

Running Head: OMM640-WK1ASSIGN2-BIG BROTHER

The logo for 'Assignment Ace' features a stylized orange book icon on the left. To its right, the word 'Assignment' is written in a large, orange, sans-serif font. Below 'Assignment', the word 'Ace' is written in a smaller, blue, sans-serif font. The 'A' in 'Ace' is significantly larger than the 'ce' and overlaps with the 's' in 'Assignment'.

Assignment
Ace

OMM640-wk1assign2-Big Brother

[Writer Nam]

[Institute Name]

OMM640-wk1assign2-Big Brother

Introduction

Procter and Gamble (P&G) is very famous brand which provides many products like Gillette, Pantene, Bounty, Dawn, Spices, Safeguard, Charmin, Ariel, Crest, Tide, Oral B, Olay, and many more. Procter and Gamble brands are available in more than 170 countries all over the world. In 1991, a case occurred in Procter and Gamble related to its news and secrets, then investigation was done to find the persons and sources through which news and secrets of the company were revealed (Thomson, 2006).

Assignment

Discussion

The big brother, P&G case was about the secrets of the company and somehow ethics. In 1991, two articles were published in Wall Street Journal about its information. So its CEO got the case investigated and hired an investigator from the Cincinnati fraud squad. The investigator was also a part of P&G, used to work in P&G in the past. The CEO, Edward Artz got angry with the reporter of the journal for printing the stories which were secret and he did not want to reveal at that time (Boatright, 2009). While the reporter was thinking that he must have been lying. And then investigation was started, it violated many things like, the telephones records of common people or employees were searched and checked, which was an unethical act, and the reporters right to search out newsworthy information to print was also violated.

P&G was justified to find out the sources of leak, but the way it adapted was not right one. Artz, the CEO had the rights to check the telephone records of its employees according the Ohio Law 1974, which prohibits revealing any confidential information or matter of the organization (Boatright, 2009). Company has rights to secure all its information. The company has a right to protect its secret but it's not right thing to violate the resident privacy and to discomfort people for its investigation.

The company definitely has a right to investigate if anything is going wrong. But in all the matters, there are some limits as well, its step was legally correct, but it was not ethical to spoil the privacy of common people. If P&G had searched the telephone records of just company, it would have fine because the company has rights on its employees and in the premises of company, but it did not have any right to disturb common people.

Yes, the rights of Cincinnati area residents were violated by the act of checking their telephone records. Violation of rights can have very serious consequences, and people should be alarmed by any occurrences. It's very bad feeling to get someone's telephones records checked. Definitely I would feel very bad, shameful and dishonorable if my telephone records were checked in this way. This situation created a very bad impact among all.

Conclusion

It was all about the case of P&G and its effect on employees and other common people. In the case, the way Artz tried to solve the problem was not right. To get the telephone records checked of employees and other common people is not an ethical act. The company had the

rights to investigate, but the way P&G adapted was not right. All persons rights should be taken care, they should not be violated.



Reference

David G. Thomson, (2006), *Blueprint to a billion: 7 Essentials to Achieve Exponential Growth*, publisher John Wiley & sons, 116-120

John R. Boat right, (2009), *Ethics and the conduct of business*, 5th Edition, Publisher Pearson Education India, 74-79

