M08 – BUSINESS ETHICS & CSR

Ethical Decision-Making and Corporate Responsibility

Critical Strategic Report

Student Name	Mukta Khanam
Student ID	PMB26017
Module	M08 – Business Ethics & CSR
Assignment Option	Option 1: Ethical Decision-Making and Corporate Responsibility
Referencing Style	APA 7th edition
Submission Deadline	4 September 2026 (as stated in the brief)

Prepared in accordance with the assignment guidelines provided.

Table of Contents

Abstract

1. Introduction

2. Literature Review

3. Methodology

4. Findings

5. Discussion

6. Conclusion

References

Appendix A: Ethical decision checklist

Appendix B: Recommended implementation plan

Note: Page numbers are omitted from this contents list to avoid inaccuracies across PDF viewers.

Abstract

Business ethics provides principles and processes for deciding what an organisation ought to do when commercial objectives conflict with duties to employees, customers, investors, communities or the environment. This report critically evaluates ethical decision-making and corporate responsibility, focusing on how ethical theories can be translated into organisational practice. It reviews utilitarianism, deontological ethics, virtue ethics and stakeholder theory, then examines ethical leadership, organisational culture, governance and mechanisms for raising concerns. A qualitative secondary-research methodology is used to compare academic literature with documented corporate cases. The Boeing 737 MAX crisis is considered as a case in which safety, schedule pressure, regulatory oversight and transparency became central ethical concerns. The case illustrates that compliance systems can be inadequate when commercial incentives and organisational culture discourage challenge or obscure critical information. The report argues that ethical conduct cannot depend only on individual integrity or a code of conduct: it requires aligned incentives, clear accountability, independent assurance, psychological safety and transparent engagement with affected stakeholders. It recommends a practical decision framework that identifies stakeholders, tests decisions against ethical theories, assesses foreseeable harms, records alternatives, escalates high-risk matters and reviews outcomes. Ethical business conduct can protect trust, improve resilience and support long-term performance, but it should not be justified solely as a tool for profit. Organisations have responsibilities to respect rights and prevent avoidable harm even when doing so is costly. The report concludes that responsible decision-making is strongest when ethics is embedded in strategy, leadership behaviour, operational controls and learning systems, rather than treated as a separate compliance activity.

1. Introduction

Organisations make decisions every day that affect people beyond their owners. Decisions about product safety, working conditions, marketing, data collection, supply chains, pricing and environmental impacts can create value, but they can also impose costs on employees, customers, communities and future generations. Business ethics examines the principles used to judge these decisions and the processes through which organisations act responsibly. It is especially important in modern organisations because global supply chains, digital technologies, investor scrutiny and public communication make misconduct capable of causing rapid and widespread harm.

Ethical decision-making is not limited to determining whether an action is legal. Law provides minimum enforceable requirements, while ethics also asks whether an action is fair, honest, respectful and responsible. An action may comply with a narrow interpretation of a rule and still mislead customers, exploit unequal bargaining power or transfer unacceptable risks to others. Conversely, managers may face genuine dilemmas in which different duties conflict and no option is free from cost. The challenge is therefore to develop a consistent process for reasoning, consultation, action and accountability.

The assignment brief asks for a critical assessment of business ethics and corporate responsibility, including ethical theories, leadership, organisational culture, a real-life ethical dilemma and recommendations for responsible conduct. This report addresses Option 1: Ethical Decision-Making and Corporate Responsibility. Its objectives are to explain the relevance of business ethics, compare key theoretical frameworks, evaluate the influence of ethical leadership, analyse a documented corporate dilemma, and propose practical improvements to organisational decision-making.

The report argues that ethical performance depends on more than policies or individual character. It emerges from the interaction of leadership, incentives, governance, information flows, organisational culture and the ability of employees to challenge decisions without retaliation. The Boeing 737 MAX crisis is used to illustrate how product safety and transparent communication can be compromised when organisational and regulatory systems

do not adequately manage risk. The case is not presented as evidence that every employee or decision-maker acted unethically; rather, it demonstrates how complex systems can produce serious failures when responsibilities, incentives and independent oversight are insufficiently aligned.

