is not discriminatory, due to the fact that the policy was relying on generalizations between men and women. The Supreme Court has decided against VMI in the way that it must not rely on the generalizations and capabilities of males and females. The wrongdoing in this case lies within the reasoning that even if the generalizations of men and female capabilities would be true, there is no justification of denying females of their right to have the same opportunity. (US v Virginia, 1996)

The third view is connected with the wrongdoing of treating person according to their merits. This was supported by the theorist Hook, who said that hiring decisions according to anything else except the decision of who is best qualified for the job, are wrong. The controversy in this opinion was immediate and opponents of this theory have argued that

criteria, which are determining the qualifications for the job are not reasonable and therefore hiring process according to the merits is more connected with the efficiency than to fairness. (Cavanagh, 2002)

The fourth view of reasoning why the direct discrimination is wrong is focusing on the connection to prejudice. Prejudice itself may invoke feelings connected to intellect, skills, antipathy towards the targeted group. Let's have an example of Jews, who are trying to get a job in the bank, however the recruiters of the bank have a prejudice towards Jews, which lies within the myth that they are greedy and likely to steal. Therefore, the wrongdoing of prejudice may evolve into discrimination by not hiring them, moreover, not even get a chance to request for the job. Theorist Dworkin is supporting the view by adding that discrimination connected to prejudice might be justified only if there is a proof of true with that prejudice. (Dworkin, 1985)

3.3.5 Discrimination and the job market

This chapter of discrimination will be focused in regard with the job market. There were debates over the topic of discrimination on the job market as well as the explanation, when the discrimination occurred. This section will be divided into three subgroups, discrimination as the misallocation of the jobs, discrimination according to preferences and beliefs and discrimination in regards with social divisions.

Discrimination and the misallocation for the job refers to the belief that the most qualified job seeker should be entitled for the job, due to the fact that the person deserves it, because of his or her merits. However, it was argued that there is a close link between deserve the job and having merit for the job. Every potential applicant for the job is deserving it according to his/her skills and qualifications achieved. The question arises, why one's merit support should be also the moral claim for the job.

The critics of the meritocratic hiring argued that it is more rational self-interest from the employer side, moreover that meritocratic hiring is not an adequate reason for the most qualified job seeker to claim a position. Thus, the main question arises, how big is the difference among meritocracy hiring as normative standard and the economic models, which are describing how do in reality employers allocate these jobs. According to theorist Miller,

jobs should be given to those, who deserve it, due to their skills or superior education among job seekers. However, by doing so, the employer may face critics from customers, because they might have prejudices towards this person. (Lippert-Rasmussen, 2017)

Let's have an example of person, who is by far the most adequate candidate for the job, thanks to his previous experiences and acquired skills, however there were rumors about the candidate of some wrongdoing in personal life, therefore he/she is in the customer eyes seen as bad, if such an candidate is accepted for the job, the employer may face denial from the customer side and decrease of revenue in the company.

In contrast with those, who sympathize with meritocratic hiring, there are few objections from other theorists, who are pointing out that, meritocratic meaning is not right in case that there are equally same opportunities in other aspect of people's life, e.g. education. If that would be a case, then there would be on point from employer to engage in affirmative actions, which would help those from disadvantaged conditions, which would equalize those, who were. This could be also called as meritocratic hiring under non-ideal conditions. This section could be summarized as, when the employer misallocates the job, then he is acting under discriminatory hiring process. The Meritocratic hiring is an action, where the employer has the duty to give the job to most qualified job seeker, in contrast with this opinion one can think about possibility of allocating the job in regard with the social welfare and the overall help for the broader society.

The second section is aiming on the wrongdoings based on preferences and beliefs, it is known that people are sometimes acting according to their biases, which is told by theorists as intrinsically wrong, it is said that such wrongdoing is showing the lack of respect. This approach is set to define distinctions between preferences and beliefs. Theorists believe that this problem has roots in the history and historical biases towards salient groups.

Let's have an example of 100 applicants for the job in the first round of interviews, the employer has the prejudice towards those, who have the ginger hair, due to the fact that during employer's childhood, he/ she was imposed of bully from the person with ginger hair. This prejudice remained with the employer for the whole life and is therefore intrinsically wrong, because not all people with ginger hair would do the same thing. According to this

event from the childhood the employer will have prejudices and eventually will prefer other candidates for the job.

The third and last section connected to the discrimination and the job market will be focusing on understanding of the concept in regards with broader social divisions. When considering the discrimination on the job market one should think about the broader patterns, which corresponds with social differentiation. Theorist Hellman have concluded the idea of wrongful discrimination as the problem of pointing out differences, which humiliate the people with these distinctions. He said that, if the employer makes differences among his employees, which might be humiliating if they are in regard to broader culture.

When considering example from the real life, let's have a casino employees, where men and women have different dressing standards, this is judged to be humiliating for the women, who might not want to follow the idea that their body is for adornment and enjoyment by others looking at them.

On the other hand having the example of nursing home, which refuses to hire man or female to taking care of the opposite gender is not demeaning, thanks to the fact that it does not reflect that one of the gender is less worthy rather than that the practice of having same gender, when taking care of elderly people, is more like convention, because of private functions and ability to see the old people naked seems more appropriate for the same gender than the opposite one. Therefore, even though this approach is discriminatory, it should be viewed differently due to the circumstances. (Lippert-Rasmussen, 2017)

4 Practical Part

This section of the diploma thesis will focus on my own research. The research has been done through interviews, which aimed towards the attitudes among three group of stakeholders. First group of stakeholders are people, who are owning their business, the second group of people are those regularly employed in the institutions and the last group of people are those, who are self-employed.

I have primarily chosen these groups, due to their different position on the labor market and therefore their attitudes towards the problematic issues of exploitation and discrimination might be different. Due to the respondents wishes, I have decided to keep them in anonymity, providing just brief summary about their education, field of business, age, gender and nationality. Most of the interviews have been done in the Czech language and trans crypted afterwards, if the nationality of the respondent is different than Czech, then the interview has been done in the English language.

