Part I. Please read the following news story carefully before answering questions.

"A teacher says that he isn't giving a test grade back until Monday, because he hasn't finished grading them all," a participant wrote in an online forum at collegeconfidential.com last Wednesday. "You walk by his desk and notice that yours is done and on the top of the stack. "Would it be unethical to walk close to his desk on the way out and sneak a peek?"

This is one of hundreds of hypothetical scenarios rippling across the Web after it was revealed two weeks ago that some eager business school applicants -- most of them aiming at Harvard -- exploited a technical glitch to get an early peek at their pending decisions online.

Officials at Harvard, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Carnegie Mellon called it an inexcusable ethical breach and rejected the application of any student who exploited the hole. Stanford and Dartmouth continue to deliberate over what action to take.

Others said it was something far more innocent, and accused the schools of pious grandstanding. And the incident seemed to point up for everyone a persistent, digital-age truism: that the social and ethical rules that govern life offline do not always translate neatly online.

"There's a big difference in people's minds between the physical world and the virtual world in how they perceive the seriousness of incidents like this," said Lauren Weinstein, a co-founder of People for Internet Responsibility, an advocacy group in Menlo Park, Calif., that tracks issues relating to the evolution of the Internet. "We have not come to grips with the fact that not all actions are created equal."

The actions that sparked the current debate went like this:

At 12:15 a.m. on Wednesday, March 2, a visitor to an online forum posted instructions for exploiting some sloppy Web page coding at ApplyYourself.com, a company based in Fairfax, Va., that, among other things, handles applications for some of the country's most elite business schools, including Harvard Business School.

"I know everyone is getting more and more anxious to check status of their apps to HBS, given their black box," wrote the individual, known only as "brookbond," referring to applications to Harvard Business School. Harvard's decisions are to go out on March 30. "So I looked around their site and found a way. Here are the steps."

Precisely 119 Harvard applicants followed those steps, which required them to log in to their application accounts with the school and, using some creative copying and pasting from the Web page's source code (something any Web surfer is free to do), create an address that would access their application decision - if one had been made.
About 100 applicants to other business schools at M.I.T., Carnegie Mellon, Stanford, Dartmouth and Duke, which also use the ApplyYourself.com service, made use of the recipe as well. Some applicants saw rejection letters. Others saw nothing.

The schools found out about the breach later on Wednesday, and Harvard decided to act the following Monday. "Our mission is to educate principled leaders who make a difference in the world," Kim B. Clark, the dean of Harvard Business School, wrote in an official statement. "To achieve that, a person must have many skills and qualities, including the highest standards of integrity, sound judgment and a strong moral compass - an intuitive sense of what is right and wrong. Those who have hacked into this Web site have failed to pass that test."

But many commentators thought the ethics of the incident were more nuanced.

"I might feel differently if I knew that the applicants were aware that they were breaking the rules," Edward W. Felten, a professor of computer science at Princeton University, wrote in his Web log. "But I'm not sure that an applicant, on being told that his letter was already on the Web and could be accessed by constructing a particular U.R.L., would necessarily conclude that accessing it was against the rules."

David Lampe, the executive director of marketing and communications for Harvard Business School, does not agree. "Anyone who followed these steps, it would have been very clear to them that this is not the legitimate route to this information," he said. "To us, an ethical breach is an ethical breach whether it happens digitally or in the real world."

But some of the applicants affected said they felt Harvard's decision was overwrought. "For what we did to be considered unethical, you would think it would have to have done harm to someone or gained an unfair advantage to ourselves," said one Harvard applicant in his twenties who works in finance in the Midwest. Some other applicants argued that, in a world where viewing source code and pasting Web addresses are pedestrian tasks, their cyberpeeking was on a moral par with taking a pencil home from the office.

Some experts in business ethics said the students were not the only ones at fault.

"What they would have done in an ideal world was wait to get their results, but that curiosity got the better of them does not make them bad people," said Edwin Hartman, director of the Prudential Business Ethics Center at Rutgers University. "If this were the worst thing businesspeople ever did, we'd be living in Utopia. I think the punishment was a bit harsh."

Marjorie Kelly, editor and co-founder of the Minneapolis-based magazine Business Ethics, said the students were unlucky "to have been in the wrong place at the wrong time," when that message popped up on their screens.

"The real breach was one of flawed security by the schools or the company that designed the software," she said.