The report is structured as follows. The literature review examines ethical theories and organisational ethics. The methodology explains the use of secondary sources and case analysis. The findings analyse ethical decision-making, leadership and the Boeing case. The discussion evaluates tensions and limitations, and the conclusion sets out recommendations for embedding ethical responsibility in practice.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Meaning and relevance of business ethics

Business ethics concerns the moral principles, values and standards that guide conduct in commercial settings. It considers the responsibilities of individuals and organisations toward stakeholders and society. Carroll (1991) distinguishes economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic responsibilities, arguing that corporate responsibility involves more than profitability and legal compliance. Although profitability is essential to organisational survival, it does not automatically justify every means used to achieve it. An organisation can be financially successful in the short term while damaging trust, harming stakeholders or creating liabilities that undermine long-term viability.

Ethics is particularly relevant where decisions have unequal consequences or where affected parties lack information or power. A consumer may not be able to evaluate the safety of a complex product; a worker may fear retaliation for reporting unsafe practices; and a community may bear environmental costs without participating in corporate decisions. Ethical frameworks help managers recognise these asymmetries and avoid treating stakeholder silence as consent. They also support consistency across departments and locations, which is important for multinational firms operating under different regulatory conditions.

2.2 Utilitarian ethics

Utilitarianism evaluates actions by their consequences, generally seeking the greatest overall well-being or the least overall harm. In business, a utilitarian analysis may compare the benefits and costs of alternative decisions for employees, customers, shareholders and communities. It can encourage managers to look beyond immediate financial results and consider long-term consequences, including safety, environmental damage and reputational effects.

However, utilitarian reasoning has limitations. Forecasts of consequences are uncertain, and benefits are not always readily comparable. Aggregating outcomes can also justify imposing severe harm on a minority if a larger group receives a benefit. For example, an organisation might claim that cutting safety expenditure benefits thousands of customers through lower prices, while underestimating the catastrophic risk borne by a smaller number of people. A sound utilitarian assessment should therefore include low-probability, high-impact outcomes, distributional effects and the rights of people exposed to risk. Consequence analysis is useful, but it should not be the only ethical test.

2.3 Deontological ethics and rights

Deontological ethics focuses on duties, rules and respect for persons rather than outcomes alone. Kantian ethics, for example, asks whether a principle could be universalised and whether people are treated as ends in themselves rather than merely as means (Kant, 1785/1993). Applied to business, this perspective supports honesty, informed consent, respect for privacy, fair treatment and the duty not to mislead customers or regulators.

A duty-based approach is especially valuable when an organisation is tempted to justify deception by pointing to commercial benefits. Misrepresenting a product’s safety or hiding material information from a customer may generate short-term gains, but it violates duties of honesty and respect. Nevertheless, duties can conflict. A manager may owe confidentiality to an employee while also needing to disclose information to prevent serious harm. Deontological reasoning therefore requires clarity about duties, rights, exceptions and the appropriate escalation process.

2.4 Virtue ethics

Virtue ethics focuses on the character and practical judgement of decision-makers. Rather than asking only “What rule applies?” or “What outcome is best?”, it asks what an honest, courageous, fair and prudent person would do in the circumstances. Aristotle’s account of virtue emphasises habits developed through practice and practical wisdom in applying values to complex situations (Aristotle, trans. 2009). In organisations, virtues such as integrity, humility, courage and accountability influence whether employees disclose uncertainty, admit mistakes and challenge powerful colleagues.

Virtue ethics explains why a code of conduct cannot cover every possible dilemma. Employees need judgement to interpret policies in unfamiliar circumstances. However, relying on individual virtue alone is inadequate. People operate within systems of authority, incentives and peer expectations. A courageous employee may remain silent if reporting misconduct repeatedly leads to retaliation. Virtuous conduct must therefore be supported by organisational structures that make ethical action possible and expected.

2.5 Stakeholder theory

Stakeholder theory argues that organisations should consider the interests of groups that affect or are affected by corporate activity, rather than treating shareholders as the only relevant constituency. Freeman (1984) provides a foundational account of stakeholder management. Stakeholders may include employees, customers, suppliers, investors, regulators, local communities and the natural environment. Their interests may overlap, but they may also conflict. Employees may value secure jobs while communities demand lower pollution; customers may seek low prices while workers require fair wages.

