

Beechnut: risking responsibility and professional ethics

Sociology



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The CEO was required to clear the adulteration accuse of the company and make it regain its normal sales and market share.

He was required to identify the faulty areas in the company, but the route he followed awoke the crisis. He called a meeting with the department heads and stakeholders and expected that they would give him an insight into the problem. The CEO handled the problem by considering the perspectives of stakeholders rather than identifying the problem and dealing with it (Burke 1988). He was morally obligated to follow a certain procedure while making decisions. However, the issue at hand demanded better handling of the problem.

Bruce McIntosh was responsible for ensuring that the products met the set quality standards. He believed that the PAI test was biased and was aimed at supporting domestic apple growers. He argued that the tests done by the detectives were not passed by the government agencies and hence he supported filing a lawsuit against universal. His perspective was to follow the ethic of quality set by nestle.

Tom Storer was the head of operations and Canajoharie plant and was responsible for ensuring plants operated efficiently and profitably (Burke 1988). He supported cutting the cost of raw material at the expense of having pure materials. He signed contractual agreements with universal and hence authenticated the materials used. He did not take note of any previous warnings by their former supplier (Haskins), and he defended universal's purity and price. He was more concerned with profitability rather than quality. Norm Haskins, the director at R & D was responsible for testing for adulteration of food products. He was concerned about the cheap price of

the concentrate. He informed Storer about it, but no actions were taken.

Moral Framework

The CEO decided to ignore the Friday incident and to carry on with selling the inventory. He hoped that no complaints were made by the customers then the concentrate was good. However, if negative complaints were made, the Beech-Nut nutrition company would lose its credibility and would experience massive financial losses. This approach was utilitarian since it depended on the consequences. The decision would be correct if most of the customers were satisfied. The company was also required to use a deontological approach since they also needed to consider their dignity. This approach did not happen since the company knew that there was a possibility of adulteration due to the price of the concentrate.

My proposal to the CEO would be to use the deontological approach. This approach would make the company suffer losses at that particular time. However, there would not risk losing customer trust and loyalty. The company should first research on the quality of the concentrate rather than focusing on making massive profits that might only last for a short period.