Organizational Silence as Systemic Risk: A Case Analysis of Decision Failures in the Boeing 737 MAX Development Program

Gökhan Gülatik

Independent Researcher

Istanbul, Turkey

Author Note

Gökhan Gülatik is an independent researcher with over 15 years of senior general management experience across petrochemicals, defence, and automotive sectors in Turkey. This analysis draws on publicly available primary source documentation and applies organizational behavior theory to one of the most extensively documented industrial decision failures of the twenty-first century.

Correspondence: via gokhangulatik.com/iletisim

July 2026

Abstract

Background: The Boeing 737 MAX crashes of October 2018 and March 2019, which claimed 346 lives across two accidents, constitute one of the most extensively documented organizational failures in aviation history. Congressional investigations, regulatory reviews, and journalistic investigations collectively documented that engineering concerns about the MCAS (Maneuvering Characteristics Augmentation System) were present within the organization but systematically failed to reach, or were suppressed from reaching, the decision-making levels at which they could have altered the program's course.

Objective: This case analysis applies organizational silence theory — specifically, Morrison and Milliken's (2000) foundational framework and Vaughan's (1996) normalization of deviance concept — to the Boeing 737 MAX development program, examining the organizational mechanisms through which silence functioned as a systemic risk factor.

Method: Qualitative case study design (Yin, 2014) drawing on publicly available primary sources including the U.S. House Committee Report (2020), NTSB investigation findings, FAA review documentation, and the Joint Authorities Technical Review (2019), integrated with theoretical analysis through organizational behavior and safety science frameworks.

Findings: Four distinct organizational silence mechanisms are identified: (1) competitive pressure-induced schedule constraints that structurally discouraged safety challenge; (2) a hierarchical culture in which challenge was equated with disloyalty and organizational resistance; (3) regulatory capture that undermined the external voice function; and (4) distributed accountability structures that prevented individual responsibility for systemic outcomes. Together, these mechanisms produced what Morrison and Milliken

(2000) define as a climate of silence — a structural organizational condition, not merely an individual or interpersonal failure.

Conclusion: The Boeing 737 MAX case demonstrates that organizational silence is not merely a communication failure or cultural dysfunction — it is a structural property with measurable safety and operational consequences. High-risk industries require explicit organizational silence detection as a component of safety management systems.

Keywords: organizational silence, Boeing 737 MAX, safety culture, normalization of deviance, systemic risk, case study, regulatory capture, distributed accountability

1. Introduction

On October 29, 2018, Lion Air Flight 610 crashed into the Java Sea twelve minutes after takeoff from Jakarta, Indonesia, killing all 189 people on board. On March 10, 2019, Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 crashed six minutes after takeoff from Addis Ababa, killing all 157 people on board. Both aircraft were Boeing 737 MAX 8 jets. Both crashes were caused by the activation of MCAS — a software system that was pushing the nose of the aircraft down in response to erroneous sensor data, and that pilots, operating without adequate training or documentation about the system's existence, could not effectively override. The Boeing 737 MAX was grounded worldwide in March 2019. The total death toll was 346.

What followed the grounding was one of the most comprehensive organizational autopsies ever conducted of a major industrial failure. The U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure conducted an 18-month investigation producing a final report of over 200 pages (U.S. House Committee, 2020). The National Transportation Safety Board and the FAA produced separate investigation reports. The Joint Authorities Technical Review (2019), conducted by an international team of aviation regulators, examined the certification process. Investigative journalists at the Seattle Times, the New York Times, and other outlets produced extensive primary-source reporting based on internal Boeing communications and whistleblower testimony.

What these investigations collectively revealed was not, primarily, a story of technical failure. The technical dimensions of the MCAS failure — the erroneous angle-of-attack sensor data, the absence of redundancy, the inadequacy of pilot training — are well documented. What the investigations revealed was a story of organizational failure: specifically, the systematic failure of safety-relevant information to travel from the organizational levels where it was held to the organizational levels where it could be acted upon. Engineers knew about the MCAS system's risks. Test pilots had concerns. FAA safety officers had reservations. The information existed. It did not flow.