Stakeholder theory does not mean every stakeholder preference must be satisfied equally. Managers need to identify legitimate claims, assess the severity of potential impacts, consider rights and explain how trade-offs are made. Mitchell et al. (1997) propose that stakeholder salience can be understood through power, legitimacy and urgency. This can help managers prioritise attention, but it also raises a warning: groups with little power may be overlooked despite being severely affected. Ethical stakeholder management must therefore consider

vulnerability and potential harm, not merely the ability of a group to influence corporate outcomes.

2.6 Ethical leadership and organisational culture

Ethical leadership involves demonstrating normatively appropriate conduct and encouraging such conduct through communication, decisions and reinforcement (Brown et al., 2005). Leaders shape culture through what they reward, what they tolerate, how they respond to mistakes and whether they invite dissent. Employees often interpret actual managerial behaviour as a more reliable guide than formal values statements. If leaders publicly praise safety but reward only speed and output, employees may reasonably infer that safety is secondary.

Organisational culture includes shared assumptions about acceptable behaviour. Schein and Schein (2017) argue that leaders play a significant role in embedding cultural assumptions through attention, resource allocation, reactions to crises and promotion decisions. Culture can support ethical conduct by making questions and reporting normal, or suppress it through fear, excessive hierarchy and pressure to meet targets. Ethical culture requires consistency between stated values, operational decisions and consequences for misconduct.

2.7 Corporate responsibility, governance and accountability

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) concerns the responsibilities organisations accept for their economic, legal, ethical and social impacts. While this report focuses on decision-making, CSR provides a broader context: ethical choices should be reflected in business operations, supply-chain standards, community engagement and environmental management. Governance structures, including board oversight, risk committees, internal audit and independent assurance, can support accountability. Yet governance mechanisms can become ceremonial if directors receive incomplete information or if performance metrics reward short-term results while ignoring serious risks.

The OECD (2023) guidelines for multinational enterprises emphasise responsible business conduct across areas including human rights, labour, environment, bribery, consumer interests

and disclosure. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights establish that businesses have a responsibility to respect human rights, including through due diligence to identify and address adverse impacts (United Nations Human Rights Council, 2011). Such frameworks help organisations structure responsibilities across complex supply chains, but their effectiveness depends on implementation, evidence and remedy—not merely public commitments.

2.8 Ethical decision-making models

A practical ethical decision model typically involves recognising a moral issue, gathering facts, identifying affected parties, considering alternatives, evaluating options against principles and consequences, making a decision, implementing it and reviewing outcomes. Rest's (1986) model distinguishes moral awareness, judgement, motivation and character, demonstrating that knowing the ethical answer does not guarantee ethical behaviour. Employees may fail to notice an ethical dimension, reason poorly, prioritise personal incentives over moral concerns or lack the courage and authority to act.

Ethical frameworks therefore complement one another. Utilitarianism highlights consequences; deontology highlights duties and rights; virtue ethics highlights character and judgement; stakeholder theory broadens the set of interests considered. A robust organisational process should use these perspectives together, while documenting assumptions and seeking independent review for high-risk decisions.

3. Methodology

This report uses qualitative secondary research and a focused case-study approach. Academic books and peer-reviewed articles were selected to establish the theoretical basis for ethical decision-making, leadership, stakeholder management and organisational culture. Institutional guidance from the OECD and United Nations was used to consider responsible business conduct and human-rights responsibilities. Publicly documented material concerning the Boeing 737 MAX crisis, including investigations by the U.S. House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the National Transportation Safety Board, was used to examine the organisational and governance dimensions of a real-world ethical dilemma.

The analysis proceeded in three stages. First, the literature was organised into themes: ethical theories, stakeholder responsibilities, leadership and culture, governance, and ethical decision processes. Second, the case material was examined for the principal ethical issues, affected stakeholders, decision pressures, control failures and consequences. Third, the findings were used to develop recommendations that are linked to the assignment's assessment criteria and to the practical constraints faced by organisations.

A case-study approach is appropriate because ethical problems rarely arise from a single isolated decision. They often involve technical uncertainty, competing incentives, information asymmetry, multiple actors and institutional constraints. Case analysis can reveal how these factors interact. However, secondary research has limitations. Public investigations may focus on particular events and may not capture every internal perspective. Corporate cases can be influenced by hindsight, media framing or legal disputes. The report therefore distinguishes documented findings from ethical interpretation and avoids claiming that a single case proves a universal causal relationship.

