© NOV 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 5 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I5-1718270

Crisis and Risk Management in Aviation: Lessons from the Boeing 737 MAX Crisis and Implications for African Regulatory Bodies

FOLORUNSO, MATTHEW KAYODE
Nigerian Civil Aviation Authority, Lagos, Nigeria

Abstract- ***The Boeing 737 MAX crisis exposed deep weaknesses in aviation risk management, regulatory oversight and organisational safety culture. The crashes of Lion Air Flight 610 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302, and the subsequent worldwide grounding of the Boeing 737 MAX fleet, demonstrate how design decisions, automation, regulatory delegation and crisis communication can interact to produce catastrophic outcomes. This paper investigates the crisis through a qualitative document-analysis methodology and derives lessons for crisis and risk management in aviation. It then applies these lessons to the African regulatory context, with particular attention to Nigeria and Ghana. African civil aviation authorities must strengthen oversight of automation and software, deepen safety management systems, invest in capacity building and leverage regional cooperation to avoid repeating the systemic failures seen in the Boeing 737 MAX case.***

Index Terms- ***Aviation Safety, Boeing 737 MAX, Crisis Management, African Civil Aviation, Regulatory Oversight, Safety Management Systems***

I. INTRODUCTION

Aviation is often regarded as one of the safest transportation methods; yet, recent incidents demonstrate that systemic deficiencies in design, legislation, and organizational culture can result in catastrophic outcomes [1, 11]. The Boeing 737 MAX crisis, stemming from two catastrophic incidents in Indonesia in 2018 and Ethiopia in 2019, is now recognized as a pivotal case in aviation safety and engineering ethics, underscoring the interaction of technical design deficiencies, automation dynamics, pilot training inadequacies, regulatory delegation, and corporate governance [1, 8].

Aviation is essential for connectivity, trade, and regional integration among African states, particularly through initiatives like the Single African Air Transport Market and the African Civil Aviation Policy (AFCAP) [2, 3]. Many African civil aviation authorities function under considerable resource limitations, exhibiting diverse levels of regulatory sophistication and safety oversight capabilities, while confronting an evolving risk environment due to the introduction of new aircraft models, automation, and intricate supply chains [7, 15].

The 737 MAX incidents had a direct impact on African stakeholders. Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 took off from Addis Ababa and included passengers from several African and non-African nations [8, 1]. African regulators imposed restrictions or bans, and subsequently contemplated removal of these bans, exemplified by the Nigerian Civil Aviation Authority's (NCAA) decision to rescind its ban in 2021 following examination of international findings [13, 14].

This paper poses two primary research inquiries. First, what crisis and risk management lessons may be extracted from the Boeing 737 MAX case when analyzed through a systems and governance perspective? Second, how may these lessons be converted into practical applications for African regulatory authorities, specifically Nigeria and Ghana? The objective is to analyze the crisis as a benchmark for enhancing crisis and risk management in African aviation.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE BOEING 737 MAX CRISIS

The Boeing 737 MAX series was introduced as a more fuel-efficient variant of the successful 737 Next Generation family, particularly designed to compete with the Airbus A320neo series [1]. Boeing and regulators adopted a strategy to ensure continuity in pilot type-rating by characterizing the MAX as a modest evolution of earlier types instead of a completely new design [11].

Two significant incidents characterized the crisis. Lion Air Flight 610 collided with the Java Sea on 29 October 2018, killing all 189 aboard, while Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 crashed on 10 March 2019, with 157 fatalities [8, 1]. Investigations highlighted the Manoeuvring Characteristics Augmentation System (MCAS) as a vital technical element. MCAS depended predominantly on a single angle-of-attack sensor and issued continuous nose-down stabilizer commands, which crews found challenging to counteract [4, 8].

The global 737 MAX fleet was grounded in March 2019 and remained grounded in the United States until late 2020, becoming the longest suspension of a contemporary commercial aircraft type [1]. Boeing sustained billions in financial losses attributable to compensation, production cessation, redesign, and reputational harm [8].

Investigations revealed deeper systemic issues. The outsourcing of certification responsibilities from the FAA to Boeing within the Organisation Designation Authorization (ODA) framework diminished independent supervision and fostered potential conflicts of interest [1]. Organizational assessments indicate Boeing's corporate culture had transitioned to prioritize cost and schedule at the expense of safety [9, 1].

