

# How safe is safe case study essay sample

[Sociology](#), [Ethics](#)



1. As a company, would you describe PPI as having an identifiable philosophy of moral values? How do its policies contribute to this philosophy? In some ways PPI's moral values can be considered distinguished. The reason I say this is because as we know, all for profit organizations are obviously out to make money and many will cut corners or sacrifice their future for quick gains. PPI could have very well kept their facility up to code just enough to comply with the law, but instead they are going above and beyond their own narrow self interest to insure the safety of their facility and provide a great working environment for their employees. This organization has obviously instilled some good moral values, by making decisions that not only benefit their own bottom line, but the people that work for them.

2. Which ethical perspective best describes PPI's approach to safety issues? Would you say PPI takes a utilitarian-duty, or virtue-based approach? I believe PPI's ethical perspective to safety can closely relate to a virtue-based approach. The company recognizes that it has a moral obligation to provide a safe working environment for its employees, and proper measures have been set forth and are being followed regularly, by having auditors inspect the plant to continuously improve on safety. The company continues to practice in good faith to improve its facility, thereby creating a comfortable, safe, efficient and orderly place to work. PPI is noticeably making the right decisions by acting in the best interest of its employees in making yearly improvements to keep the facility safe, the preventive measures that are being taken by the leaders of this organization is not only benefiting to the employees, but it's also protecting the interest of the company, as been proven by the many years the company's insurance haven't had to pay out

claims from injuries to any employees. That being said, I think the company is doing a good job upholding its moral responsibility to the employees by keeping up with its commendable business practices of putting safety and its employees first.

3. Regarding safety issues, how does management see its responsibilities toward its employees? How do the attorneys see their responsibilities toward PPI? I think management realizes what their responsibility is to their employees as it pertains to safety issues, take it very seriously and are doing their best to make sure that it remains a priority. They are investing the necessary resources to make sure that the working environment remains safe for the employees, even though it may pose some risks for the company if an injury or claim were to arise in the future. I think the attorneys view their responsibility to PPI somewhat differently than how PPI view their responsibilities to their employees. I would categorize the attorneys' views closely to an egoism ethical perspective. They want to take the necessary measure to protect PPI's and their own interest but not the employees. I think it's apparent with the attorneys having an issue with PPI hiring outside auditors to survey the plant every year. In some ways I don't disagree with the attorneys views, because if they do not advise PPI of the potential exposures, than it wouldn't be good representation on their part.

4. Why does it appear that the ethics of PPI and its attorneys are in conflict? I think the reason there's conflict between PPI and the attorneys ethics is because PPI is looking in the best interest of its employees and the organization as a whole, while the attorneys are looking in their own best

interest. PPI is running their business in an honest, open and morally commendable fashion, while the attorneys are concerned with the bottom line. The attorneys are not necessarily wrong for this because their only doing their jobs, if they see potential risk, its only right they inform their client of that risk and the consequences that can follow. While I do believe PPI has a moral obligation to provide a safe working environment and are doing a great job at fulfilling that obligation, I also think they should be smarter about how they go about doing it. It's one thing to have morals and be conscious of what's right and making difficult decision to do the right thing, but doing the right thing doesn't necessarily mean giving up what's vital to yourself (in this case the organization's future).

PPI needs to figure out a way to not expose their organization to too much risk, while continuing to improve the facility. I do believe all the outside involvement with the auditors can hurt them later if they are not more conservative about the information they share with outside parties. I admire PPI's willingness to make the improvements that it does yearly to insure the safety of it's employees, but I have to agree with the attorneys' argument to a certain extent, that in the event of a lawsuit, " any previous issues could be used as evidence of a historical pattern and knowledge of unsafe conditions" (Northouse, 2009). I think the conflict between PPI and the attorneys could easily be resolved if PPI would conduct their audits internally. Outside auditors can still be used, only in the event that they are really needed.

References:

<https://assignbuster.com/how-safe-is-safe-case-study-essay-sample/>

Northouse, P. G. (2009). Leadership theory and practice . Thousand Oaks:  
Sage Publications.