No primary interviews or original surveys were conducted. As a result, the report does not claim to measure the prevalence of unethical behaviour across businesses. Instead, it applies established concepts to a well-documented case and proposes controls that organisations can adapt to their own sectors. The conclusions are analytical recommendations rather than a substitute for legal, engineering or regulatory advice in a specific organisation.

4. Findings

4.1 Ethical issues in modern organisational decisions

The review indicates that ethical issues are often embedded in ordinary operational choices rather than appearing as obvious requests to break rules. Managers may face pressure to reduce costs, accelerate product development, increase sales, use customer data or meet quarterly targets. These objectives are legitimate in themselves, but ethical risks emerge when their pursuit undermines safety, fairness, honesty or accountability. Ethical decision-making must therefore be integrated into product design, procurement, sales, human resources, data governance and financial reporting.

A recurring risk is the gap between formal policy and actual incentives. An organisation may have a detailed code of conduct while bonuses reward sales regardless of how they are achieved. Employees then receive conflicting signals. Similarly, a company may promise transparency but penalise staff who disclose bad news. This gap can make ethical policies performative rather than effective. Leadership teams should test whether employees can raise concerns, whether misconduct is investigated consistently and whether performance systems reward responsible behaviour.

4.2 Comparing ethical frameworks in practice

The ethical theories reviewed offer complementary tests. A utilitarian test asks which option is likely to produce the best overall consequences and who bears the costs. A deontological test asks whether the option respects rights and duties, including truthfulness and safety obligations. A virtue-ethics test asks whether the decision demonstrates integrity, courage and sound judgement. A stakeholder test asks whose interests are affected and whether less powerful groups have been considered.

Consider a hypothetical manufacturer deciding whether to delay a product launch after engineers identify a potential safety issue. A narrow financial analysis might emphasise the cost of delay. Utilitarian reasoning should include the expected harm of a defect, including catastrophic outcomes even if their probability is low. Deontological reasoning highlights duties not to expose users to unreasonable risk or withhold material information. Virtue ethics asks whether leaders are demonstrating courage and honesty by confronting inconvenient evidence. Stakeholder analysis includes customers, workers, regulators, investors and communities. The combined assessment is more robust than any single framework.

The limitation is that frameworks may point in different directions or be used selectively. A manager may invoke “the greater good” to justify an action that benefits the organisation at the expense of a vulnerable group. Another may follow a rule rigidly without considering an unforeseen emergency. Organisations should therefore require decision-makers to state the relevant facts, explain their reasoning, consider alternative interpretations and document why a chosen option is proportionate.

4.3 Case study: Boeing 737 MAX crisis

The Boeing 737 MAX crisis provides a significant example of ethical and governance challenges in a safety-critical industry. Two MAX aircraft crashed in 2018 and 2019, killing 346 people. Subsequent investigations examined the aircraft's Maneuvering Characteristics Augmentation System (MCAS), pilot information, design and certification processes, and the relationship between the manufacturer and regulators. The U.S. House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure (2020) identified multiple contributing factors and criticised aspects of Boeing's development and certification processes, while the National Transportation Safety Board (2019) examined assumptions about pilot response and the need to account for human performance in safety assessments.

The central ethical issue is not simply whether a technical component functioned as intended. It concerns how safety risks were identified, communicated, evaluated and governed within a commercial and regulatory system. Aircraft manufacturers have duties to passengers, flight crews, airlines, employees and the public. These stakeholders rely on technical information that they cannot independently verify. This information asymmetry increases the ethical importance of transparency, independent challenge and conservative risk management.

The case exposed tensions between competitive pressure, product development schedules and safety assurance. In a market where manufacturers compete for airline orders, delays can be costly. However, commercial urgency cannot ethically override the duty to protect human life. The case also raises questions about whether pilots and airlines received adequate information to understand the system and respond to abnormal conditions. In safety-critical contexts, communication is part of the safety system: users cannot manage a risk that has not been adequately disclosed or explained.