This case analysis applies organizational silence theory to the Boeing 737 MAX development program to understand the organizational mechanisms through which this information failure occurred. The research question is: Through what organizational mechanisms did silence function as a systemic risk factor in the Boeing 737 MAX development program? The analysis identifies four distinct silence mechanisms and examines their combined operation using Morrison and Milliken's (2000) theoretical framework and Vaughan's (1996) normalization of deviance concept.

The contribution of this analysis is twofold. First, it extends organizational silence theory to a high-profile, fully documented case in a high-risk industrial sector, demonstrating the framework's explanatory power at scale. Second, it proposes that organizational silence is, in high-risk industries, a safety risk factor requiring systematic detection and management — not merely a communication or culture concern.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the theoretical framework, drawing on organizational silence theory, normalization of deviance, safety science, and regulatory capture concepts. Section 3 describes the methodology. Section 4 presents the case analysis across four silence mechanisms and the crash sequence. Section 5 discusses implications for theory and practice. Section 6 addresses limitations. Section 7 concludes.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Organizational Silence

Morrison and Milliken (2000) define organizational silence as the collective-level phenomenon in which employees withhold information, opinions, and concerns that could be potentially useful to the organization. The theory distinguishes the phenomenon from isolated individual instances of non-communication, emphasizing its collective and structural character: organizational silence is a climate property that emerges from the interaction of managerial beliefs, organizational structures, and employee behavioral norms.

The theory identifies two core features of organizational climates that generate silence. First, managerial beliefs: when managers believe that employees are primarily self-interested, that dissent is inherently threatening, or that organizational problems are best managed by those at the top without input from below, they generate behavioral signals that suppress upward voice. Second, structural features: top-down decision-making processes, the absence of formal voice mechanisms, and the concentration of authority in senior leadership create structural conditions in which silence is the path of organizational least resistance.

Milliken et al. (2003) documented empirically that employees routinely withhold safety-related concerns from supervisors — concerns they themselves regard as important for organizational welfare — primarily due to the anticipation of negative relational and professional consequences. The Boeing 737 MAX investigations provide documented evidence of exactly this pattern at scale: engineers and safety professionals holding concerns that they regarded as important and that were not communicated, or were communicated and suppressed, through organizational processes.

2.2 Normalization of Deviance

Vaughan's (1996) analysis of the Space Shuttle Challenger launch decision introduced the concept of normalization of deviance to describe the process by which organizations gradually and incrementally come to accept behaviors, findings, or conditions that would initially be recognized as deviant — as departures from the expected or the safe. The normalization occurs not through deliberate decision but through the accumulation of small decisions that each appear reasonable in context while collectively drifting the organization toward an unsafe state.

In the Challenger case, engineers repeatedly identified O-ring erosion as a concern but, as the erosion occurred multiple times without a catastrophic outcome, the organization progressively redefined acceptable O-ring erosion as normal rather than as evidence of a systemic problem. The precedent of prior safe flights with eroded O-rings became evidence that the erosion was not a critical risk — a form of organizational learning that was, in fact, learning the wrong lesson.

Vaughan's normalization of deviance concept is directly applicable to the Boeing 737 MAX case, as detailed in Section 4. The progressive redefinition of acceptable schedule risk, acceptable regulatory oversight delegation, and acceptable MCAS authority without corresponding safety analysis — each step normalized by the precedent of the previous step — constitutes a textbook instance of the normalization process.

2.3 Safety Culture and Systems Drift

Reason's (1990) Swiss cheese model of organizational accidents proposes that complex system failures are rarely the result of a single error but of the alignment of multiple latent conditions — weaknesses in organizational defenses — that normally exist in isolation but combine catastrophically under specific circumstances. Latent conditions include inadequate equipment, incomplete procedures, poor supervision, poor design, and organizational culture that allows errors to accumulate without correction. The model's central insight for this analysis is that organizational silence is itself a latent condition: it prevents the error-correction mechanisms that would otherwise detect and address the accumulating weaknesses.