4.1 Respondents

Respondent	Gender	Age	Nationality	Education	Field of business
Employee 1	Female	50	Czech	High school with state exam	Banking sector
Employee 2	Female	57	Czech	University - bachelor degree	Accounting sector
Employee 3	Male	28	Czech	University - bachelor degree	Pharmaceutical sector
Employee 4	Female	24	Czech	College	Medical sector
Employee 5	Male	25	Czech	University - bachelor degree	Accounting sector
Employer 1	Male	31	Czech	High school with state exam	Food sector
Employer 2	Male	28	Czech	High school with state exam	Food sector
Employer 3	Male	30	Czech	Vocational school	Food sector
Employer 4	Male	43	American	University - bachelor degree	Investment sector
Employer 5	Male	55	Czech	University - masters degree	Accounting sector
Self-employed 1	Male	54	Czech	University - masters degree	Rentals sector
Self-employed 2	Female	57	Czech	High school with state exam	Rentals sector
Self-employed 3	Male	34	Czech	High school with state exam	Insurance sector
Self-employed 4	Female	53	Czech	University - masters degree	Medical sector
Self-employed 5	Male	59	Czech	Vocational school	Blacksmith

Table 1 - Own creation

When looking into the overview of these three groups of stakeholders, one can say that several fields of business have been used for the purpose of having as much attitudes from different fields as possible as well as the age of the respondents differ throughout 2 generations, which may give also different points of view, if the attitude towards this problem may evolve with the age.

4.2 List of questions

- Are you familiar with the concept of discrimination and exploitation in regards with business ethics?
- Have you ever faced exploitation?
- How would you react to this problem?
- Do you feel any difference between discrimination and exploitation, if so, what is the main difference you see?
- It is said, that sometimes the exploitation might be beneficial and wrong, do you see any real-life situation, when this might happen, and you would be able to justify exploitation in that case?
- There is said by theorists that, if there is a transaction between two parties, where one party is selling something, under special circumstances, which is irrelevantly more expensive than in normal circumstances, then the exploitation occurs, what is your attitude towards this example?
- Exploitation is often connected to unfairness, substantive unfairness is a term, which might happen to everyone, how would you react in such situation?
- Non-Worseness claim is a term, which was challenged by the theorists, where both sides pointed out some pros and cons, is there in your opinion some benefit or is it rather just a term, which is trying to justify exploitation?
- Is there in your opinion a possibility how to prevent exploitation or how to eradicate it completely?
- What would be your reaction towards the company, which was accused of being exploitative, would you still buy their services and goods or rather buy from their competitors?
- What would be your feelings, if the state would established Universal Basic Income?
- The problematic case of sweatshops is known to take place within developing countries, however there is an argue among theorists, if these practices are overall good for the society of that country or not, could you give your opinion on this issue?
- Would you agree that discrimination might be unintentional?
- When do you think one can face institutional discrimination, can you provide some example?

- Theorists argue on both sides that if discrimination is justifiable (case of blind person getting driving license), then it can be dismissed, do you feel this case to be a discrimination at all?
- Discrimination in regards with hiring process is a big issue for a long time, moreover there were institutions (military groups), who were hiring according to the stereotypes of gender, what is your opinion on hiring according to the stereotypes?
- Do you see hiring process according to the merits as a fair one or could you imagine being able to claim a job according to something else?
- Have you ever faced prejudice within the hiring process and being refused as the correct candidate for the position?
- What would be your action, if the most adequate candidate would be accused of some wrongdoing?
- When considering two real life examples of casino dress code and nursing home, do you agree with the Hellman's theory?

These 20 questions are the roots for my practical part, there is needed to mention that the interviews sometimes offered more sub questions, however for the purpose of correlating respondents answers with the literature review, I will do transcriptions just for the questions asked.

4.3 Responses from the interviews

4.3.1 Are you familiar with the concept of discrimination and exploitation in regards with business ethics?

The first question was asked just for the introductory purposes, if the respondents have theoretical background in regards with these two concepts and if they know their basic meanings. All of my respondents have positively answered, that they have heard about these issues providing me brief answers such as:

“Discrimination is, when one is treating others differently, because they are part of some group, towards which the discriminator has some aversion.” (Employee 2)

“Exploitation is, when one is trying to do a business with someone else but trying to rip the money out of the second party.” (Self-employed 3)

These two transcribed answers are just highlighted ones out of the fifteen.

4.3.2 Have you ever faced exploitation?

When asking this question, the answers started to differ according to the field of business as well as the status of employment. When the group of people, who are being employed, started to answer, it was obvious that some of them have already faced it either on themselves or on others. The overall result for the people, who are employed is that they have faced it at the workplace, moreover most of them have experienced this on themselves. The transcript of highlighted answer is as follows:

“I had a boss at my previous job, who thought, I am not working enough, therefore he gave me so much work that I ended up working till late nights even during the weekends, firstly I thought about it, that it is going to stop soon, but the change never came and I decided to quit that job exclusively for this purpose” (Employee 1)

The answers of the group, who are employers on the labor market were mostly negative, reasoned by the fact that, they were worried that they could be facing this and that was the reason, why they have made their own business, however there was one respondent, who told that before starting his business he faced such a practice. The answer follows:

“Before I started my restaurant, I had a part time job during the summer, we have been working six days a week with the average salary of 50 CZK/ hour plus tips, the owner of the restaurant was strict and there was an event, where me and my 5 colleagues were working till late night. The day after, the owner found out that there is a cash missing, however nor me nor my colleagues have taken it, but it ended up by none of us getting the salary for the whole month. Immediately after not getting the money for the prior month, I quit the job.” (Employer 2)

The last group have answered in the similar way as the employers, the answers were negative in the sense that they probably did not face it on the labor market, however there was a response, which differs from the rest and that was as follows:

“I do not certainly know, if this is an exploitation, but in my opinion it was. I was in a need of material and my clients were waiting for my goods, the supplier of mine with whom I was working for several years, promised, that he will bring me the material for the price discussed in advance, however once he came the price was exponentially higher than it was supposed to be, but I was in need of that material, so I bought it, after a while I was told by his other clients that the supplier had gambling issues and that was the reason why the price skyrocketed. Therefore, this was in my view an exploitation.” (Self-employed 5)

4.3.3 How would you react to this problem?

When asking this question my presumption was that it will definitely differ among the groups, however the opposite was the true.

People, who are employed, came to an overall agreement that they would end the relationship in their current job, if the exploitation would be taking longer than some period of time, which differs according to the personality of the person. The only reason, why people would stay in their job, would be the need of financial tools for the purpose of normal living or the fear of not having this salary somewhere else.

“ I would definitely quit the job, my life is too short to be working for the people treating me like someone who is not at the same level as they are, however if I am thinking about it, I must admit that, if there would be no other choice how to feed my family, I would try to overcome it for the necessary period of time, while looking for another job.” (Employee 4)

“You know, I hate to admit it, but if there would be a case, when I would have my dream salary, maybe I would close my eyes for the exploitation and try hard to overcome it, other than this motivation I would certainly quit the job.” (Employee 5)

This was very interesting answer, because it suggests that respondent was aware of possibility of being exploited, but at the same token will be able to close their eyes due to the monthly salary from the job.

