

✓ The Madaartz Corporation toothpaste graphs are unethical for a few reasons. First of all in the comparison of the non-fluoride and fluoride graphs the y-axis does not start at zero. In fact, the graphs do not even have the same y-axis starting point. The nonfluoride graph starts at negative two while the fluoride graph. This one point alone makes it impossible to fairly compare the two graphs. ✓

Words missing

Nice use of vocabulary

I also believe that to be ethical the bars on the histrogram should be touching. This makes comparison from year to year easier. Additionally, the individual bars appear to be the same width, but it is difficult to be certain with the space in between. The comparison should be in height but width of the bar could lead one to believe that more sales are projected in this area.

Good perspective graphs distort.

Good but specify where they're not.

The labels on graphs being compared should be identical in order to be ethical. This makes it easier for the reader of the graph and helps remove any confusion. Lastly, on both titles the word fluoride is spelled incorrectly. This may not be a large ethical concern but as a consumer it deters me from purchasing a product that is misspelled. Kas

The stakeholders in the problem include the company as a whole, the individual workers in the company, the potential shareholders, as well as the consumer.

Current shareholders too

Teleologically speaking this is unethical because it is false information given to the public, or at least the potential shareholders. This could also have a negative effect on the individual workers especially those in non-fluoride production. Since the projected sales for non-fluoride are lower than those for fluoride there is a potential for layoffs especially if these are produced in different cities. The greater good for all involved, which is the teleological way of thinking, is not being ethically represented in these graphs.