Dekker's (2011) concept of drift into failure extends this framework by describing how organizations with no intent of compromising safety gradually drift into unsafe states through normal organizational processes. Drift occurs when organizations make rational-seeming decisions within their local constraints that, in aggregate, erode their safety margin without any single decision being obviously dangerous. The concept of drift is particularly relevant to the Boeing 737 MAX case, where the organizational decisions that collectively produced the MCAS failure each had a local rationality — competitive pressure, resource constraints, regulatory relationship management — that made them appear reasonable in context.

Zohar's (1980) safety climate research established that the perceived priority of safety relative to production is the central dimension of organizational safety climate, and that this perception is primarily determined by the behavioral consistency of senior management in prioritizing safety when it conflicts with production goals. Safety climate research predicts that when organizational members observe senior management consistently prioritizing schedule over safety, they update their own behavior accordingly — including their calculation of whether safety concerns are worth communicating upward.

2.4 Regulatory Capture

Regulatory capture — the process by which a regulatory agency comes to serve the commercial or political interests of the industries it is meant to regulate, rather than the public interest — is a well-documented phenomenon in political economy and public administration. In organizational behavior terms, regulatory capture is relevant because it describes the failure of the external voice that is, in principle, structurally independent of the organizational silence dynamics within the regulated firm. When a regulator is captured, the organizational silence that suppresses internal voice is compounded by the absence of effective external voice.

In the Boeing 737 MAX case, regulatory capture manifested primarily through the FAA's Organization Designation Authorization (ODA) program, through which significant certification authority had been delegated back to Boeing itself. The consequence was that the external voice — the FAA — was structurally dependent on Boeing for the information it needed to exercise oversight. The organizational silence dynamics within Boeing thereby directly impaired the FAA's ability to perform its regulatory function.

3. Methodology

This paper employs a qualitative case study design following Yin's (2014) case study research methodology. Case studies are appropriate when the research question is 'how' or 'why' in nature, when the investigator has little control over actual behavioral events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context (Yin, 2014). All three conditions apply to the present inquiry: the research question is 'through what mechanisms' — a how question — and the Boeing 737 MAX program is a real-world, contemporary organizational event for which the investigator has no ability to control variables or conduct experiments.

Primary source documents consulted include: the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure (2020) Final Committee Report, which provides 238 pages of documented findings based on 1.1 million documents and testimony from hundreds of witnesses; the Joint Authorities Technical Review (2019) report on the Boeing 737 MAX Flight Control System certification process; and publicly available NTSB and FAA investigation reports on both crashes. Secondary sources include peer-reviewed organizational behavior and safety science literature cited in the theoretical framework, and investigative reporting by the Seattle Times and New York Times that was based on primary internal Boeing communications.

The analytical approach is theoretical thematic analysis: the case material is examined through the lens of the organizational silence framework, with the explicit aim of identifying organizational mechanisms that correspond to the framework's theoretical categories. This approach sacrifices the inductive openness of grounded theory for the theoretical precision of framework-driven analysis — a trade-off appropriate for a case analysis whose purpose is theoretical extension rather than theory generation.

The primary limitation of this methodology is that it produces a theoretically filtered account of the case. Other theoretical lenses — engineering failure analysis, regulatory economics, criminological accounts — would produce different accounts, each with its own validity. The present account is explicitly partial in both senses of the word: it covers only part of the case, and it is informed by a specific theoretical commitment.