The employers come to the overall conclusion that if they would find out such a practice is present in their company, they would definitely examine it deeper and try to find out who is the “bad guy” in this case. They were also afraid, that if such a practice would go public about their company, they would be facing possible troubles from their customers, which might be the end of the company.

“Look, I know that these practices happen, hopefully not in my business, but if I would have found out that they are, I would be looking for the responsible person and immediately fire him, in this modern world of internet, everybody knows about your scandals sooner than you blink.” (Employer 3)

In the case of self-employed people, the answers were pretty clear, because they are working on their own, therefore they see that the possibility of exploitation might be faced just from the people they are doing trades with, if that would be a case, they agreed, they would definitely cancel the exclusivity of the contractor and would try to look for another supplier.

“I would be strict about this, take into consideration current electricity issues and electricity prices. If I know how much I should pay per month and out of nowhere it is being higher without any notification, I see this as an exploitation and if these people are not appreciating me as their client, I will go to someone else. Thanks god we are living in the world of competition.” (Self-employed 2)

4.3.4 Do you feel any difference between the discrimination and exploitation, if so, what is the main difference you see?

This question was tricky for the respondents and I wanted to observe, how they see these two concepts differences according to their personal taste. This question was aimed more for the curious purposes, which differences they see, due to the fact that sometimes it is being challenged as the same thing, than for their attitudes. As I predicted, this is more choice of the personal taste rather than possible differences among various stakeholders.

The answers were mixed, although there was an agreement among various respondents, which in their view there is exploitation, which is definitely bad, but discrimination is even worse according to them. In the views of Employees 4,5 and employers 1,2,3, they have

mentioned that their feeling about discrimination is stronger than in the case of exploitation in the way of being worse and should be solved differently.

“In my view, the difference lies within the emotions involved against other people, if I just do not like someone, I can imagine someone is exploiting, because of antipathies, but when I think about discrimination, the word evoke in me the feeling of someone hating others and those actions are surpassing those of the exploitation.” (Employee 4)

4.3.5 It is said, that sometimes the exploitation might be beneficial and wrong, do you see any real-life situation, when this might happen, and would you be able to justify it in that case?

When I asked this tricky question to all groups, I have provided them no more info on purpose, due to the fact of asking question about Non-worseness claim and giving the info afterwards. The purpose of this question was to gather info, how people are thinking about the concept of exploitation and according to the answers it looks like that only non-beneficial transactions come to their mind.

The first group, which are employees, have been shocked by this question and immediately asked me back, how I mean this question and that exploitation is a bad action. Moreover, respondents added that in their opinion exploitation is not justifiable and that it is never meant to make both parties beneficial.

“Why do you ask such question, I had an opinion that it can be just a bad thing, and therefore I cannot find a situation, when it can be beneficial for both sides, nor I think that one can justify exploiting others and also one exploiting cannot justify being exploited.” (Employee 3)

The second group was of the similar opinion as the first one, only respondent Employer 4, have taken the question in depth and thought about the situation where it might be beneficial. The answer was as follows:

“When I think about in depth, I can see a situation, where it might be beneficial for the both sides, just in case that the one being exploited can overcome this action, when the one

exploiting is offering in exchange something very precious to him, in that case I can think of the example of person trying to convince other to humiliate himself in exchange for money and this money will be so demanding by the person who is being exploited that he/she agrees to do that.” (Employer 4)

The third group of respondents have all shared the idea that the exploitation cannot have any benefits, and therefore is not justifiable at all. None of the five respondents have come with any idea, where it might be accepted by the broader society.

4.3.6 There is said by theorists that, if there is a transaction between two parties, where one party is selling something under special circumstances, which is irrelevantly more expensive than in normal circumstances, then the exploitation occurs, what is your attitude towards this example?

For the purpose of my respondents fully understands the background story, I have introduced them the example from the literature review, which was connected to the person, who is selling some important goods or services after natural disasters.

After explaining the story, answers of the Employees were strictly in agreement with some theorists, who believed that these people should not using natural disaster to his/her own benefit and that it is definitely morally wrong attitude how to react.

The highlighted answer chosen was from the respondent Employee 1.

“If I can imagine being after the natural disaster, where for instance my house was destroyed or part of it and I have no extra savings to afford goods way above their market price, I must fully agree with these theorists, who are referring to this as the exploitation, when the person has no moral good in him and has to use the situation, while others are struggling after natural disaster.” (Employee 1)

However, one might expect such answers from the group one, I was really curious about the answers of the second group, due to their owning a business know-how. Their answers did differ much more from the first group than I expected, where respondents Employer 1, 2, 3, 5 did have an opinion about this situation that the person, who is selling way above the market price is not an exploitation, due to the fact of supply and demand, their reasoning

was clearly built on the business model and employers tend to maximize their profit and that is their nature. Only respondent Employer 4 have shown empathy towards the people influenced by the disaster. The answer I picked from this group was from respondent Employer 5.

“ If such a disaster happens, it is sad, however I do not see selling your goods above the market price as exploitation rather I see it as grasp of the opportunity from the seller side, if the demand is surpassing the supply the price will always go higher than it should be, but that is not an exploitation in my opinion.” (Employer 5)

In the case of the self-employed people the mix of answers was visible. On one side having respondents Self-employed 1, 2, 5, who were of the opinion that it is not exploitation in their view, even thought that they would be sorry for the people, who were affected by the disaster, however they would not judge someone, who is trying to make his/her own living. Respondents Self-employed 3, 4 had a similar feeling as the employees had and pointed out that this is just profiting on the bad events, which happened to others, therefore it is exploitation and that this cannot be justified by any means.

4.3.7 Exploitation is often connected to unfairness, substantive unfairness is a term, which might happen to everyone, how would you react if such situation happens to you?

This question was aimed to examine specific reactions of the respondents, if the substantive unfairness would be used on them, for the purpose of understand from my respondents side, I have told them example from the literature review connected to substantive unfairness, so they would have an exact understanding, what to imagine under the term.

The group of employees have understood the question very properly, due to the fact they have either faced it themselves or have been present, when someone else was treated under such condition. The cross-section of the answers was surprisingly similar. All of the respondents would be trying to defend themselves, if there would be a case, them being fired with none justifiable reason, if there would be an action against them e.g. admonition from

the supervisor, they would get over that, with justification “ the supervisor has a bad day.”
As the respondent

Employee 4 answered:

“If I would be in the situation of being fired, knowing that I did not do any misconduct for the company, I would feel a need to talk about it with my supervisor or the person responsible for my dismissal, if that would not help, I would definitely feel the wrong, which was done on me. If there would be a situation, where the supervisor would give me warning and I would do no misconduct, then I would preferably be quiet and in hopes it would not happen again, if there would be a similar action repeatedly, I would feel the need of quitting the job.”