The case also illustrates the limits of relying on regulatory compliance alone. Certification is essential, but regulators may depend on technical information supplied by manufacturers, and delegated processes can create conflicts if independence is not sufficiently protected. Effective governance requires clear separation between commercial decision-making and safety assurance, transparent reporting of engineering concerns, documented risk acceptance and a

culture in which dissent is welcomed. The U.S. House investigation called for stronger oversight and reforms to certification and organisational practices (U.S. House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 2020).

The stakeholder consequences were extensive. Families and communities suffered irreversible losses. Pilots and airline employees faced operational uncertainty and reputational consequences. Airlines experienced grounding, disruption and financial costs. Boeing faced regulatory scrutiny, legal claims, reputational damage and substantial costs associated with grounding and remediation. Regulators faced questions about oversight and public confidence. The case demonstrates that ignoring or inadequately managing ethical risk can impose far greater costs than a short-term delay or additional testing.

It is important not to reduce the crisis to a simplistic claim that a single unethical decision caused every outcome. Complex accidents typically involve multiple technical, organisational and regulatory factors. The ethical lesson is systemic: when risk information is fragmented, incentives are misaligned and challenge is weak, a series of individually bounded decisions can combine into a catastrophic failure. Ethical responsibility therefore includes designing systems that make it difficult for commercial pressure to suppress safety concerns.

4.4 Ethical leadership and organisational culture

Leadership determines whether ethical expectations become operational reality. Leaders influence culture through their own conduct, the questions they ask, the data they demand and the consequences they impose. Ethical leaders seek accurate information, acknowledge uncertainty, explain trade-offs and avoid punishing employees for raising legitimate concerns. They also hold high-performing employees accountable; otherwise, organisations can implicitly signal that results excuse misconduct.

Psychological safety—the belief that people can speak up, ask questions and report mistakes without humiliation or retaliation—is especially important where early warnings are valuable. Psychological safety does not mean the absence of standards or accountability. It means employees can surface concerns before they become crises, while investigations remain fair and evidence-based. Reporting channels should include options outside the direct management

chain, protection against retaliation and feedback to reporters about the outcome where appropriate.

Training is necessary but insufficient. A one-off online course may improve awareness without changing the incentives that shape daily behaviour. More effective measures include scenario-based training, manager discussions of real dilemmas, ethical review in project gates, independent escalation for safety concerns and performance assessments that include conduct. Leaders should also review whether employees are under unrealistic pressure to meet targets that could encourage corner-cutting.

4.5 Governance, disclosure and accountability

Boards and senior executives should define the organisation’s risk appetite and ensure that ethical risks are visible alongside financial performance. High-risk decisions need clear ownership, documented rationale and independent review. Internal audit should test whether controls work in practice, not simply whether policies exist. Compliance and risk teams need access to relevant information and the authority to escalate concerns to the board or a designated committee.

Disclosure is another key control. Organisations should communicate material risks honestly to customers, regulators, investors and employees. Transparency can be uncomfortable, but concealment can worsen harm and undermine trust. In addition, remediation should focus on affected stakeholders, not solely on legal exposure. Where harm has occurred, responsible responses may include acknowledgement, compensation, corrective action, independent investigation and changes to prevent recurrence.

4.6 Practical decision process

The findings support an eight-step process for consequential ethical decisions:

1. Recognise the ethical issue and describe the decision without euphemism. 2. Establish the facts, identify uncertainties and seek relevant expertise. 3. Identify affected stakeholders, including vulnerable or less powerful groups. 4. Generate realistic alternatives, including delay, redesign or non-action. 5. Evaluate each alternative using consequences, duties and

rights, virtues, and stakeholder impacts. 6. Identify legal, safety, human-rights and professional obligations that set minimum boundaries. 7. Document the rationale, obtain independent review for high-risk decisions and communicate transparently. 8. Monitor outcomes, provide remedy where necessary and update systems based on lessons learned.

This process should be proportionate to the risk. A routine low-impact decision may need a brief checklist, while product safety, privacy, bribery, labour rights or environmental decisions may require specialist review and board-level oversight.

5. Discussion

The analysis demonstrates that ethical decision-making is a management capability and a governance responsibility, not merely a matter of personal morality. The theoretical frameworks help managers consider different dimensions of a dilemma, but their effectiveness depends on the quality of information and the willingness to act on uncomfortable conclusions. Ethical awareness is of little value if employees lack authority to escalate concerns or if leaders reward the opposite behaviour.