4. Case Analysis: The Boeing 737 MAX Program

4.1 Background: The Competitive Context and the 737 MAX Decision

Boeing's decision to develop the 737 MAX was made in 2011 in direct response to Airbus's launch of the A320neo — a re-engined variant of the A320 that promised significantly improved fuel efficiency. American Airlines, a major Boeing customer, announced in 2011 that it was ordering 460 A320neos. Boeing faced a competitive crisis: if it did not match the A320neo's fuel efficiency, it risked losing a critical customer segment to Airbus. The options were to develop an entirely new narrow-body aircraft — which would take approximately ten years and require airlines to invest in new pilot training and maintenance infrastructure — or to re-engine the existing 737 platform, a faster and cheaper development path that would allow airlines to extend their existing 737 type ratings, reducing training costs.

Boeing chose to re-engine. The decision was driven by competitive necessity: the new aircraft development timeline was incompatible with the speed at which the market was moving toward the A320neo. The 737 MAX was publicly launched in August 2011. The first 737 MAX entered commercial service in May 2017. The speed of development — approximately six years from conception to commercial service — was, in the context of aircraft development, extremely fast.

The choice to re-engine rather than redesign created a structural constraint that would have significant downstream consequences. The new LEAP engines were larger than the previous 737 engines and, because the 737's fuselage sits low to the ground — a design dating from the 1960s — the engines had to be mounted higher and further forward on the wing than aerodynamics would ideally require. This positioning gave the aircraft a tendency to pitch nose-up at high angles of attack. MCAS was developed to compensate for this tendency. The organizational decision to re-engine, made in 2011 for competitive reasons, created the engineering problem that MCAS was designed to solve — and that MCAS, in its implemented form, ultimately could not solve safely.

4.2 MCAS: Engineering Concerns and the Organizational Response

MCAS — the Maneuvering Characteristics Augmentation System — was a software feature in the 737 MAX's flight control system designed to address the pitch-up tendency created by the engine placement described above. MCAS worked by automatically deploying the horizontal stabilizer — moving the aircraft's tail to push the nose down — when sensors indicated a high angle of attack. In principle, this would prevent the aircraft from entering a stall.

The critical design choices regarding MCAS — choices whose safety implications were visible to engineers working on the system — included: the decision to make MCAS dependent on a single angle-of-attack sensor, rather than requiring agreement between multiple sensors before activation; the progressive expansion of MCAS's authority during development (increasing the degree and speed of stabilizer movement it could command); and the decision not to include MCAS in the Flight Crew Operations Manual provided to pilots, on the grounds that the system was designed to operate below pilot awareness and that its inclusion would require recertification.

The House Committee Report (2020) documented, based on internal Boeing communications, that engineers had expressed concerns about aspects of the MCAS design. The Report found that 'a culture of concealment' contributed to the certification process. Internal messages revealed Boeing engineers describing the aircraft as 'designed by clowns, who in turn are supervised by monkeys' (a quote attributed to a former Boeing test pilot in internal communications, cited in the House Committee Report), and expressing concerns that the MCAS design had been inadequately analyzed. These communications demonstrate that concerns existed within the organization. The organizational silence mechanisms described in Section 4.3 explain why these concerns did not result in design changes.

The expansion of MCAS's authority during development is a particularly clear instance of normalization of deviance (Vaughan, 1996). Each expansion was rationalized incrementally: as the flight test program revealed that the original MCAS parameters were insufficient to fully compensate for the pitch-up tendency, the system's authority was expanded — and each expansion was treated as a contained technical adjustment rather than as a qualitatively different safety condition requiring a fresh safety analysis. By the time the aircraft was certified, MCAS had authority to move the stabilizer significantly more than had been originally analyzed — without the corresponding safety analysis update that this change would normally require.

4.3 Four Silence Mechanisms

The organizational silence in the Boeing 737 MAX program did not operate through a single mechanism. Four distinct mechanisms are identified, each corresponding to a different dimension of Morrison and Milliken's (2000) organizational silence framework.