Group of employers have been looking more from the position being the ones using the substantive unfairness on others. Surprisingly some of them have admitted, that they have taken part in such action.

As respondent Employer 5 have admitted:

“Even though that I hate to admit it, situation similar to, what you have told me, happened to me. There was a day, when one of my still customers have ended the contract with me, immediately afterwards one of my employees have come to work a few minutes late and I have acted impolite to this employee and eventually felt guilty, because of my inadequate reaction. However now, I am being more aware of this problem and trying to keep calm, even though I am not having my best day.”

The last group asked this question has answered in agreement that such action as substantive unfairness is a big issue, but due to the fact that they have been working on their own, they have not faced it, nor they have done it to someone else.

“I see it as a big problem, which I believe is happening every day to someone, although I have never taken part in this action. If such situation would have happened to me, I would feel horrible and try to talk to my supervisor about this.” (Self-employed 1)

4.3.8 Non-Worseness claim is a term, which was challenged by theorists, where both sides pointed out some pros and cons, is there in your opinion some benefit or is it rather just a term, which is trying to justify exploitation?

For the purpose of getting adequate responses, I have introduced my respondents basic theoretical background of the term Non-Worseness claim, which refers according to the theorists to the situation, when being exploited might be still a better option in regards with buying a goods, than having not option to buy at all, as well as pros and cons told by theorists, which are being parts of the debates. When asking their attitude towards this term, I was expecting mixed feelings, due to the fact that even theorists are in no agreement, however there were more negative attitudes from my respondents than expected.

Group of employees had a skeptical attitude towards this. In their opinion, the Non-worseness claim is still part of exploitation and it is therefore morally wrong to act like that and justify it by the mere term. Only respondent employee 3 has seen more of the positive aspects than the negative ones. His attitude was as follows:

“If there is a situation, which is putting life on the line and the possible help for that person lies within someone’s else hands, even thought that the person is acting exploitative, it is still better than zero chance of survival and not getting help from anyone.” (Employee 3)

After asking this question to the group of employers, one could see massive differences in their attitudes, when comparing to the employees. All of my five employers have agreed that it definitely has a lot of benefits and all of them pointed out that, it is always better to have the option at least to buy something, even though it might be more expensive, than not having the option to buy at all.

“Look, there might be for someone narrow line between exploitation and ruthless business and I can imagine that a lot of people will be thinking about it like exploitation, however in my eyes, one should be really glad to have the option to buy and if the price is too high, then they don’t have to buy. I would definitely be glad to have the option than not to have it.”(Employer 4)

In my third group of self-employed people the responses were rather similar to the employers. They were mainly pointing out similar ideas regarding business strategies and the possibility to choose either buy or not to buy the product. Only one respondent Self-employed 4 have taken into consideration another aspect of non-worseness claim and pointed out that she would not take it as exploitation unless there are some aggressive practices involved within the transaction. If that would be a case, then according to my respondent Self-employed 4, it would be an exploitation.

4.3.9 Is there in your opinion a possibility how to prevent exploitation or how to eradicate it completely?

When asking this question, one could expect as many opinions as the number of respondents, however most of the responses were rather similar with the same negative output. The majority of all respondents have the attitude that it cannot be prevented, nor it can be eradicated, due to the fact of human personality and the presence of exploitation for a very long period of time.

Respondent Employee 1 said:

“Even though I would wish the exploitation to be eradicated, I don’t see any possible tool how to do it or how to even prevent it. In my eyes it is something in our human nature and we don’t have to necessary have a bad personality or be a bad person in general, but sometimes it can happen to everybody to act in non-moral way, which is not an excuse, but a fact, which no one can influence.”

Respondent Employer 4 said:

“I would be really glad to get rid of these acts, which are harming our society, however when I am hiring people, I cannot be sure, if they will act in such non-moral way to others. Therefore, I can just hope that it will not happen in my company.”

This answer is interesting, because it suggests that other people are capable of exploiting others, but respondent thinks that he is not capable of this wrongdoing.

Respondent Self-employed 5 said:

“I believe that one can influence only his actions towards another people, so if there would be a chance of getting rid of this issue, everybody would need to think about his actions towards others and act in his/her best intentions. That is in my view the only possibility, how we as a society can influence reduction of exploitation.”

4.3.10 What would be your reaction towards the company, which was accused of being exploitative, would you still buy their goods and services or rather buy from the competition?

When I asked this question, the different opinions as the points of view on this issue come to light as well. On the one side the employees and the Self-employed respondents, who tend to analyze it more from the cost perspective, on the second side the employers, who were more thinking about their reaction and put this example on their companies.

Employees and Self-employed respondents agreed that, if there would be a proof of company doing business in non-moral way, they would think about going to the competition, however they would calculate the potential losses, if they would go to the competition, another major point among my respondents was the type of service or goods the company is providing, if it would be life needed component and the competitors would be more expensive, they would still buy the product, even though they would not agree with the company behavior.

As respondent Employee 3 pointed out:

“If the company would be accused of some moral wrong and I would know that the competitors have identical product for the same or similar price, I would leave the current company as their customer, however if it would be a different scenario, more expensive product or hard to replace, then I would stick with the current company, although I would be highly dissatisfied with them.

Similar attitude was sharing respondent Self-employed 1:

“In such situation, I would definitely look somewhere else for the product, however there might be possibility, when the replacement for the current one is either more expensive or it

lacks in quality, if that would be a case, I would stay with the current one, even though I know this attitude is not helping.”

On the side of employers, I have found out that they initially understood the question of their company being accused of this wrongdoing and how they would react from the positions of leaders in the company. All of my five respondents from this group have agreed that, such accusation might have critical impact on the company name, revenue and reputation, therefore they would immediately look if such accusations are true and eventually fire the employees responsible for any misconduct done. Moreover, the employers shared the common idea, that if charges would not be true, they would still feel outflow of customers from their companies.

As respondent Employer 3 said:

“If I would find out, that it is true, I would definitely fire people responsible for this behavior, moreover I would try to tell the public that the people responsible have already been dismissed from the company. I must admit that if that would happen, I would be scared about the future of the company, because the reputation after the incident would be at the bottom, this would be also connected to the revenue, which would be definitely downward sloping.”

