

Ford

Linguistics, English



1) What ethical system do you believe Ford was probably operating under at the time of this series of events? This is a speculation, as we have no empirical evidence upon which to base this claim. However, given their actions, you can make a logical inference.

In this case rather than being ethical reasons to their customers, Ford was trying to keep their hands clean and did not want a bad name themselves. They had according to me were thinking that if they said to the public that the rollover was because of their fault in the car as speculated by certain agencies, it would hamper their sales in future. But according to me they should have given their customers the actual information. It would give the public a sense of trust in Ford. The real ethics lies in having the faith of the customers by thinking about their well being.

2) What rationalizations do you believe they may have told themselves?

As per a Ford inside notice, the optimal approach to defeat the security issue was by bringing down the core of gravity, enlarging the Explorers wheel base, and utilizing a more diminutive P215 tire. Then again, when further dissection was carried out, Ford understood that stretching the wheel base and bringing down the core of gravity might have deferred the processing, and consequently it chose to act " unethically" Rowell (2008). This shows that Ford was aware of the problem and they also knew the reason for it. It was a fault on their end. They had the thought process of saving their reputation.

3) What ethical model would have been useful, had they chosen to examine their corporate behavior?

We can use the Utilitarian approach in this situation. Consistent with the Utilitarian Approach, the maker of the item ought to be considered answerable for the imperfections as opposed to the retailer, and it is the obligation of each maker to guarantee that it processes the most secure items conceivable. Accordingly dependent upon the Utilitarian Approach, it could be reasoned that Ford was " unethical" since it was regulating the methodology through which Explorer was transformed, and in this manner it is to be considered ethically and also lawfully answerable for the imperfections which were available in the vehicle. Based on this theory it can be said that the responsibility should have been taken by Ford.

4) Although Ford was not subject to any punitive legal actions, should they have been? Why or why not? Be specific. What consequences should Ford have been made to accept?

Yes Ford should have taken the responsibility instead of blaming the whole issue on Firestone. It was unethical on their part to protect themselves and blaming a tire manufacture. Ford should have recalled all the faulty cars that had been manufactured by them and should be replaced with the non faulty one or should have repaired the cars on their own expense.

5) Was it fair that Firestone be made to bear the entire brunt of legal responsibility for the rollover deaths?

According to me it was not at all fair to put the complete blame on Firestone. A mere tire cannot get a car roll over. The car can skid but it cannot roll

solely because of a tire. Ford was aware of it but even after knowing that the fault was their own, they did not own up. It is a pure case of ethics. Ford thought about their own interest and brand name. They should have at least borne some of the losses instead of staying mum on the whole verdict. It ruined their faith and trust which they realized later.

References:

1) Rowell, J, (2008). The ford explorer: History repeats itself. Retrieved from <http://www.cdrb-law.com/legal-articles/ford-explorer-history-repeats-itself-john-drowell.pdf>