Mechanism 1: Competitive Pressure as Structural Silencer. The competitive context described in Section 4.1 created a structural incentive system in which schedule adherence was visible, measurable, and organizationally rewarded, while safety concerns were implicitly treated as schedule threats. The House Committee Report (2020) documented extensive evidence of schedule pressure: Boeing had committed to delivery dates that the organization was under intense pressure to meet, and the internal messaging about these dates was explicit. An internal 2016 Boeing document described pressure to complete testing and certification on schedule as intense and sustained.

The silencing effect of this pressure was not primarily through explicit instruction not to raise safety concerns; it operated through the implicit organizational logic that safety concerns meant schedule risk, and schedule risk was organizationally costly. Engineers who raised concerns faced not punishment per se but the organizational calculation that their concerns would be treated as obstacles rather than inputs — which is the organizational silence dynamic that Morrison and Milliken (2000) describe as the most durable: silence based on the belief that speaking will not produce the desired outcome.

Mechanism 2: Hierarchical Culture and Challenge as Disloyalty. Multiple accounts from Boeing engineers and investigators suggest that the organization's engineering culture had shifted — over a period that predated the 737 MAX program — from one that celebrated rigorous technical debate to one in which challenge to program directions was experienced as organizational resistance. The House Committee Report (2020) noted that Boeing's culture, particularly following the 1997 merger with McDonnell Douglas, had become increasingly focused on financial performance and schedule management, and that this cultural shift had implications for the organization's treatment of engineering dissent.

The silence this produced was of the quiescent type (Pinder & Harlos, 2001): engineers held concerns but did not express them because they feared consequences — not necessarily severe consequences but the social and professional cost of being labeled as a program obstacle. In the context of an organization under intense competitive and schedule pressure, this fear was rationally grounded: the organization's signals about the value of dissent were consistently negative.

Mechanism 3: Regulatory Capture and the Absence of External Voice. The FAA's Organization Designation Authorization (ODA) program, through which the FAA had delegated substantial certification authority to Boeing's own safety engineers, created a structural condition in which the external regulator's voice was dependent on information provided by the organization it was regulating. The House Committee Report (2020) documented that FAA officials who sought to exercise more rigorous oversight of the MCAS system faced resistance — including from within the FAA itself — due to the relational and programmatic dependencies that the ODA arrangement had created.

The Joint Authorities Technical Review (2019) found that the FAA's review of the 737 MAX certification was inadequate and that the delegation of certification authority had been excessive. The practical consequence was that the organizational silence within Boeing — the failure of safety concerns to reach decision-making levels — was not compensated by the external oversight that might otherwise have detected and corrected it. The silence was structurally compound: internal voice was suppressed, and external voice was captured.

Mechanism 4: Distributed Accountability and the Diffusion of Responsibility. The Boeing 737 MAX program involved a complex distribution of responsibility across internal departments, external suppliers, and regulatory bodies. MCAS was developed and certified across multiple organizational boundaries: the flight controls team, the flight test program, the FAA's ODA-delegated engineers, and the broader certification program. No single individual or organizational unit was responsible for MCAS as a system — for its design, its certification, its documentation, and its pilot training implications as a whole.

Darley and Latane's (1968) bystander effect and its organizational analog — the diffusion of responsibility — predict that as responsibility is distributed across more actors, each individual actor's felt obligation to act decreases. Applied to organizational silence: the engineer who has a concern about one aspect of MCAS may reasonably assume that the engineer responsible for the adjacent aspect is handling that concern, or that the FAA ODA engineer has visibility to the overall system picture that the individual engineer lacks. This diffusion of responsibility creates a collective action problem: each actor's rational calculation that someone else is handling the concern produces a collective outcome in which no one is handling it.

4.4 The Crash Sequence and the Persistence of Silence

Lion Air Flight 610 crashed on October 29, 2018. The NTSB and the Indonesian KNKT investigation found that the MCAS system had activated repeatedly during the flight in response to erroneous angle-of-attack data from a faulty sensor. The pilots, who had not been trained on MCAS and who were not aware of its existence as a distinct system, struggled to understand why the aircraft was repeatedly pitching nose-down against their inputs. The aircraft entered the Java Sea twelve minutes after takeoff.