4.3.11 What would be your feelings, if the state would establish Universal Basic Income?

When I have asked this question, I have introduced my respondents the pros and cons according to the theorists, and the results, which I got from my respondents were all almost identical. All my respondents share negative attitude towards universal basic income with no difference if they are employed or they are employing someone else. Their common argument, why this is bad, was similar to the ones presented by theorists, who were concerned about people willing to work and people with no motivation to work getting the same amount of money from the state.

As respondent Employee 2 said:

“ I am working for the past 30 years almost straight, paying taxes and if I would imagine that part of taxes given to the state are being redistributed to all people, even though they have no intention to work and never had any, I would feel angry, because in my opinion, this Universal basic income could work only in the case of all people willing to work. If there are those, who wants to take only, then the system of UBI can never be effective.”

4.3.12 The problematic case of sweatshops is known to take place within developing countries, however there is an argue among theorists, if these practices are overall good for the society of that country or not, could you give me your opinion on this issue?

For better understanding of the concept called sweatshop, I have introduced this issue to all my respondents, before getting their attitudes and answers. The difference in thoughts among the groups were obvious. The first group of employees were looking into this issue from the perspective of the workers with contrast of the second and third group of employers and self-employed respondents, who have taken into consideration more the overall effects on the price of goods as well as the possible benefits for the economy, where the sweatshops are taking place.

The group of employees shared the common attitude of this being a bad thing, which is definitely connected to exploitation and therefore according to them has no benefits at all. In the contrast with this attitude the other two groups have pointed out, that even though they don't agree with the working conditions in the sweatshops, they are well aware, what the costs of the goods would be, if these sweatshops would be eradicated. In my opinion, their thoughts were mixed, due to the fact that they agreed on the needs of these sweatshops, however they don't sympathize with the moral wrongs, which are done there, however they don't seem to have a clear solution towards this issue, rather than some recommendation, what could be changed.

The respondent Employee 4 said:

“I am definitely against these practices, where people are treated like animals in horrible conditions. Companies, which are producing goods in such non-moral way, should be

punished and all the people should recognize this wrong and act towards companies involved in this accordingly.”

The respondent Employer 3 said following:

“Even though I don’t sympathize with the methods used in the sweatshop concept, I can imagine, that the unemployment rate of that country might be minimal, thanks to the big international companies, which are outsourcing their production towards developing countries. From the perspective of business man, I can say that all these big companies wants to minimize their costs at whatever prize, therefore, if there would be an obligation to raise salaries, I am skeptical that these companies would transfer their production to another state, which would just transfer the sweatshops as well.”

Similar attitude was also shared from the respondent Self-employed 2, who said:

“Even though I am really concerned about the conditions, I must admit that I would be afraid of the costs for the goods, if the production would be outsourced in the developed countries in regards with high salaries, therefore I must say that it is a problem, how the sweatshops are treating their employees, however I don’t see any solution towards this, due to the fact that, if the production would be moved, the only ones who would pay the price would be the customers.”

4.3.13 Would you agree that discrimination might be unintentional?

This question seemed as one of the easiest, due to the fact of all my respondents shared the same attitude that discrimination according to them is always intentional. When I was getting responses on the question asked, there was clearly recognizable, how my respondents feel about discrimination in contrast with the questions from the exploitation topic, where the opinions were rather mixed between the groups.

Due to the fact of all my respondents shared the same idea of discrimination being always intentional, I will highlight just two answers.

As respondent Employer 1 pointed out:

“In my eyes there is always intention behind the discrimination, there might be people, who deny it, but in all cases, there is someone, who had the intention to disadvantage others.

This answer surprised me, because there was no suggestion towards the unintentional discrimination, which is not a discrimination according to some theorists, however the respondent seems not to take into consideration the fact that unintentional discrimination does not have to always be considered as discrimination at all.

Respondent Self-employed 1 said following:

“I cannot imagine a situation, where one can discriminate others unintentionally, there might be a case of someone who is responsible for the policy making and he/she does not see the discrimination within the policy, however in that case one should be responsible enough to hear other opinions and try to see the policy from all the views possible. In my opinion the term that discrimination is unintentional is a weak justification for something one cannot justify.”

4.3.14 When do you think one can face institutional discrimination, can you provide some example?

When asking this question to my respondents, there was in the beginning a misunderstanding, between organizational and institutional. For this reason, I have introduced my respondents both these concepts to get proper answers. When getting the answers there was a clear difference in the ideas in regards with age. It was clear that the people, who lived during the communism, could come up with ideas regarding institutional discrimination, on the other hand the respondents, who did not fully experienced communism struggled with the answers and their ideas regarding this issue were not that precise. It seemed that if the age of the respondent was approximately 50 years and more, their knowledge about institutional discrimination was more advanced than those, who are younger.

As the respondent Self-employed 1 said:

“After your explanation about institutional discrimination, I can clearly remember the times, when it was a common thing, during the communist era, one could face institutional

discrimination in instant, here are my two examples happened to me or my family. First example is, when the communists signed the policy that one cannot own a building, if this person is not connected to the communist party, as the result of this policy, my family have lost plenty of buildings in Prague and never get them back, other example is in regards with those, who wanted to choose their job, there was a policy, which was established by political institutions, and this policy was ensuring everybody will get a job, which would be a good thing except that you did not have the right to choose a job, you were entitled to have one, which was chosen by someone else.”

In the contrast with the previous respondent, who lived in the communist era, there is a respondent Employee 4, who were born after the velvet revolution.

“That is a tricky question for me, because I am not well aware, if I have ever experienced this type of discrimination, but in my opinion exactly things like institutional discrimination might happen in the countries, which are under socialist or communist domination. I know from the elders of my family that the rights for ownership were definitely discriminated, but I don’t have anything else in my mind than this example.”

4.3.15 Theorists argue on both sides on the topic if the discrimination is justifiable (case of blind person getting driving license), then it can be dismissed, do you feel this case to be a discrimination at all?

When asking this question, I have told my respondents the story about blind person, who would like to get driving license, but is rejected, and afterwards told my respondents, why some theorists see this as discrimination, while others would not consider this as discrimination at all. The responses were rather mixed, which was not expected from my side. While some respondents were strongly against any justification of discrimination, others have pointed the fact that this case is a rare one, where the concept of discrimination is for the overall good of others and therefore should be justified. However, there was no correlation among the three groups of respondents rather than personal preferences and attitudes towards discrimination.

The two main sides among my respondents were no justification at all and the second side, which shared the view towards this example and justification.