Computer-security specialists said the breach required only a minimal tech savvy. "Hacking implies a certain level of ability. These folks were doing something extremely simple," said Adelle McIlroy, of International Network Services, which helps firms find vulnerabilities in
Already at least one potentially gray area has emerged. The schools know which files were accessed because users had to log in. One Harvard applicant's fiancee said she checked his application status without his knowledge. Another applicant, currently a student in Los Angeles, said his sister checked his application when she saw "brookbond's" invitation. He had an admission interview scheduled at Harvard, but it was rescinded today, he said.

"That is a tricky case, and we are certainly willing to listen to people's circumstances. We're not unreasonable people," said MIT's Sloan School Dean Richard Schmalensee. "Look, we're not saying this is the crime of the century here. But it did show ethical insensitivity."

"The analogy I use is, if someone gives you a key to the office and says you can go in there and look at your file, and you do it, did you do something wrong? Yes."

Questions:
※Questions 1 to 10 are single-choice, and a 2-point penalty will be assessed to each wrong answer. Please choose the "most appropriate" answer.

1. Which of the following statements is an undisputed fact? (4 points)
   A) 119 Harvard Business School applicants hacked into Harvard's server.
   B) 119 Harvard Business School applicants hacked into ApplyYourself.com's server.
   C) Stanford University has decided to reject those applicants involved in this incident.
   D) Carnegie Mellon University's Tepper School of Business has decided to reject those applicants involved in this incident.
   E) Each of the above is an undisputed fact.

2. Which of the following is in dispute among commentators and the parties involved? (4 points)
   A) What those "peeking" applicants did is akin to someone taking a key to the office and look at his/her file.
   B) Someone identified only by his/her pseudonym disclosed the secret that prompted those applicants to peek.
   C) Those schools involved all used the service by the same provider to handle their online application.
   D) Not all applicants who peeked succeeded in learning their results.
   E) None of the above.

3. Which of the following is a logical rebuttal to the statement "both MIT and Harvard used ApplyYourself.com's service because they are both on the east coast of the United States"? (4 points)
   A) Duke also used ApplyYourself.com's service.
   B) Columbia did not use ApplyYourself.com's service.
4. What is the main issue of the incident? (4 points)
   A) Whether "brookbond" was also an applicant.
   B) Whether Dartmouth should follow suit and reject those peeking applicants.
   C) Whether it is a wise decision for those schools to choose ApplyYourself.com's service.
   D) Whether computer hacking unethical.
   E) Whether it is unethical to follow someone else's instruction to peek into a not-yet-announced file on a computer you do not own.

5. Which of the following is not a university official? (4 points)
   A) Richard Schmalensee.
   B) Lauren Weinstein.
   C) David Lampe.
   D) Edwin Hartman.
   E) Kim B. Clark.

6. Which of the following is not a suitable headline for this news story? (4 points)
   A) MBA Applicants Pay Price for Unauthorized Site Searches.
   B) College Admissions Sites Breached.
   C) Legal Actions Considered for Admission Site Breach.
   D) Not Yet in Business School, and Already Flunking Ethics.
   E) All of the above are suitable.

7. Which of the following arguments has not been advanced by someone in the story? (4 points)
   A) "Brookbond" hacked, but applicants following his/her instruction are innocent bystanders.
   B) Peeking into a not-yet-announced file is unethical.
   C) It is the responsibility of the schools and ApplyYourself.com to secure the server if they do not want other people to peek.
   D) An ethical breach is an ethical breach wherever it happens.
   E) All of the above have been advanced by someone in the story.

8. Which of the following can be logically inferred from the story? (4 points)
   A) While it is unethical to peek yourself, it is ok to ask your fiancée to do so.
   B) It is unethical to peek only when you are caught.
C) Business schools have a higher ethical standard than law schools.
D) Peeking itself is unethical, even when the one doing it did not know it is wrong and no
one was harmed by the action.
E) The lack of physical boundaries in cyberspace is having an impact on people's moral
judgments.

9. Those who accused the schools of "pious grandstanding" did so because they
thought ... ? (4 points)
A) the schools blamed those peeking applicants only because they can not catch
"brookbond."
B) the schools had been saying very little about the ethical lapses common in the
business world, and was taking this chance to show that they cared.
C) the schools were embarrassed by their security lapse and were trying to shift the
blame.
D) the schools were embarrassed by their lack of good judgment in choosing a
less-than-secure service provider and were trying to shift the blame.
E) all of the above.

10. Which of the following statements is a "fact," instead of an "opinion"? (4 points)
A) It is not clear that an applicant, on being told that his letter was already on the Web
and could be accessed by constructing a particular U.R.L., would necessarily
conclude that accessing it was against the rules.
B) By rejecting those peeking students, the schools were engaging in pious
grandstanding.
C) What those peeking applicants did show significant ethical insensitivity.
D) Lauren Weinstein thinks there is a big difference in people's minds between the
physical world and the virtual world in how they perceive the seriousness of incidents
like this.
E) All of the above.

