

2: ge healthcare (b): a csr dilemma

[Health & Medicine](#)



Case Study: Healthcare Number There are certain ethical issues that the GE (General Electric) faced when introducing diagnostic equipment of low costs as a strategy implementation in the developing world. For one, the GE introduced into the developing world/ local market, a product that it would not have otherwise introduced in its mainstream markets due to the product's relatively low performance. In fact, the idea had been shelved in the 1990s for this reason but was later one deemed worthy of consideration in the local markets because of the trade offs that low income users were open to in the prevailing conditions (Singh, 2011). Introducing low performance equipment just because it is in the developing area is thus the first ethical mayhem the group had to contend with. To deal with this concern, the GE has to ensure that the cited laptop based platforms ensures that the performance of this low cost equipment is suitably enhanced, to levels agreeable both in their mainstream markets and in the developing world alike.

Secondly, the company was forced to consider the fact that their low cost and easily available ultrasound equipment had significantly led to the untold 'missing girls' situation in which pre-determination of the fetus' sex using GE's cheap ultrasound device would in some cultures, that preferred male children over females, result in the abortion of female fetuses (Singh, 2011). The GE was therefore accused of promoting this unpalatable trend by cheaply availing fetal sex determination techniques. To counter such stereotypes, GE must do well in the management of their distribution, sales and marketing in such regions so that their devices do not fall into the wrong hands, and to make it known that the GE does not condone the use of its products to facilitate termination of fetuses of 'unwanted sex'.

<https://assignbuster.com/2-ge-healthcare-b-a-csr-dilemma/>

One of the key concepts of profession and applied ethics requires that companies, such as the GE, remain obliged to the society and to serve public interest. However, the idea of introducing low performance equipment into the market for monetary gain shows that the GE put self interest ahead of quality healthcare for its clients and therefore, to an extent, breeched professional and applied ethics (Boylan, 2001). GE is apparently unconcerned about how their products are being used in the markets to facilitate abortions. Their reluctance to at least speak against such behavior is overwhelmingly profound (Boylan, 2001).

The use of ultrasound technology such as the one provided by the GE is contemporarily ubiquitous and is a practice found all over the world. GE does wrong to provide low quality products to selected regions of the world just because they are underdeveloped and will accept anything thrown at them. However, GE is not responsible for how pregnant women choose to use the knowledge acquired from ultrasound regarding their pregnancies. This is more of a cultural and legal problem than it is GE's. It is the function of the legislature (governments) to ensure that abortions are illegal. However, if abortions have been legalized in such areas, then it is even more unfair to criticize the GE. Pressure from investors and human rights groups must therefore be directed at the right people, and not the GE who are only trying to lower the cost of healthcare, increase access to healthcare, improve quality of healthcare and help families prepare for new-born babies. The GE has to however make it know that they will take appropriate action against any illegal use of their products. Depending on the stakeholders of the GE, sale of such equipment can be banned in areas where abortions (especially of certain fetuses) are legal, or where such crimes are rampant.

References

Boylan, M. (2001). *Business ethics*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Singh, J. (2011). *GE Healthcare, A CSR Dilemma*. INSEAD, The Business School for the World.