As the respondent Employee 5 said:

“I can imagine that this particular case can be dismissed as the discrimination, due to the fact that it is discrimination for the purpose not to harm others. However, I see this as a really rare example, where the discrimination can be justified. Maybe one should not consider this as a true essence of discrimination rather using a common sense, if it is good for the blind person to have driving license.”

From the group of no justification at all, I have picked the respondent Self-employed 4, who said as follows:

“There is no possible way to justify discrimination and those, who are seeking for the justification by pointing out the irrelevant examples, should consider medical help. I have no understanding for those, who are trying to lighten such issue, by the examples, which does not make sense, why would a blind person seek to have a driving license and if so, how many cases would it be around the globe. In my opinion this is just a way of looking for loopholes, how to justify discrimination.”

4.3.16 Discrimination in regards with hiring process is a big issue for a long time, moreover there were institutions, which were hiring according to the stereotypes of gender, what is your opinion on hiring according to the stereotypes?

For the better understanding from my respondents’ side, I have told them the story about military group in the state of Virginia, which gave my respondents the basic introduction about the concept of hiring according to the stereotypes. The answers on this issue were definitely not single minded as one could expect rather there was a clear difference between those, who are in the position of hiring in the contrast with those, who are being hired.

Employees seemed to have strongly negative attitude towards the issue of stereotypes, however, were well aware of this, happening in the different areas of the labor market as well. On the side of employers, one could noticeably see that because of owning a company, they have the right and the option to choose the best fitting candidate according to them. Therefore, if they see for the particular position best fitting just one gender, they will choose accordingly. Similar attitude was also shared by the Self-employed group, who argued with

similar reasons as the group of employers, however admitting that they are not best to judge, due to their position of not hiring nor being hired.

As the Employee 2 said:

“In my eyes it is a problem, which should be eliminated, however the fact is that it is happening on the daily basis not just in the military, but in every industry on the job market, as an example I can provide HR department, how many males have you seen there working? It is clear that employers are choosing according to the stereotypes, so it fits the best to their needs and the needs of the company.”

The respondent Employer 3 said as follows:

“I am owning a business and therefore I have the right to choose the best candidate according to me, I can understand that there might be objections to someone’s hiring principles, but it does not change the fact, that the owner should have the right to choose the candidate and not the other way around. This might be seen as a strong attitude, but I really stick with it.”

Similar attitude was also shared by the respondent Self-employed 3, who pointed out as follows:

“I was not in the position of being hired as well as being the one, who hires, therefore I cannot properly answer from the experience, but I can imagine the situation, where the employers should have had the exclusive option to choose the best fitting candidate for the company, but they should not misuse their position and act in moral way, but who would like to work for the company, if it is known by non-moral actions to the candidates or employees?”

Both of the examples from the group of employers and self-employed are interesting due to the fact that in the previous question they seemed to be against any justification of discrimination, however when considering it is in their power to choose, they seemed to agree with the possibility to discriminate.

4.3.17 Do you see hiring process according to the merits as a fair one or could you imagine being able to claim a job according to something else?

After asking this question, I have expected more heterogeneous attitudes, however the opposite was the true. It seems that Employees as well as employers and Self-employed respondents are seeing the hiring process according to the merits as the most appropriate one, moreover there were just two respondents from the employers' group, who have admitted hiring a person with other reason than the persons merits. There were also mentioned several times across all the groups the question regarding young people seeking for the job opportunity and their merits, when they are at the beginning of their carriers, this was surprising information, which did not come to my mind in the first place, therefore I am glad that my respondents also took into the consideration this option.

Respondent Employee 5 said following:

“Hiring process according to the merits is according to me the most appropriate way of hiring, due to the fact that it shows the skills people have or obtained, my only worry would be aiming on those, who are starting their carriers, which means they need to get a chance in some company, but I could imagine some entry tests, which would be taken by those who are starting and comparing results from the test to those, who had a chance to acquire similar skills earlier in their carriers.

Respondent Employer 2 admitted following:

“Even though I stand by the opinion to hire according to the merits, I have to confess that during my time as a businessman, I had accepted several times people, who were not the best candidates according to their merits, however they were recommended by my close friends and therefore they got a chance instead of these, who might be more suitable for the job according to CV.”

4.3.18 Have you ever faced prejudice within the hiring process and being refused as the correct candidate for the position?

This question was aimed differently according to the respondents group, therefore people employed were asked, if they have faced it and on the other hand employers were asked if

they have ever used it, the last group of self-employed did have a free option to answer from whatever perspective they wanted. The group of employees have thought that they have been part of a hiring process and being judged by prejudices.

Most of the prejudices mentioned were on the topic of education, the only employee, who have not been a participant in such a hiring process was respondent Employee 1. Respondent Employee 2 moreover added that judgment came earlier in the carrier due to the future possibility of becoming a parent. The rest of my respondents have confessed that in their view the possible denial came soon after the question, which type of school have attended. However, one cannot properly judge, if that was a true reason. My group of employers have agreed that hiring according to prejudices might damage the business, but on the same token they have all confessed that it has happened at least one time, during their participation on the labor market.

Respondents Employer 1, 2, 3, have admitted that they were clearly responsible for denial of the candidate, in case of Employer, 4, 5 it was a mistake of the third person and their participation is therefore limited, because they were not personally hiring or denying the candidate, but found out afterwards, what happened, which left the consequences to the ones responsible.

In case of my respondents from the Self-employed group, I was told that they have never experienced it, due to the fact of their position on the labor market and they have also strictly condemned those, who would be playing a role in this issue.

As respondent Employee 5 said:

“I was once attending the interview and after general talk about myself, there came a question regarding the school I was studying, they have specifically asked, why I have changed the schools and after telling the reason, I was told that they have studied the previous school and eventually told me that they are those, who were able to finish it. This was according to me a clear prejudice towards any other school the candidate is attending.”

Respondent Employer 1 admitted following:

“I have to say, that I have also done something similar during my time in the business, there were a candidates, which would be suitable for the job, but they seemed to me unsympathetic and therefore that was my reason not to accept them, however maybe I should, because the people, which I hired instead, were a disaster to my business.”

4.3.19 What would be your action, if the most adequate candidate would be accused of some wrongdoing regarding business ethics?

This question was asked differently among the groups for the purpose of getting the attitudes of my respondents in the correct way. In the group of Employees and Self-employed people, the question was asked, what would be their action towards the company, if the company would accept person, who was accused of wrongdoings.

The answers were homogenous with the following output. All my respondents from the groups mentioned earlier have answered that their action would be dependent on the wrongdoing as well as the persons justification or the evidence of committing the wrongdoing. The respondents have also high lightened the possibility of accepting the candidate even though he/she would be proven guilty, if that would be a case then all my respondents agreed of leaving such company as their customers.