Following the Lion Air crash, Boeing and the FAA were aware of the MCAS role in the accident. The organizational response to this information is itself an instance of organizational silence: the decision was made to issue a bulletin to pilots explaining how to respond to erroneous MCAS activation, rather than to ground the aircraft or require the mechanical fix that would have prevented the subsequent accident. This decision — made by the organizational actors responsible for managing the certification and airworthiness of the 737 MAX — can be understood, through the normalization of deviance lens, as a continuation of the pattern established during the development program: incremental accommodation of safety concerns through minimal corrective action rather than systemic redesign.

Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 crashed on March 10, 2019 — four months and eleven days after the Lion Air accident. The Ethiopian Airlines crews had received the Boeing bulletin about the MCAS activation response procedure. The Ethiopian Airlines investigation found that the crew followed the correct procedure but that the aircraft's speed at the time of the MCAS activation made the procedure physically unworkable: the aerodynamic forces on the stabilizer prevented its manual trim from operating as the procedure required. The aircraft crashed six minutes after takeoff.

The organizational silence that had characterized the development program persisted, in a modified form, in the post-Lion Air interval: the information that MCAS was a systemic design problem — not merely an operational training gap — was available in the organization but was not treated as requiring grounding action before the Ethiopian accident forced the regulatory response.

4.5 What Was Known and Not Communicated

The organizational silence in the Boeing 737 MAX case is characterized by a specific pattern: information existed at multiple organizational levels but was not communicated in ways that could have altered the program's course. The following summary draws on the primary source documentation to identify what was known and where the communication failures occurred.

At the engineering level: Boeing engineers knew that MCAS's authority had been expanded from its originally analyzed parameters. The House Committee Report (2020) found evidence that engineers involved in the MCAS development were aware of the authority expansion and its implications for the system's behavior during malfunction. This knowledge did not result in a comprehensive safety analysis update or in the escalation of a redesign concern to program leadership.

At the certification level: FAA ODA engineers involved in the MCAS certification were provided with analyses that did not fully represent MCAS's authority range, according to the House Committee Report (2020). The information that the authority had been expanded was available within Boeing but was not provided to the FAA engineers in a form that would have prompted additional scrutiny. This is a direct instance of the organizational silence mechanism through which internal information fails to traverse organizational boundaries.

At the pilot training level: the decision not to include MCAS in the 737 MAX's pilot documentation and training requirements was made, according to the House Committee Report (2020), in part because including MCAS would have required airlines to invest in simulator training for the new system — eliminating one of the competitive advantages of the 737 MAX (the ability to certify 737 NG-rated pilots for the MAX without full simulator retraining). The safety engineering concern — that pilots needed to know about MCAS and how to respond to its malfunction — was subordinated to the commercial concern about training cost implications.

5. Discussion

5.1 Boeing as a Canonical Case of Organizational Silence Theory

The Boeing 737 MAX case provides an unusually well-documented empirical instance of the organizational silence mechanisms described by Morrison and Milliken (2000). The case demonstrates, at scale and in a high-stakes industrial context, the theory's core claims: that organizational silence is a structural phenomenon produced by managerial beliefs and organizational structures; that it results in the withholding of information that is meaningful and available; and that its consequences are not limited to communication dysfunction but extend to organizational decision quality and, ultimately, operational safety.

The case extends the theory in several respects. First, it demonstrates that organizational silence can compound across organizational levels and boundaries — that silence within the engineering team, combined with silence at the certification interface, and silence in the regulatory relationship, can produce collective organizational blindness that exceeds what any single silence mechanism would produce in isolation. Second, it demonstrates the interaction between organizational silence and normalization of deviance: the incremental accommodation of safety concerns that characterizes normalization of deviance is enabled and sustained by the organizational silence that prevents each incremental deviation from being named and challenged.