The Boeing case highlights the interaction between market pressure and organisational controls. Competitive environments can encourage innovation and efficiency, but they can also intensify incentives to reduce costs or accelerate delivery. The ethical challenge is not to eliminate commercial objectives; it is to ensure that they remain bounded by non-negotiable responsibilities such as safety, truthfulness and legal compliance. In high-risk industries, independent assurance and transparent escalation should be treated as productive capabilities rather than bureaucratic obstacles.

A key tension exists between utilitarian and rights-based reasoning. Consequence analysis is valuable because decisions have real-world effects and resources are limited. Yet aggregate benefit cannot automatically justify exposing particular people to serious avoidable harm. A balanced framework uses consequence analysis to compare legitimate options while treating fundamental rights, safety duties and prohibitions on deception as constraints. Where duties conflict, managers should seek proportional solutions and explain the basis of their judgement.

Another tension concerns stakeholder inclusiveness and decision speed. Consulting every stakeholder on every issue may be impractical, but excluding affected groups can produce blind spots and undermine legitimacy. A proportionate approach identifies stakeholders according to the severity, likelihood and distribution of impact. For decisions affecting vulnerable groups or involving irreversible harm, consultation and independent scrutiny should be stronger. Stakeholder engagement should also be meaningful: asking for views after a decision has effectively been made is unlikely to build trust.

Ethical culture is difficult to measure because misconduct may remain hidden and employees may give socially desirable answers in surveys. Organisations should therefore use multiple indicators: employee confidence in speaking up, investigation times, substantiated retaliation claims, repeat control failures, customer complaints, safety incidents, supplier audits and the quality of board-level risk reporting. No single metric should become a target that can be manipulated. For example, a low number of reported incidents may indicate either strong performance or fear of reporting. Metrics need interpretation and qualitative follow-up.

Ethics also has a business case. Trust can support customer loyalty, employee retention, supplier relationships and resilience during crises. Preventing misconduct can reduce legal exposure and costly remediation. Nevertheless, the argument for ethics should not be limited to financial return. Some responsible actions—such as delaying a launch to protect safety or paying for remedy—may reduce short-term profit. They may still be required because stakeholders have rights and organisations have duties that are not reducible to a financial calculation.

Global operations create further complexity. Legal standards, cultural expectations and enforcement capacity vary across countries. Cultural sensitivity is important, but it should not be used to excuse bribery, forced labour, discrimination or serious environmental harm. International frameworks such as the UN Guiding Principles and OECD Guidelines provide a common basis for due diligence and responsible conduct. Firms should map their supply chains, identify salient risks, engage affected stakeholders, monitor corrective action and provide remedy where they contribute to harm.

The report recommends that organisations embed ethics into the full decision lifecycle. At strategy stage, boards should define ethical commitments and risk tolerances. During design and procurement, teams should assess safety, human rights, privacy and environmental impacts. During execution, managers should maintain reporting channels, monitor indicators and respond to concerns. After incidents, organisations should investigate root causes, acknowledge harm and verify whether corrective action works. This lifecycle approach is more effective than treating ethics as an annual compliance event.

Finally, the quality of ethical decisions depends on humility. Managers rarely possess perfect information, and hindsight can make uncertain choices appear obvious. Good governance does not promise that every decision will be correct; it creates a defensible process for surfacing evidence, challenging assumptions, making proportionate choices and correcting mistakes. The most ethical organisations are not those that claim to be free of error, but those that make it safer to reveal problems and more likely that lessons lead to change.

6. Conclusion

This report has critically assessed ethical decision-making and corporate responsibility in modern organisations. It has shown that business ethics extends beyond legal compliance and profitability to include honesty, fairness, respect for rights, prevention of harm and accountability to stakeholders. Utilitarianism helps evaluate consequences; deontological ethics protects duties and rights; virtue ethics emphasises character and practical wisdom; and stakeholder theory broadens the analysis to include people affected by corporate activity. Each framework has limitations, so responsible decisions benefit from applying them together.