From the group of Employers, the answers differed and were divided into two different attitudes. First attitude was, that respondent, who was accused of some wrongdoing should definitely justify himself and prove his innocence and if that would be a case the employer would not have a problem of accepting such candidate. This attitude was shared among respondent Employer 2, 3. The second attitude was more skeptical and employers, who would have such a candidate would deny him, because of their fear in regards with customers. They have been nervous that even though the person might be innocent, customers might overlook this fact and give the company a hard time, therefore the employers have agreed not to accept this person at all. Although some disagreements among my employers' group, they have all shared the common idea of not accepting the person, who was proven guilty of some wrongdoing.

As respondent Self-employed 2 said:

“I must say that, if the person would be connected to some wrongdoing and proven guilty and the company would accept him anyway, I would definitely feel the need to change the company for the competitor, because I will not support a company, which is not against these actions. If the person would be able to justify it or would be proven innocent, I would have no problem that the company will accept this candidate.”

Respondent Employer 5 said:

“Even though that the candidate might be innocent, I would be afraid to hire him, due to my fear from customers, which might be overlooking this fact and the company name would be forever connected to the person, who was accused of some wrongdoing and in the current world, where building the reputation is really hard, but ruining it is really easy, I would have no other option, but to refuse this person, even though it could be a great employee.”

4.3.20 When considering two real life examples of casino dress code and nursing home, do you agree with the Hellman’s theory?

For my respondents better understanding I have told them two real life examples mentioned in the literature review as well as I gave my respondents the overall idea about Hellman’s theory. The responds were surprisingly similar, where all my respondents in all groups have agreed with Hellman’s theory, pointing out a fact that it should not be generalized to all examples, rather one should always conclude some opinion on the specific case, in our two examples of casino dress and nursing home, all my respondents agreed that by using common sense, they would condemn the first example and would have full understanding and justification for the second one, due to the differences in each case.

As respondent Employer 4 said:

“I definitely agree with the theory mentioned, however, one should always take into consideration the contrasts in each case and eventually think about it and not immediately judge all the cases on the same note. The casino dress code is definitely a problem moreover, if someone is arguing that one gender should wear something else, because others should enjoy the look, this is to me a huge issue, which should be handled by the owner of the

casino. On the other hand of considering the example of nursing home, I can totally understand their hiring process and I believe this is justifiable reason, which should be understood by the majority of society.”

5 Results and Discussion

5.1 Attitudes towards exploitation

The attitudes from my respondents have definitely differed according to the group they belong to, however they have overall all condemned the wrongdoing called exploitation. The differences among them have been visible and each respondent from each group knew at least a concept of exploitation and the problems connected to it.

First few questions were answered in agreement by not supporting this wrongdoing, however the reactions and actions, which would be made, did differ among the groups in accordance to their position on the labor market. It was also obvious that most of my respondents have come into contact with exploitation and tried to solve it according to their capabilities.

The main differences came, when my respondents were asked about specific examples. During these questions the attitudes towards, what is considered to be exploitation, differ in accordance to each group. Employees were more likely to look from the position of the person being employed in contrast with employers, who sympathized with the attitude of being a good businessman. The group of Self-employed respondents seemed somewhere in the middle of these two attitudes.

The important outline came from my respondents towards the question in regards with prevention or eradication of exploitation. It seems that even though all the respondents share the negative attitude towards this issue, they don't feel to have a power to prevent it nor to eradicate it. My respondents believed that these actions are part of the human nature, which cannot be eradicated and therefore will be forever present.

5.2 Attitudes towards discrimination

The second part of my interviews was aiming to gather attitudes towards the concept of discrimination. The answers gathered did differ similarly to the previous part, however it seemed that most of my respondents sees discrimination as a bigger problem in the society than exploitation.

The main differences among the groups have been present during the questions related to discrimination and the job market, where the employers seemed to share the idea that, if they own the business, it is up to them, who will be the right person for the job, however admitting that they see hiring according to the merits as the best way. Employees and the Self-employed respondents on the other hand did share the attitude to see all possibilities of discrimination as something unjustifiable.

To my surprise, the results shown that employees as well as employers have some experience in regards with prejudice and the hiring process, which could be considered as the big issue for the young absolvents seeking to get their first full time job, due to the fact of most absolvents lack of experience.

The final question from the interviews, which was considering real life examples and Hellman's theory, was surprisingly answered with similar attitudes from all three groups. The arguments given by the respondents seemed to aim for the persons morality and use of a common sense. Even though that employees seemed to deny any justification of discrimination, they have commonly agreed in the example of nursing homes that this should be justifiable, however there is a possibility that they did not see the nursing home example as the discrimination at all.

5.3 Interesting findings

When concluding interesting finding I have aimed for the information provided by the literature in contrast with the attitudes of my respondents.

First interesting finding was that none of my respondents have thought about tools, which might be provided by the state or other executive power, these tools might be fines or redistribution of resources, which could lead to overall decrease in exploitation and discrimination, but it seems that the respondents does not seem to have either thoughts about this solution or trust in the system and intervention of the state.

Second interesting finding was answer from my employee group, which was focused how would they react to the exploitation. The answer was not focusing on quitting the job, but rather under which circumstances the respondent would be willing to overlook being exploited.

Third interesting finding was in regards with discrimination and employers group, due to the fact that all of my respondents were strictly against any form of discrimination, however when the question in regards with hiring process and discrimination has been asked, the employers and self-employed respondents have changed their attitude from being strictly against it to justification, why they have the power to choose, who to hire, even though it will not be the most adequate candidate by the resumé. This seemed interesting, because the contrast of opinions was drastic.

6 Conclusion

After extensively reviewing the information provided by the literature sources as well as my respondents, it can be said that concepts of exploitation and discrimination represents major role of wrongdoings on the individuals as well as the society as a whole. It is obvious that these issues have been present since the beginning of transactions between two parties, however, are more opened to discussions in the recent years.

In summation, this thesis firstly observed the concept of exploitation, its historical background, the wrongdoings and harm connected to it. Then the literature review provided extensive information about unfairness connected to the exploitation and set the differences between moral weight and moral force of it.

Secondly, the theoretical part provided applied issues from everyday life in regard to exploitation. These issues were described on the examples such as Universal Basic Income, problems of sweatshops and commercial surrogacies. Moreover, the whole literature review was written in accordance to the theorist, which have disagreements about the issue and each of them pointing out subjects, which should be challenged and considered.