A door plug blowout on an Alaska Airlines 737 MAX 9 in January 2024, while not fatal, exposed persistent systemic issues in manufacturing quality control, leading to increased scrutiny by the NTSB and FAA [16, 17]. This underscores that the MAX situation reflects a persistent trend of safety challenges, not merely a historical event.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. System-Based Approaches to Aviation Risk

Recent scholarship emphasises that aviation safety cannot be understood solely through individual technical components; it is a property of socio-technical systems integrating technology, humans, organisations, and regulatory environments [11]. System-based analyses of the 737 MAX highlight how latent hazards accumulated through design decisions, documentation practices, organisational incentives, and oversight structures, eventually manifesting as active failures in flight operations [11, 9]. The concept of "resident pathogens" in systems engineering — persistent vulnerabilities lying dormant until activated by a certain sequence of events — has been applied to explain how standard activities can abruptly turn hazardous [11].

Systems thinking is especially pertinent in high-reliability sectors such as aviation, where risk is distributed across design, training, maintenance, operations, and regulation. This literature underscores the need for comprehensive risk assessments examining interactions among components rather than isolated failure modes [1].

B. Automation, Software Risk and Human-Machine Interaction

The MAX issue heightened scrutiny over the potential dangers posed by inadequately designed or insufficiently transparent software and sensor-dependent systems to human operators [4, 5]. MCAS was designed as a modest enhancement; however, its dependence on a singular sensor, frequent trim orders, and restricted visibility on the flight deck resulted in pilots being inadequately informed about its behavior or potential failure modes [4, 8].

Research on the 737 MAX underscores three major aspects linked to automation: dependence on single-point sensors that may transform common-cause failures into catastrophic incidents; software functionalities that significantly modify aircraft behavior must be transparent and incorporated into training curricula; and human-machine interaction design must ensure pilots maintain situational awareness even during automation [4, 1].

C. Regulatory Oversight, Delegation and Safety Culture

The delegated certification under the ODA program allowed Boeing personnel, as FAA-authorized representatives, to assess elements of their own company's design, resulting in apparent conflicts of interest and diminished external scrutiny [1, 9]. Research on reputational contagion demonstrates the MAX crashes adversely impacted not just Boeing's reputation but also airlines, regulators, and competitors, highlighting the systemic characteristics of aviation risk and trust [6].

These assessments converge on the view that safety culture — collective attitudes and norms around acceptable risk and reporting — is essential. When management incentives emphasize output, cost, or schedule, safety may deteriorate even in formally compliant organisations [1, 9].

D. Crisis Communication and Organisational Response

The literature on crisis management, utilizing frameworks such as Situational Crisis Communication Theory and Image Restoration Theory, has been employed to analyze Boeing's post-crash communications [18]. Analyses indicate initial communications from Boeing and certain authorities were viewed as defensive or minimizing, potentially eroding public trust [18, 6]. A staged perspective of crisis management — pre-crisis risk identification, acute crisis interventions, and post-crisis evaluation — is beneficial for African regulators formulating their own frameworks [1, 9].

E. African Aviation Regulation and Regional Cooperation

African aviation regulation functions under the African Civil Aviation Policy (AFCAP), which emphasises that safety management must be integral to all civil aviation operations and advocates for enhanced safety oversight mechanisms and inspector training [2]. The African Union and ICAO have endorsed Regional Safety Oversight Organisations (RSOOs) via the Ezulwini Declaration and AFI-Plan activities [7].

Nigeria's NCAA and Ghana's GCAA have implemented targeted safety oversight and SMS protocols. The NCAA outlined precise conditions for lifting the ban on the 737 MAX, including compliance with FAA airworthiness guidelines and enhanced pilot training [13, 14]. Ghana has enacted Safety Management System regulations and instituted a National Aviation Safety Plan with performance objectives and reporting frameworks [10, 11a, 12a, 12b].

Evaluations reveal that numerous African nations encounter obstacles including restricted technical capacity, inconsistent SMS execution, and resource limitations that hinder effective supervision of intricate operations and emerging technologies [15, 7].

IV. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative, interpretive case study approach focused on document analysis. Case-study methodologies are suitable for cultivating a comprehensive, contextual understanding of intricate systems requiring integration of diverse forms of evidence [19]. This paper examines the Boeing 737 MAX crisis as the principal case, with African regulatory actions in Nigeria and Ghana as embedded sub-cases.

