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1. Kertas soalan ini mengandungi DUA (2) BAHAGIAN iaitu BAHAGIAN SATU dan BAHAGIAN DUA dalam EMPAT (4) halaman bercetak tidak termasuk kulit hadapan.
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**JANGAN BUKA KERTAS SOALAN INI SEHINGGA DIBERI ARAHAAN**

SULIT
BAHAGIAN SATU/SECTION ONE (60 MARKAH/MARKS)

1. Bincangkan:
   a. Bagaimana organisasi boleh dilihat sebagai satu sistem politik.
   b. Pandangan-pandangan tentang politik organisasi.
   c. Punca-punca wujudnya politik organisasi.

   Discuss:
   a. How organization can be seen as a political system.
   b. The different views of organizational politics.
   c. What triggers organizational politics.

   (15 markah/marks)

2. Jelaskan tahap-tahap diskriminasi di dalam organisasi.

   Describe the levels of discrimination in the organization.

   (5 markah/marks)

3. ‘Burnout’ merangkumi tiga dimensi yang saling berkait. Nyatakan dimensi-dimensi tersebut dan berikan contoh yang sesuai untuk setiap satu.

   ‘Burnout’ consists of three interrelated dimensions. State the dimensions and provide an example to illustrate each of your answers.

   (10 markah/marks)


   Describe the symptoms of ‘groupthink’. Explain the levels of discrimination in the organization and how its presence can cause decision making defects.

   (30 markah/marks)
BAHAGIAN DUA/SECTION TWO (40 MARKAH/MARKS)

Jawapan anda hendaklah berdasarkan kepada kajian kes yang dilampirkan di halaman 3.

*Please answer your questions based on the case study provided on page 3.*

1. Jika anda Georgia, apakah yang akan anda lakukan?

   *If you were Georgia, what would you do?*

   *(5 markah/marks)*

2. Sekiranya ada, apakah perlanggaran etika yang telah berlaku di dalam kes tersebut?

   *What breaches of ethics, if any, occurred in this case?*

   *(5 markah/marks)*

3. Pada pendapat anda, adakah para majikan perlu diberikan hak untuk membuka atau mengambil tahu kandungan email, data-data di dalam computer atau maklumat lain berkaitan kaktangannya? Kenapa atau kenapa tidak?

   *In your opinion, should employers have the right to inspect employees’ email files, computer files and so on? Why or why not?*

   *(20 markah/marks)*

4. Sekiranya anda diminta untuk merangka satu kod etika bagi mengenengahkan isu ini, apakah peraturan-peraturan dan garis-garis panduan yang akan anda masukkan?

   *If you were going to develop a code of ethics to address this issue, what rules and guidelines might you include?*

   *(10 markah/marks)*

KERTAS SOALAN TAMAT

*END OF QUESTION PAPER*
CASE STUDY
E-MAIL ETHICS

E-mail can be an extremely convenient method of communication. The sender can transmit messages whenever he/she wishes, the recipient can read messages and write responses as time allows.

However, the privacy of such messages has become a source of some controversy. In 1993, for example, Macworld magazine published a survey showing widespread eavesdropping by employers and this would mean that employees may be subject to electronic monitoring on the job.

The Macworld survey found that more than 21 percent of the respondents had searched their employees’ computer files, electronic mail, voice mail or other networking communication. Of those who admitted to snooping, 74 percent had searched computer work files, 42 percent had searched electronic mail and 15 percent had searched voice mail.

Why had these searches been conducted? To monitor work flow, investigate thefts, or prevent industrial espionage, some said. But whatever the purpose, there are no legal limits placed on employers “spying” on their employees in the workplace. They are free to view employees on close-circuit television, tap their telephones, search their e-mail and network communication, and rummage through their computer files with or without employee knowledge or consent, twenty-four hours a day.

Georgia Jones learned this lesson the hard way. An e-mail expert, she was hired by a high-tech computer software firm in California to assist with the installation of a new e-mail system and to provide training to the company’s 350 employees concerning how that system should be used. After she had taken the job, she met with officials of the company to plan e-mail installation and training. Among the many questions she asked was, “Will employees’ e-mail messages be confidential?” “Absolutely,” she was assured.

During the training sessions, she repeated this information for the company’s employees: She had been guaranteed that e-mail messages would be kept confidential, so that employees need not worry about the information they sent to one another.

A few months after the e-mail system had been installed and all employees had been trained, two first-line supervisors were fired by management. The rumor mill said they had been fired for “insubordination” and that the e-mail messages they had sent one another strongly criticizing management had somehow ended up “in the wrong hands.” Because she was concerned about this rumor, Georgia decided she should meet with the company’s president.
When she entered the president's office to keep their appointment, she noticed a stack of computer printouts on the credenza located along one wall of his office. A closer look revealed the contents of these printouts: employees' e-mail messages. When she asked, "What are those?" the president answered, "None of your business!"