

FOOD HYGIENE AND CORPORATIVE ETHICS

Viesturs Rozenbergs, Gita Skudra, Gita Krumina,

Latvia University of Agriculture, Department of Nutrition

viesturs.rozenbergs@llu.lv

INTRODUCTION

A number of investigates shows the impacts of consumer ethnocentrism and cultural sensitivity on both imported product judgment and intention to purchase local products (Tho D. Nguyen et.al., 2008). Consumers believes that domestic product are better and consumer should be encouraging for domestic producer. Are constantly unequivocal evidence for consumer to choose none but the best? This question is pressing not only in Latvia (Bartkevičs V., 2008), but also worldwide (Terpstra P.M.J., 2003). To run its course globalization for consumer problem is to distinguish domestic and non-domestic products (Shiv Ch., 2005). Consumers demand is not only for safe product, but also for ethical produced products (Nina Michaelidou, 2008).

KEY WORDS: food hygiene, corporative ethics, Corporate Social Responsibility, Corporate Social Performance, Corporate Financial Performance

METHODOLOGY

What is the motivation to choose domestic products? Are domestic entrepreneurs and processing managers more ethic than other producers. To find answers to questions content analysis (Aitken J.E., 2008) of public relations (PR) and content analysis of non-PR expressions was analyzed as well as conclusions from expressions are compared with laboratory results from recent research (Bartkevičs V., 2008).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Although interest has been growing in recent years, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is not a new concept. The idea that business has a social role can be traced back for centuries (Carroll 1999, Smith 2003). The first modern definition of social responsibility was provided by Bowen (1953). In his opinion, businesspersons are responsible for the consequences of their actions in a sphere wider than that covered by their profit and loss statements.

Results shows that Latvian case is not different from world know cases; especially in cases with organic farming, where consumers trust is higher (Sergio Pivato, 2008) but producers attitude can be depressed. For instance, banned antibiotic chloramfenicol most frequently is finds in organic farming products (Joffe A., 2007). There are cases when banned stuffs are funded in foreign laboratories and therefore problems with export of Latvian products. Now are problems with prices and expenses in milk sectors. But economists say,- one of expenses item is chloramphenicol control (Miglavys A., 2008). Other item of expenses is bureaucratic documentation in farms (Dūmiņa Z., 2008), e.g. HACCP, TQM system etc., inspection and quality control.

The above mentioned requirements are for producers monitoring and control. Unfortunately yesterday shows that lack of bureaucratic measures (e.g. HACCP, TQM system etc., inspection and quality control) are entailed with lack of quality and safety of end product.

The other term - Corporate Social Performance (CSP) – shows public relations and companies environment for consumers. It should be CSR=CSP (in this context), but there is not only lack of social performance of separate companies, but also stark unethical performances in advertisement – promotion – publicity field. For example: milk without preservative and whiteners (Urtāns P., 2007) or milk with methionine (Varika A., 2004) or vegetable oil without cholesterol (Girgensons V., 2007), yogurt without `chemical additives` (Ēvelis K., 2007).

Beyond companies PR and government supported PR e.g. „Made in Latvia” are others opinions about ours domestic products, e.g., ice-cream: modern ice-cream made from vegetable fat, E-stuffs and air (Šteinfelde I., 2008).

CONCLUSION

There exist nonethical methods in producing and promotion praxis what non managed in corporative, entrepreneurship, branch or associations frame, promote bureaucracy upkeep, outward monitoring, control and inspection, consequently are rising prime cost for production of each solitary enterprise.

REFERENCES

1. Aitken J.E. A Content Analysis of Communication Purposes in an Online Support Group Online Submission, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Interdisciplinary Network for Group Research, Kansas City, Missouri, July 18, 2008.
2. Bartkevičs V., Comparison of Quality of Latvian and Imported Food Products. – Proceedings of the International Veterinary Laboratory Scientific and Applied Conference „Laboratory Diagnostics Today and its Future Challenges”. – p.4, Riga, 28-29 August, 2008.
3. Bowen, H.R.. Social Responsibilities of the Businessman. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1953
4. Carroll, A.B.. ‘Corporate social responsibility. Evolution of a definitional construct’. Business & Society, 1999, 38:3, 268–295.
5. Dūmiņa Z. Laukos – smagā piezemēšanās [In country – hard landing]. – Diena, 25.04.2008.
6. Ēvelis K. Kāpēc aizliegta „Daugavas” produktu realizācija? [Why baned distribution „Daugava” production?]. – www.tvnet.lv, „Bauskas Dzīve”, 5.12.2007
7. Joffe Anna. PVD atkārtoti konstatē pienā hloramfenikolu [Food and Veterinary Department repeatedly find out chloramphenicol in milk] www.pvd.gov.lv 20.04.2007
8. Girgensons V. Kaislības ap holesterīnu [Passional about cholesterol] – Žurnāls „HoReCa”, 2007, <http://www.balticovo.lv/lv/publikacijas/holesterins>
9. Miglavs A. Kas nosaka piena cenas? [What set milk prices?] www.agropols.lv
10. Nina Michaelidou and Louise M. Hassan. The role of health consciousness, food safety concern and ethical identity on attitudes and intentions towards organic food. – International Journal of Consumer Studies Volume 32 Issue 2, 2008, Pages 163 – 170
11. Sergio Pivato, Nicola Misani, Antonio Tencati (2008) The impact of corporate social responsibility on consumer trust: the case of organic food Business Ethics: A European Review 17 (1) , 3–12
12. Shiv Chaudhry, Dave Crick. An exploratory investigation into the entrepreneurial activities of Asian-owned franchises in the UK. – Strategic Change Vilume 14 Issue 6, 2005, Pages 349 - 356
13. Šteinfelde I. Mūsdienu saldējums no augu taukiem, E un gaisa. [Modern ice-cream made from vegetable fat, E-stuffs and air] - www.apollo.lv, „Neatkarīgā” 18.06.2008.
14. Smith, N.C.. ‘Corporate social responsibility: whether or how?’. California Management Review, 2003, 45:4, 52–76.
15. Terpstra P.M.J. Home hygiene, habits and sustainability in a theoretical framework. – International Journal of Consumer Studies Volume 27 Issue 3, 2003, Pages 239 - 239
16. Urtāns P. Ar bioloģisko pienu pret alerģijām. – www.tvnet.lv/zalazeme, 21.03.2007
17. Tho D. Nguyen, Trang T.M. Nguyen, Nigel J. Barrett Consumer ethnocentrism, cultural sensitivity, and intention to purchase local products - evidence from Vietnam. – Journal of Consumer Behaviour Volume 7 Issue 1, 2008, Pages 88 - 100
18. Varika A. Piens pret bezmiegu [Milk against insomnia]. – Eirozornis, www.agropols.lv, 20.02.2004