Back in November of 1994, there was a recall event from the Intel company, where Intel did not act properly, by questioning the customers instead of looking into what was wrong and recalling the product immediately. This event also happened to Samsung, where their Galaxy Note 7 suffered a major issue of battery problem and needed urgent recall, and they did do that. Since they did it immediately, a question was raised, was it ethical for them to recall 2.5 million units of phone in just days after the customer report and without proper handling of the situation? Based on Samsung’s principle on their home page, they say they do follow business ethical standards, but with this event Samsung failed to uphold their “best standard” of recalling the items within their own terms of transparency and complying with laws.

One major issue with the recall was that the company did not rely on the government, in this case the C.P.S.C, or United States Consumer Product Safety Commission, to help with their recall of the product. The Samsung company itself first only sent out their own messages through a website telling the customers what to do and how to return the product, only later then they connected with the C.P.S.C. to send out a formal message of the recall. With how fast they responded and put out their own message, a question pops up about how and when should they have responded to the issues for it to be ethically correct? The how part can be answer by first talking with the government to send out a formal message to the mass, because surely the government have more ways to coordinate the recall successfully than just the company itself. Second, when they should do it is right after the very first known issues. After knowing there is a problem with the phone the company first should have put out an announcement stating that they do know there is a problem and immediately put out a fix like they did, where they disabled the full charge, to reduce the risk of battery burning causing human harm.

Second issue is their transparency. It wasn’t lacking or anything like that, but there was not enough information given out for the masses that were affected. An article on The Verge states that Samsung did know there was an issue and it only affected 0.1 percent of the whole volume sold, but nothing like that was said on the company’s announcement. If any human risk if involved, there should be a recall plan put to action right away, in this case, it was immediately, but the structure of the recall was wrong. There were confused customers as of what to do, because there was not a clear fix, telling everyone they’re going to recall 2.5 million phones is just causing mass panics. If they didn’t wanted to recall every units sold then they should’ve coordinated with the government to send out a message that contained the IMEI number of the affected phone so that some customers will have a piece of mind that their phone was not affected. Other confusion was caused by using the word “replace” instead of recall in their initial statement, leading to some customer thinking they can keep using their affected phone for now.

When a company decides to recall, they should always seek help from the people that are available to help. In this case with Samsung they tried to fix the issue on their own and mass confusion was caused. It was good for them to acknowledge the issue, but they went too far on their own. They failed their own standards that they setup and they were criticized for it afterwards.
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