

Ethics in the aviation industry

Business



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

This paper investigates the literature that is available on ethics in the aviation industry. It elucidates the possible moral steps that one would take considering the ethical standards of the industry.

The paper gives a range of real life situations and the ethical responses that would ideally suit each of them. According to literature, ethics in the aviation industry are quite significant as they serve to regulate the relations between the workers and their passengers. In addition, they determine the type of passengers who can be allowed on board so as to avoid confrontations once the plane is off the ground. It is always a risky affair to tell on a fellow employee, especially someone who holds a superior position than you. Considering that a manager could have a say on junior employees character when they get into problems with the administration, it would certainly be risky to report a matter in which he is at the center of controversy. There are chances that he could start up a long gone case in which you were involved just to ensure that you get to the wrong side of the law.

Besides, he or she could eventually refuse to recommend you for a job someday when you desperately need to move up your career line. These considerations make it hard to report a case similar to the one presented in scenario one. However, there is even a greater danger in leaving the case unreported as it would mean plainly putting the lives of the passengers at a risk. Ideally, an airplane wing struck by a tug poses a great risk as it can injure people on the ground. Besides, it can possibly cause a major accident during landing thereby killing everyone aboard, including the staff. That is why it would not make sense to keep quiet about the accident even though the manager is of the opinion that it is kept secret (Kingsbury 2007).

<https://assignbuster.com/ethics-in-the-aviation-industry/>

Indeed, the Civil Aviation Safety Authority recommends that any threats to passenger safety are reported promptly so that safety measures can be put in place. Particularly, safety threats involving the airplane wing are highly prioritized as they are likely to affect even people who are not aboard the flight. Thus, every step should be taken to ensure that the mistake in the plane is corrected before it can lead to loss of lives. This is the ideal requirement of social ethics and indeed of the aviation industry (Lin and Liu 1988). Undoubtedly, it is a mistake to tattle on a fellow as it could cause him or her only source of their income.

However, it may be necessary to do it when failure to reveal poses a greater danger to humanity. In fact, the possible accident could find him or his relatives onboard and cause him his life. That is the reasoning that should inform his decision to reveal the accident to the relevant authorities so that they can solve it amicably. It should be noted that we can never make everyone happy with our course of actions. Thus, the focus should be on doing the right thing rather than on making anyone happy.

For instance, the manager would be quite satisfied when everyone decides to conceal the details of the accident on the airplane wings. However, it would only be ethically right to consider the bigger picture in making the final decision. Ideally, social ethics require that one would rather upset an individual rather than the established social norms, especially with regards to humanity (Grewe et al 2001). The Federal Aviation regulations dictate that a plane should not carry passengers who are too intoxicated with drugs. This should ideally be observed with the interest of the public at the forefront.

In fact, if there were other passengers on board, it would be advisable to explain to the boss that he need not board the flight. However, due to the fact of his drunkenness', it would be foolhardy to think of convincing him. That is why leaving him behind would be the best option. Nonetheless, he would certainly require explanations as to why he was left behind contrary to his expectations. There is no doubt that he would be a better person to talk to when he is sober and there are high chances that he will understand a convincing explanation.

That is why the security of one's job should not worry them much in doing the right thing because the Chief Executive Officers life is being protected in the first place. Besides, he would not agree to put passenger's life in danger in his sober state. Essentially, I would leave him behind and prepare a convincing statement for him when he gets sober on why he had to remain behind (Lin and Liu 1988). However, the fact that the plane was going to have only two passengers, the pilot and the Chief Executive Officer, there would be no great harm in carrying him over in the flight. In some instances, regulations are just guidelines that are supposed to inform people's decisions. However, it should not be mandatory to act within them when there would not be any significant harming ignoring them.

Indeed, that could be the reason why most airlines ignore this rule as it is too ideal. First, it must be noted that there are no passengers whose lives are being put at risk except the pilot and the CEO. In addition, the plane in question is a corporate plane that is normally less subject to conventional rules of the industry. This would certainly make it a little offence to carry a drunken passenger. Ideally, a win-win situation in this scenario would be to <https://assignbuster.com/ethics-in-the-aviation-industry/>

carry the CEO since it is a corporate plane and because there are no members of the general public being subjected to unnecessary risks.

In social ethics, slightly bending the conventional rules could be acceptable if such actions do not have gross effects on humanity. That would sound more realistic, especially due to the fact that most airplanes usually ignore the rule as it sounds too idealistic (Grewe et al 20001). In business, one may have to make some of the toughest choices of his or her life. This is usually due to the conflict between the desire to make money and the considerations of the society, especially the political class. However, this case is unique in that the company is already in a fix and desperately needs to pull out a surprise on its competitors. Understandably, the increased wages has made them the most expensive company in comparison to their competitors.

This means that they really have to do something to ensure they get back to the top or compete favorably. Although the appropriate step may not be popular with the public or the political class especially due to potential job losses, five years would be long enough to mend the relationship. Thus, the marketing firm should first focus on surviving the competitive market before thinking of creating a good rapport with the politicians. Indeed, the idea that one cannot satisfy everyone should apply in this case as well for the good of the company (Kingsbury 2007). Understandably, there would be grumbles from politicians questioning the patriotism of the firm and why they would take jobs to foreigners when their own citizens need those jobs.

In case this question arises, the management should act boldly and explain to the public that those jobs can only be available when the company is

depending running. In doing this, they should make everyone understand that their actions were not due to lack of patriotism, but purely as a strategy to survive the competitive market. Indeed, the politicians would readily understand this if thorough explanations are given to them. In fact, it may inform them to change certain policies to make it possible for the company to get the same services in the country instead of soliciting for them in foreign countries and in the process shipping jobs abroad. This should make the difference between ideal ethical demands and the reality of people's actions.

According to the ideal demands of ethics and patriotism, the company should have stayed in the country come what may to create jobs for the citizens of the country. However, this would put serious financial constraints that could eventually lead to the closure of the company. That is why going to manufacture outside the country became a necessary evil with a view to ensuring the continued survival of the firm well into the future. Nonetheless, such a step should be properly explained to stakeholders in a timely manner so as to prevent a situation where everyone considers them traitors of the nation (Grewe et al 2001). In conclusion, absolute ethics is the desire of everyone.

However, it is sometimes unrealistic as it could have far reaching consequences. This is usually the reason behind the idea of necessary evil where people slightly deviate from the ideal ethical standards in order to realize maximum long term gains.