5.2 Organizational Silence as a Safety Risk Factor

The Boeing 737 MAX case supports a claim that has significant implications for safety management in high-risk industries: organizational silence is not merely a communication failure or a cultural dysfunction with indirect effects on performance. It is, in high-risk industrial contexts, a direct safety risk factor — a condition that increases the probability of accident through the specific mechanism of preventing error-correction. This claim is consistent with the high-reliability organization literature (Weick et al., 1999), which identifies sensitivity to operations — the active cultivation of upward information flow about operational realities — as a defining feature of organizations that maintain safety under high-hazard conditions.

If organizational silence is a safety risk factor, it follows that safety management systems in high-risk industries should include explicit mechanisms for silence detection and correction. Current safety management system frameworks — such as ICAO's Safety Management System (SMS) framework in aviation — include components for hazard identification and risk assessment, but these components typically assume that hazard information will be reported. They do not adequately address the organizational conditions that prevent hazard information from being reported in the first place. The Boeing 737 MAX case is evidence that this gap in safety management frameworks has measurable consequences.

5.3 Implications for Organizational Theory

The Boeing 737 MAX case extends organizational silence theory in a direction that has been insufficiently explored: the downstream consequences of silence at scale. Most organizational silence research has examined consequences at the level of individual employee outcomes (withdrawal, disengagement, turnover) or team-level outcomes (learning, innovation). The Boeing case demonstrates that organizational silence can have catastrophic consequences at the systemic level — consequences measured in human lives and in the financial and reputational destruction of a major industrial organization.

The case also reinforces Perrow's (1984) normal accidents theory, which proposes that in tightly coupled, complexly interactive systems, accidents are not anomalies but normal — predictable consequences of the system's structural properties. From this perspective, the Boeing 737 MAX accidents were the predictable consequence of an organizational system in which safety information was systematically suppressed at multiple levels, combined with a technical system whose design created a failure mode that was invisible to pilots. The accident was not the result of any single decision or individual failure; it was the result of a set of organizational conditions that, in Perrow's terms, made the accident 'normal' — latent in the system from the point at which the silence mechanisms were established.

5.4 Practical Implications for High-Risk Industries

For practitioners in high-risk industries — aviation, petrochemicals, defence, nuclear energy, healthcare — the Boeing 737 MAX case provides a sobering and well-documented illustration of what organizational silence produces at the extreme end. Several practical implications follow.

First, safety culture assessments should explicitly measure organizational silence as a variable, using validated instruments (such as Morrison and Milliken's framework operationalized for measurement purposes) alongside conventional safety climate measures. An organization that scores well on safety climate surveys but has not measured the degree to which safety concerns are actually communicated upward has not adequately assessed its safety culture.

Second, regulatory bodies should develop mechanisms for detecting organizational silence in the industries they oversee — including anonymous reporting systems for concerns that organizational employees feel unable to raise internally, and audit practices that specifically assess the upward information flow of safety concerns rather than merely the presence of safety management system documentation.

Third, organizational leaders in high-risk industries should recognize that the silence mechanisms identified in the Boeing case — competitive pressure, hierarchical culture, regulatory capture, and distributed accountability — are not unique to Boeing. They are structural conditions that can develop in any large industrial organization operating under competitive and financial pressure. The Boeing case is distinctive in scale and consequence but not in kind.

6. Limitations

This case analysis has several limitations that require explicit acknowledgment. First, the case study methodology limits the generalizability of the findings. The Boeing 737 MAX case is, by definition, a single case: the specific combination of organizational, competitive, technological, and regulatory factors is unique to this program. The theoretical mechanisms identified are proposed as generalizable to other high-risk industrial organizations, but this generalization requires empirical validation across additional cases.