The document corpus consists of: peer-reviewed academic articles on the 737 MAX and engineering ethics [1, 11]; technical and safety analyses [8, 4, 9]; regulatory and policy documents including AFCAP [2], Ezulwini Declaration and AFI-Plan RSOO studies [7], EU-Africa Safety in Aviation programme documentation [15], and SMS directives from the GCAA [10, 11a, 12a, 12b]; and press releases from the NCAA and GCAA [13, 14, 12b].

Documents were thematically classified according to four analytical categories: design and automation risk; regulatory supervision and delegation; safety culture and organisational governance; and crisis preparedness and communication. Themes were triangulated across sources to improve validity. The application to African regulatory authorities was created by aligning these themes with AFCAP, national SMS policies, and documented responses to the 737 MAX, then analyzing gaps, strengths, and opportunities.

The research relies on secondary documentary sources and does not engage human participants; ethical considerations encompass proper description of sources, avoidance of misattribution, and critical reflection on the limitations of secondary data.

V. LESSONS FROM THE BOEING 737 MAX CRISIS

A. Design Modifications, Automation and Single-Point Failures

A fundamental lesson from the 737 MAX is that seemingly minor design alterations can yield systemic repercussions when integrated with automation, sensor frameworks, and training choices. The repositioning of engines on the MAX modified pitch characteristics at elevated angles of attack, prompting Boeing to implement MCAS as a software-based fix [1, 8]. MCAS predominantly depended on a solitary angle-of-attack sensor, transforming a frequent sensor malfunction into a potentially catastrophic situation through repetitive nose-down trim commands without sufficient redundancy or cross-verification [4].

Any design modification impacting essential control attributes or introducing new automation logic must be treated as a significant safety concern regardless of whether the airframe name stays ostensibly unchanged. Reliance on singular sensors or software modules that may provide uncommanded control inputs is unacceptable without substantial redundancy, cross-verification, and fail-safe systems.

B. Regulatory Delegation and Independence

The MAX incident reveals dangers linked to widespread delegation of certification duties from regulators to manufacturers. Within the ODA system, Boeing personnel certified components of the MAX on behalf of the FAA, including facets of MCAS [1]. Subsequent investigations reveal this approach, combined with resource limitations at the FAA, diminished external monitoring and permitted significant design decisions to be characterised as minor alterations [9].

Restoring confidence after regulatory failures requires more than technical solutions; it requires institutional reforms that reaffirm regulatory independence, enhance technical expertise, and elucidate accountability.

C. Safety Culture and Organisational Governance

Examinations of Boeing's internal culture indicate the company's focus transitioned towards financial performance and timetable constraints, reducing the impact of engineering perspectives on strategic decisions [1, 9]. Internal correspondence revealing employee criticism of the aircraft and certification procedure, along with apprehension about voicing concerns, suggest a deficient safety culture [9].

Safety culture must be underpinned by governance structures that prioritise engineering perspectives, safeguard whistle-blowers, and expose significant safety-related decisions to independent scrutiny. The continuation of issues related to the MAX 9 door plug event indicates cultural and governance improvements remain ongoing [16, 17].

D. Crisis Preparedness, Communication and Post-Crisis Learning

Initial public remarks from Boeing and some authorities seemed tentative, defensive, and occasionally inconsistent with developing facts, fostering perceptions of opacity [18, 6]. Airlines and regulators grounded the aircraft at disparate periods, resulting in a fragmented reaction and exacerbating stakeholder confusion.

Efficient crisis management necessitates pre-established frameworks delineating decision thresholds for groundings, explicit communication channels to airlines and the public, and collaboration among authorities. Post-crisis learning must be institutionalized and systemic rather than superficial [16, 20].

VI. IMPLICATIONS FOR AFRICAN REGULATORY BODIES

A. Overview of the African Regulatory Landscape

African aviation operates under a complex framework of national civil aviation authorities, regional regulatory entities, and continental policy structures. AFCAP delineates strategic objectives emphasising safety management integration into daily operations and enhancement of safety monitoring and inspector training [2]. AFI Regional Safety Oversight efforts advocate for resilient RSOOs capable of consolidating resources and delivering unified oversight services to governments with constrained capacity [7].

Assessments of African safety oversight systems reveal inconsistent application of ICAO standards and recommended practices, deficiencies in technical personnel and financial resources, and obstacles in data collection and analysis [15, 7].