Thirdly, the thesis focused on the concept of discrimination, which was reviewed also in the theoretical part. The concept of discrimination was firstly introduced by its first approximation, followed by sorting different types of discrimination. Then the thesis moved to the wrongdoings connected to this concept and in the end summarized the discrimination, which is present on the job market.

Fourthly, the thesis moved to the practical part, which was contributed thanks to the interviewers, who were separated into three groups in accordance to their position on the labor market. The groups were as following: the group of employees, the group of employers and the group of people, who are self-employed. These people were asked twenty questions in regard to the concepts of exploitation and discrimination. Questions have been made in accordance to our literature review.

Fifthly, the answers from the respondents were summarized and implemented into the groups they have belonged to. Some of the answers have been also transcribed for the purpose of better understanding of the respondents' attitudes towards these problematic concepts.

The last piece of the thesis then focused on the comparison of the answers given by respondents, for the purpose of highlighting the differences in their attitudes in accordance with their position on the job market.

Lastly, it is always important to consider, if the actions, we are making in everyday life, are in the light of moral good and therefore we do not harm other people by making prejudices, unfair transactions or any other misconduct, which is making others' life worse. On the same token one should also consider the wrongdoings, which might be done by institutions and their moral principles, which might be also harmful to the society, if the policies and actions against these wrongdoings will not be established and sufficiently solved.

7 References

- 1) Abdulaziz et al. v. U.K. European Court of Human Rights, App. No. 9214/80; decided 28 May 1985.
<<https://www.equalrightstrust.org/ertdocumentbank/Microsoft%20Word%20-%20Case%20of%20Abdulaziz%20Cabales%20%20Balkandali%20v%20UK.pdf>>
- 2) Altman, Andrew, "Discrimination", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2020 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2020/entries/discrimination/>>.
- 3) Anderson, E., 1990, "Is Women's Labor a Commodity?" *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 19(1): 71–92. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2265363>
- 4) Arnold, D. and N. Bowie, 2003, "Sweatshops and Respect for Persons", *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 13(2): 221–242., DOI: 10.5840/jpr_2005_3
- 5) Boxill, Bernard, 1992. *Blacks and Social Justice*, revised edition, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield. ISBN: 9780847677108
- 6) Brown v. Board of Education 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
< <https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/109/3>>
- 7) Buchanan, A., 1985, *Ethics, Efficiency, and the Market*, Totowa: N.J.: Rowman and Allanheld., ISBN: 978-0198285335
- 8) Business Ethics Definition and Examples | Indeed.com. Job Search | Indeed [online]. Copyright © 2022 Indeed [cit. 31.03.2022]. Dostupné z: <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/what-are-business-ethics>
- 9) Cavanagh, Matt, 2002. *Against Equality of Opportunity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press., ISBN: 978019926548
- 10) Dworkin, Ronald, 1985. *A Matter of Principle*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press., ISBN: 9780198255741
- 11) Ferguson, B., 2016, "Exploitation and Disadvantage", *Economics and Philosophy*, forthcoming., DOI: 10.1017/S026626711500036X
- 12) Griggs v. Duke Power 401 U.S. 424 (1974).
<https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/401/424>

- 13) Jansen, L. and S. Wall, 2013, “Rethinking Exploitation: A Process-Centered Account”, *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, 23(4): 381–410., DOI: 10.1353/ken.2013.0015
- 14) Kahlenberg, Richard, 1996. *The Remedy*, New York: Basic Books., ISBN: 9780465098231
- 15) Lippert-Rasmussen, Kasper, 2014. *Born Free and Equal?*, Oxford: Oxford University Press., ISBN: 9780199796113
- 16) LIPPERT-RASMUSSEN, Kasper (Ed.). (2017). *The Routledge Handbook of the Ethics of Discrimination*. London: Routledge., ISBN: 9780367735883
- 17) Meyers, C., 2004, “Wrongful Beneficence: Exploitation and Third World Sweatshops”, *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 35(3): 319–333., DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9833.2004.00235.x
- 18) OpenWeb BBVA. OpenWeb BBVA [online]. Dostupné z: <https://www.bbvaopenmind.com/en/articles/a-history-of-business-ethics/>
- 19) Pincus, Fred L., 1994. “From Individual to Structural Discrimination,” in Fred L. Pincus and Howard J. Ehrlich (eds.), *Race and Ethnic Conflict*, Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 82–87., ISBN: 9780429497896
- 20) Schiek, Dagmar, Lisa Waddington, and Mark Bell (eds.), 2007. *Non-Discrimination Law*, Oxford: Hart Publishing., ISBN 978-1-84113-748-3
- 21) Shanaghan v. U.K. European Court of Human Rights, App. No. 37715/97; decided 4 May 2001
[https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#{"dmdocnumber":\["697329"\],"itemid":\["001-59452"\]}](https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#{)
- 22) Substantive and procedural fairness in labour law – Pagel Schulenburg. Pagel Schulenburg – Attorneys | Conveyancers [online]. Copyright © Copyright Charley Moore, the founder and Executive Chairman of Rocket Lawyer [cit. 31.03.2022]. Dostupné z: <https://www.pagelschulenburg.co.za/substantive-and-procedural-fairness-in-labour-law/>
- 23) United States v. Virginia 518 U.S. 515 (1996)
<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/518/515/>

- 24) van Parijs, P., 1995, “Reciprocity and the Justification of an Unconditional Basic Income. Reply to Stuart White”, *Political Studies*, XLV: 312–316.
https://www.academia.edu/8139082/Reciprocity_and_the_Justification_of_an_Unconditional_Basic_Income_Reply_to_Stuart_White
- 25) Vandenhole, Wouter, 2005. *Non-Discrimination and Equality in the View of the UN Human Rights Treaty Bodies*, Oxford: Intersentia., ISBN: 978-9050955003
- 26) Wertheimer, A. 1996, *Exploitation*, Princeton: Princeton University Press., DOI: 10.1093/mind/110.439.888
- 27) Wood, A., 1995, “Exploitation”, *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 12: 136–58., DOI: 10.1017/S0265052500004702
- 28) White, S., 1997, “Liberal Equality, Exploitation, and the Case for an Unconditional Basic Income”, *Political Studies*, 45(2): 312–326. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00083>
- 29) Zwolinski, M., 2009, “Price Gouging, Non-Worseness, and Distributive Justice”, *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 19(2): 295–306., DOI: 10.5840/beq200919215
- 30) ZWOLINSKI, Matt and Alan WERTHEIMER. (2017). "Exploitation" in The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/exploitation/>