Second, the analysis relies on post-hoc documentation — congressional reports, investigation findings, and internal communications that were surfaced through legal and regulatory processes. This documentation is authoritative and extensive, but it is retrospective: it represents an account of the program constructed after the crashes, with the knowledge of the outcome. The selection of which information was documented and surfaced was not random; it was shaped by the investigative processes and the legal context in which the documentation was produced.

Third, the analysis focuses specifically on organizational silence mechanisms and treats other causal factors — technical design failures, pilot training deficiencies, regulatory framework gaps — as context rather than as the primary focus of analysis. This framing is appropriate for a paper whose purpose is theoretical extension of organizational silence research, but it produces an account that is necessarily partial.

Fourth, the Boeing organization has evolved substantially since the 737 MAX grounding. The current organizational conditions, leadership, and safety management systems at Boeing are not the same as those analyzed here. The analysis describes a historical period and organizational configuration, not a current assessment of the organization.

7. Conclusion

The Boeing 737 MAX development program produced 346 deaths and one of the most consequential organizational failures in aviation history. This case analysis has examined the organizational mechanisms through which silence functioned as a systemic risk factor, identifying four distinct mechanisms — competitive pressure as structural silencer, hierarchical culture equating challenge with disloyalty, regulatory capture, and distributed accountability — and demonstrating their combined operation through the lens of Morrison and Milliken's (2000) organizational silence theory and Vaughan's (1996) normalization of deviance concept.

The case's theoretical contribution is its demonstration that organizational silence operates at multiple levels simultaneously and that these levels can interact in ways that produce collective organizational blindness exceeding the effect of any single mechanism. The case's practical contribution is its illustration — at a scale and with a documentation quality that is unusual in organizational behavior research — of what the structural properties of organizational silence produce when they are sustained over a multi-year program under competitive and financial pressure.

The core lesson of the Boeing 737 MAX case is not about one company's failures. It is about the conditions under which any large industrial organization operating under competitive pressure can develop the silence mechanisms that prevent its own error-correction systems from functioning. Those conditions — schedule pressure that structurally discourages safety challenge, hierarchical culture that equates dissent with disloyalty, regulatory relationships that are too close to function as independent voices, and accountability structures that are too distributed to generate individual responsibility — are not exotic. They are the structural features of organizational life in competitive industrial contexts. The organizational silence they produce is, in that sense, normal. Preventing its consequences requires treating it as a risk factor rather than as a communication problem — and designing safety management systems accordingly.

References

Darley, J. M., & Latane, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8(4), 377–383. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0025589

Dekker, S. (2011). Drift into failure: From hunting broken components to understanding complex systems. Ashgate.

Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Joint Authorities Technical Review. (2019). Boeing 737 MAX Flight Control System: Assumptions, development, and certification. Federal Aviation Administration.

Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. Journal of Management Studies, 40(6), 1453–1476. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00387

Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. Academy of Management Review, 25(4), 706–725. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3707697

Perrow, C. (1984). Normal accidents: Living with high-risk technologies. Basic Books.

Pinder, C. C., & Harlos, K. P. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 20, 331–369.

Reason, J. (1990). Human error. Cambridge University Press.

Turner, B. A. (1978). Man-made disasters. Wykeham Publications.

U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. (2020). Final Committee Report: The design, development, and certification of the Boeing 737 MAX. U.S. Government Publishing Office.

Vaughan, D. (1996). The Challenger launch decision: Risky technology, culture, and deviance at NASA. University of Chicago Press.

Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (1999). Organizing for high reliability. Research in Organizational Behavior, 21, 81–123.

Wiegmann, D. A., Zhang, H., von Thaden, T. L., Sharma, G., & Gibbons, A. M. (2004). Safety culture: An integrative review. International Journal of Aviation Psychology, 14(2), 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327108ijap1402_1

Yin, R. K. (2014). Case study research: Design and methods (5th ed.). Sage.

Zohar, D. (1980). Safety climate in industrial organizations: Theoretical and applied implications. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65(1), 96–102. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.65.1.96