11. The highlighted (boxed) parts in the news article contrast two different analogies
regarding those peeking applicants' behavior. Which in your opinion is the better
one? Why? Or, if you do not agree with either of them, what better analogy can you
offer? Why? (10 points. Write only in English.)
Part II. Please read the following paragraphs before answering the questions below them.

At-Home Genetic Testing Raises Questions Among Observers

Commercials hawking prescription drugs directly to consumers have driven doctors crazy for years. Now comes a new kind of medical marketing that is already troubling some medical professionals: at-home genetic testing.

An increasing number of online startups are marketing tests that can show predisposition to any number of maladies, from breast cancer to blood cloting. They are exploiting the blizzard of genetic discoveries reported almost daily since scientists published the complete map of all human genes five years ago.

The tests are cheap, easy to administer, often just a cotton swab inside the cheek, and the results are available online, cutting out the visit to the doctor’s office.

Plus, the companies note, the test results aren’t usually jotted down on official medical histories, which keeps sensitive information away from insurance companies.

"We are empowering patients with knowledge," said Ryan Phelan, who recently launched the San Francisco-based testing company DNA Direct.

The company currently offers genetic testing, a la carte with prices ranging from $199 to $380, for a predisposition to cystic fibrosis, blood cloting, iron overload and a heightened risk for lung and liver diseases. Testing positive can help customers make lifestyle changes to prevent the onset of disease, the company says.

This week, in a small but dramatic move validating the popularity of the online approach, DNA Direct will begin offering two popular breast cancer tests created and conducted by Myriad Genetics, the most visible player in the field of "predictive medicine."

DNA Direct’s breast cancer testing plans are modest. Initially, it will offer two of Myriad’s less-complicated tests, which screen for only a few mutations on the key genes. DNA Direct expects the tests to cost roughly $300 each.

Since Myriad launched its tests in 1996, demand has skyrocketed.

The company declined to disclose exactly how much in sales the tests accounted for last year, but its regulatory filings showed its "predictive medicine" revenues have grown from $8.8 million US in 2000 to $43 million through the 12 months that ended June 30. The company’s breast cancer tests accounted for the bulk of those sales, a spokesman said.

Until DNA Direct came along, Myriad made the breast cancer test available only to patients who visited a doctor's office or a cancer clinic.

Because DNA Direct employs doctors and genetic counselors to advise its customers, Myriad insists its deal with the company is no different from its traditional arrangements. Myriad still requires a doctor’s order and a signed "informed consent" form for each test it processes.
"As far we are concerned, there is still a qualified physician involved at DNA Direct," said Myriad marketing vice-president Bill Rusconi. "This makes perfect sense to us. In some parts of the country, it's darn hard to get to a physician."

Still, as the popularity of at-home genetic tests soars, so do questions about whether they will be correctly interpreted. Skeptics fret that the online companies don't have the expertise to properly explain the often complicated results.

There are only about 2,000 genetic counselors in the United States, the majority of whom work with pregnant women.

A Centers for Disease Control and Prevention study last year found that primary care doctors in Atlanta and Denver were largely ill-prepared to handle a surge in demand for Myriad's tests after the company tested a $3 million direct-to-consumer advertising blitz in those two cities between September 2002 and February 2003.

And as the technology gets more powerful - the day when a patient's entire genetic blueprint can inexpensively fit onto a compact disk is within sight - the problem with interpreting results will only worsen.

"As often is the case, science is running ahead of public policy," said Dr. Francis Collins, the head of the National Human Genome Research Institute and leader of the government team that published the human genetic map.

The map was a scientific milestone that has made many of these companies possible.

Collins said most patients still need doctors and genetic counselors to help them interpret their test results, services most online companies don't offer. He said it appears DNA Direct is a cut above most genetic testing companies because it employs doctors and genetic counselors. But he said he still worries about cutting the primary care physician out of the equation.

At worse, Collins and others question the validity of some of the tests offered in the largely unregulated market.

"Genetic testing offers enormous promise," Collins said. "But the majority of claims that are made on those websites aren't scientifically sound."

Questions:

※Please answer only in English. Answers in Chinese will not be graded.

1. What do you know about genetic testing? Do you know whether it is commonly used in medical practice nowadays? (15%)

2. What do you know about genetic counseling? What is its importance? (15%)

3. Do you think genetic testing and counseling need to be regulated by laws? Why or why not? (20%)