B. Nigeria: NCAA and the 737 MAX

Subsequent to Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302, the NCAA released statements confirming the 737 MAX 8 was not operational in Nigeria and that it was monitoring international investigations [13]. In February 2021, the NCAA announced removal of the prohibition on Boeing 737 MAX flights in Nigerian airspace, contingent upon adherence to FAA airworthiness regulations, specialized pilot training, and appropriate type certification acceptance processes [14].

The NCAA exercised prudence by requiring proof of technical corrections and enhanced training, corresponding with design and automation insights from the MAX catastrophe. Conversely, dependence on external mandates underscores the difficulty of developing indigenous capacity to autonomously assess intricate automation and software systems, indicating a necessity for deliberate investment in technical skills, potentially in partnership with regional entities and academic institutions.

C. Ghana: Safety Management Systems and National Safety Planning

The GCAA has actively implemented Safety Management Systems emphasising performance-driven methodology incorporating safety strategies, indicators, and ongoing monitoring [10]. Ghana's National Aviation Safety Plan for 2023-2025 delineates priorities, targets, and indicators, and pledges to provide an Annual Safety Report, fostering transparency and institutional learning [12b].

Ghana's experience indicates that even sophisticated SMS and safety planning frameworks require supplementary focused capacity building in automation and software management, as the unique complexities of systems like MCAS necessitate advanced knowledge in software engineering, control systems, and human factors analysis.

D. Cross-Cutting Implications for African Regulators

Mapping the lessons from the MAX crisis onto the Nigerian and Ghanaian contexts reveals four overarching implications. First, African regulators must prioritise design and automation modifications as significant hazards requiring thorough examination of sensor architecture, software logic, and human-machine interaction, rather than depending exclusively on foreign certification. Second, delegation of regulatory authority must be counterbalanced by robust independent auditing and verification within African CAAs and RSOOs. Third, safety culture must be assessed not only among operators but also inside regulatory agencies. Fourth, crisis-management frameworks must institutionalise communication protocols, established decision criteria for grounding aircraft, and systems for post-crisis evaluations.

VII. DISCUSSION

The analysis indicates that the Boeing 737 MAX problem, although rooted in a particular industrial and regulatory framework, had global significance — particularly for regulatory authorities in Africa. The crisis illustrates that aviation risk is systemic and multifaceted, stemming from the interplay of design decisions, automation, human-machine interaction, organisational culture, and regulatory monitoring [11, 1].

The primary challenge for African regulators is implementing these lessons under constraints of limited resources and capacity. The AFCAP and AFI-Plan initiatives have established a framework for safety management and regional collaboration, while Ghana's SMS directives and Nigeria's conditional lifting of the 737 MAX ban demonstrate active participation in global safety discussions [2, 10, 13, 14].

The MAX case illustrates that dependence on international certification may be precarious if foreign frameworks have inherent deficiencies. Recent NTSB findings about the MAX 9 door plug problem highlight that systemic difficulties may endure in large manufacturers and their regulatory agencies even following significant disasters [16, 17]. African authorities must align with FAA or EASA guidelines while cultivating capacity to critically assess these directives considering local operational situations, fleet compositions, and risk appetites.

© NOV 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 5 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I5-1718270

Regional Safety Oversight Organisations, when adequately financed and authorized, can consolidate competence in software and automation evaluation, human factors analysis, and data analytics — domains individual nations may find challenging to cultivate independently [7, 15]. Such regional entities could accommodate specialised teams assisting member states in examining intricate aircraft modifications and deriving insights from accidents across the continent.
The MAX situation also prompts reflection on safety culture within African aviation. As African nations pursue traffic expansion, the introduction of new routes and contemporary fleets may create risk that financial pressures could undermine safety margins if governance frameworks and incentives fail to prioritise safety as the foremost value. Incorporating safety performance indicators into regulatory evaluations and fostering just culture reporting are viable strategies.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This research has analyzed the Boeing 737 MAX crisis as a case study in aviation crisis and risk management, focusing on its implications for regulatory authorities in Africa, specifically Nigeria and Ghana. Through a qualitative document-analysis methodology, it has demonstrated that the MAX crisis was not merely a consequence of a defective software function, but an illustration of how design choices, automation behavior, insufficient redundancy, inadequate pilot training, regulatory delegation, and safety-culture deficiencies can converge to cause catastrophic accidents and extended crises.

The African aviation context, as framed by AFCAP and AFI-Plan initiatives, already recognises the importance of safety management and regional cooperation. Nigerian and Ghanaian regulatory responses demonstrate initial attempts to address the technical and organisational lessons from the MAX crisis; however, additional efforts are required to enhance local technical capacity, reinforce independent oversight of automation and software, institutionalise crisis preparedness and communication frameworks, and cultivate a robust safety culture.