The Boeing 737 MAX crisis illustrates how commercial pressure, complex technical information, organisational culture and regulatory oversight can interact in ways that compromise safety. The case underlines the importance of independent challenge, transparent communication, clear accountability and a culture in which concerns can be raised without retaliation. It also demonstrates that ethical failure can generate severe human harm and long-lasting organisational consequences.

The report recommends that organisations adopt a documented ethical decision process, align incentives with responsible conduct, strengthen board oversight of non-financial risks, protect whistleblowers, assess stakeholder impacts, disclose material information honestly and learn systematically from incidents. Training should be reinforced by operational controls and leadership behaviour. CSR and responsible business conduct should be integrated into strategy, procurement, product development and performance evaluation.

Ultimately, ethical business practice is not a decorative addition to organisational success. It is a condition of legitimate and sustainable operation. Organisations build trust when they make difficult decisions transparently, respect the people affected by their actions and accept responsibility when harm occurs. Ethical leadership is demonstrated not only by the values leaders communicate, but by the systems they build and the choices they are willing to make when responsible conduct is commercially inconvenient.

Appendix A: Ethical decision checklist

Before approving a significant decision, managers should be able to answer the following questions:

• What exactly is being decided, and what ethical issue may be hidden within the commercial framing? • What facts are known, what remains uncertain, and whose expertise is needed? • Which stakeholders may benefit, be harmed or be excluded? Are vulnerable groups affected? • Does the decision respect law, human rights, safety duties, privacy and truthful communication? • What are the likely consequences, including low-probability but high-impact harms? • Would the decision remain defensible if disclosed publicly and explained to those most affected? • Have alternatives—including delay, redesign or stopping the project—been considered? • Are incentives, deadlines or power relationships discouraging employees from speaking honestly? • Is independent review required? Who owns the final decision and its risks? • How will outcomes be monitored, harm remedied and lessons incorporated?

Appendix B: Recommended implementation plan

First 30 days: Review the code of conduct, risk register, whistleblowing arrangements and recent incidents. Interview employees from different levels and functions to understand where ethical pressure arises. Identify high-risk decisions and assess whether staff can escalate concerns outside the normal reporting line.

Days 31–60: Establish a cross-functional ethics and risk group involving compliance, HR, operations, legal, safety and relevant technical specialists. Introduce a decision template requiring stakeholder mapping, ethical-framework review, alternatives, uncertainty, approval level and monitoring plans. Update incentives so that conduct and control quality matter alongside financial results.

Days 61–90: Pilot scenario-based training with managers and teams responsible for high-impact decisions. Test reporting channels, response times and protections against retaliation. Assign owners to recurring issues and create board-level reporting on leading indicators, including unresolved concerns, repeat control failures and remediation status.

Ongoing: Conduct periodic independent reviews, publish appropriate summaries of lessons learned, consult affected stakeholders and verify whether corrective actions reduce risk. The plan should be adapted to organisational size, sector, legal duties and risk profile. It should not replace specialist advice in safety-critical or regulated activities.

References

Aristotle. (2009). *The Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.; L. Brown, Ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published ca. 4th century BCE)

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97*(2), 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002

Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons, 34*(4), 39–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(91)90005-G

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach.* Pitman.

Kant, I. (1993). *Grounding for the metaphysics of morals* (J. W. Ellington, Trans.; 3rd ed.). Hackett Publishing. (Original work published 1785)

Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(4), 853–886. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9711022105

National Transportation Safety Board. (2019). *Boeing 737 MAX 8 aircraft accident: Lion Air Flight 610, PK-LQP, Java Sea, October 29, 2018* (NTSB/AIR-19/01). https://www.ntsb.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/AIR1901.pdf

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *OECD guidelines for multinational enterprises on responsible business conduct.* OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/81f92357-en

Rest, J. R. (1986). *Moral development: Advances in research and theory.* Praeger.

Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2017). *Organizational culture and leadership* (5th ed.). Wiley.

United Nations Human Rights Council. (2011). *Guiding principles on business and human rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" framework* (A/HRC/17/31). United Nations. https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/publications/guidingprinciplesbusinesshr_en.pdf

U.S. House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. (2020). *The Boeing 737 MAX aircraft: Costs, consequences, and lessons from its design, development, and certification.* U.S. House of Representatives. https://democrats-transportation.house.gov/committee-activity/boeing-737-max-investigation