African civil aviation authorities must perceive the MAX problem not solely as an external occurrence, but as an opportunity for introspection regarding domestic risk-governance frameworks. By investing in capacity, utilising regional collaboration, and integrating systems-based risk analysis into regulatory practices, African regulators can enhance resilience and guarantee that aviation growth on the continent is supported by strong safety and crisis-management systems.

IX. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This analysis relies solely on secondary documentary sources and excludes primary data from interviews with regulators, engineers, or pilots, which could offer deeper insights into safety culture and operational methods. It also emphasises Nigeria and Ghana as representative examples, indicating that conclusions may not be applicable to all African nations with markedly differing regulatory histories or fleet compositions.

Future study may conduct comparative case studies of other African CAAs, integrating documentary analysis with interviews and observational data. Quantitative empirical analysis of incident and near-miss data in African airspace, particularly automation-related occurrences, would be beneficial. Investigations into the impact of emerging technologies — including unmanned aircraft systems, advanced digital air traffic management, and alternative propulsion systems — on risk and regulatory requirements in Africa would further extend the understanding gained from the MAX crisis.

REFERENCES

[1] Herkert, J., Borenstein, J., & Miller, K. (2020). The Boeing 737 MAX: Lessons for engineering ethics. Science and Engineering Ethics, 26(6), 2957-2974.
[2] African Union Commission. (2013). African Civil Aviation Policy (AFCAP). Addis Ababa: African Union Commission.
[3] African Union Development Agency. (2018). Single African Air Transport Market: Policy framework document. Midrand: AUDA-NEPAD.

[4] Curran, N. T., Kennings, T. W., & Shin, K. G. (2023). Analysis and prevention of MCAS-induced crashes. arXiv preprint.
[5] Bergstra, J. A., & Burgess, M. (2020). Candidate software process flaws for the Boeing 737 MAX MCAS algorithm and risks for a proposed upgrade. arXiv preprint.
[6] Cioroianu, I. (2021). Reputational contagion and the Boeing 737-MAX disasters. Journal of Air Transport Management, 90, 101968.
[7] International Civil Aviation Organization. (2017). AFI Regional Aviation Safety Oversight Organizations (RSOOs) study: Final report. Montreal: ICAO.
[8] Malunga, M. (2022). Key lessons from the Boeing 737 MAX 8 accidents. Loss Prevention Bulletin, 287, 24-30.
[9] Chary, S. (2024). Lessons from the Boeing 737-MAX crashes. Science and Engineering Ethics, 30, 1-24.
[10] Ghana Civil Aviation Authority. (2014). Safety Management System in Ghana's aviation sector. Accra: GCAA.
[11] Appicharla, S. K. (2023). The Boeing 737 MAX 8 crashes: System-based approach to safety. SCSC Journal of System Safety.
[12] Ghana Civil Aviation Authority. (2019). Safety Management System: GCAA safety policy statement and reporting policy. Accra: GCAA.
[13] Nigerian Civil Aviation Authority. (2019). NCAA closely monitoring investigations into B737 MAX 8 aircraft's safety. Lagos: NCAA Press Release.
[14] Nigerian Civil Aviation Authority. (2021). NCAA lifts ban on Boeing 737 MAX aircraft. Lagos: NCAA Press Release.
[15] European Union. (2015). EU-Africa Safety in Aviation: Pan-Africa programme action document. Brussels: European Commission.
[16] Associated Press. (2025). Systemic failures led to a door plug flying off a Boeing 737 Max, NTSB says.
[17] Reuters. (2025). Boeing failed to provide training, oversight to prevent MAX 9 mid-air emergency, NTSB says.
[18] Thompson, D. (2024). Boeing 737 MAX crisis of 2018-2019: A content analysis using SCCT and Image Restoration Theory. RAIS Education Press.
[19] Yin, R. K. (2014). Case study research: Design and methods (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
[20] Wall Street Journal. (2025). Boeing's internal safety plan: Make problems easier to report.
[21] Ghana Civil Aviation Authority. (2021). Part 36 - Safety Management Systems: Ghana Civil Aviation Directives. Accra: GCAA.
[22] Ghana Civil Aviation Authority. (2023). National Aviation Safety Plan 2023-2025. Accra: GCAA.