FACT SHEET

CREATING A
SPEAK UP CULTURE
AT WORK

INTRODUCTION

Imagine for just a minute that your leadership has challenged the Human Resource function to champion a single organisation development initiative that could minimise, simultaneously, many risks.

Imagine too that the budget available for this wide-ranging, high impact assignment is modest to say the least, amounting to little more than a reprioritisation of your existing skills development allocation.

Costly mistakes, lost opportunities, unethical conduct, physical and psychological harm, environmental damage, regulatory breaches, adverse findings and judgements, reputation damage, reduced financial sustainability and adverse societal impacts.

It may strike you as the kind of impossible objective that is set by a boardroom with little appreciation for the demands of your current workload or the limitations of the resources available to you.

But you would be wrong, because there is one initiative that can satisfy these criteria and it is the topic of this Fact Sheet:

Creating a speak-up culture in the workplace.

images: Freepik.com

THE NEW ORGANISATION CULTURE IMPERATIVE

We have all experienced that moment when a single thought shared by a team member makes a startling contribution to the group's understanding of a problem and their decision-making. What we don't see are the many invisible losses to the organisation when someone holds their tongue rather than risk giving input that they fear might contradict a direction that is gaining momentum.

These daily lost opportunities may not threaten the survival of the organisation or the planet, but they can. Fortunately, most leaders want to hear their employees' ideas and concerns and this interest is growing. Given the speed and reach of information shared on digital platforms, there are few leaders who today do not fear being 'the last to know'.

There are exceptions, those leaders who prefer to remain blind to evidence of inconvenient realities. Because of them, the consumer and the citizen have an interest in the creation of a speak-up culture in every organisation. For the same reason, regulators need insiders with knowledge of wilful corporate governance and compliance transgressions to raise a flag in the interests of investors and the public at large. We need people in the know to speak out - even when their information is being discouraged or ignored by the leadership.

Here are two recent cases that highlight this need:

- There were reportedly 12 whistleblowing reports of safety problems with the Boeing 737 MAX made to the US airline regulatory body, the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) in April this year. The reports came from employees of both Boeing and the FAA itself. Here's the significance of the reports being made in April: It was the month that followed the crash of Ethiopian Air flight 302, which itself followed just five months after the crash of Indonesia's Lion Air flight 620 in October 2018.

  If only these whistleblowers had spoken up before there was a combined death toll of 346, before Boeing's share price dropped $13 billion in a single trading day and before Boeing's reputation was damaged – possibly beyond repair. It's reported that a preoccupation with competition and speed to market rather than aircraft safety dominated board-level considerations. All the while, the Boeing specialists who could predict the adverse consequences of their Board's demands had access to the FAA anonymous hotline. They just used it too late.

- Employees at the Brumaldinho operation of the world's largest iron ore and nickel mining company, Brazilian multinational Vale S.A., did speak up in time – but even though their reports were heard, they were not heeded.

  When a dam of toxic by-products of the mining process requiring permanent containment collapsed on 25 January this year, it spewed 12 million cubic metres of sludge that engulfed the company's own mining operations, the nearby town and the surrounding farmlands. As at May 2019 the death toll was 237 with a further 33 missing – many Vale's own employees.

  The Vale share price is now infamous for its record as suffering the largest single day decline in the history of the Brazilian stock market. The stock lost 24% of its value (US $19 billion) on 28 January alone. Moody's downgraded Vale's credit rating to junk status on 27 February. So far eight Vale staff and contractors have been arrested, including two from the German company appointed to inspect and assure the dam's integrity. If only Vale had listened.

You may work in a context where the consequences of employee silence are less devastating. Even so, you will be persuaded of the case for a speak-up culture by the writing of Amy Edmondson, Professor of Leadership at Harvard Business School. Published in November 2018, her latest book *The Fearless Organisation*, looks set to become a management classic.

With access to performance data from multiple teams across the globe within a single giant corporation, Edmondson has demonstrated a correlation between team performance as assessed against a common set of desired outcomes, and the extent to which the team climate enables or inhibits a practice of speaking your mind.

At its best, a speak-up culture is the fuel of high performance. At its worst, employee silence is dangerous, deafening and even deadly. Given this, it will be no surprise that the topic of this Fact Sheet is today a high priority amongst leaders and governance professionals the world over. And it is to the Human Resource profession that they should be able to look for supportive insights and solutions.

CAN 'PRONENESS TO SPEAKING UP' BE INFLUENCED?

For many executives it is both surprising and puzzling to think that an employee might not speak up when they have information or ideas that are of importance to the organisation. In response it is necessary that we:

• Provide leaders with a meaningful understanding of the many factors that discourage employees from speaking up.
• Raise awareness that a speak-up culture does not manifest unaided - it has to be pursued and nurtured consciously.

In turn these insights offer a sound foundation on which to establish the workplace practices necessary if we are to counteract the powerful drivers persuading us to look the other way.

Some may argue that personality factors beyond the employer's influence explain why one employee will speak up while another stands silent. Recent research shows that while individual differences in proneness to speaking out are undeniable, the organisation context has a powerful moderating or magnifying effect regardless of individual personality.

Simply put, an outspoken employee is likely to be less so in a non-conducive climate while an employee who finds great difficulty speaking out is more likely to do so in an encouraging and enabling environment. This confirms that well-considered organisation development interventions can have a positive impact on the likelihood of all employees saying what needs to be said.

In the remainder of this **Fact Sheet** we:

• provide an overview of the many reasons why people cannot find their voices at work when we need them to.
• propose counter-balancing measures that can be integrated into your management practices and incorporated into your culture change programme.

As we highlight both the old truths and new evidence on which you will be able to formulate recommendations, we refer you to selected readings that will deepen your understanding beyond the scope of this overview.

IS OUR FEAR OF SPEAKING UP RATIONAL?

Sometimes it is. Our news feeds are punctuated by reports of courageous people who have called out their employers for wrongdoing and suffered adverse professional and personal consequences.

- **Occupational detriment**

  There are many ways in which our employment status can be harmed by employers with an interest in deterring us from telling the truth. A local level supervisor or top executive, intent on achieving results through corrupt means, can attempt to secure the compliance and silence of employees through threats of and actual occupational detriment.

  In our Fact Sheet 2019/4 you will find a list of retaliatory actions that are deemed occupational detriment in terms of the Protected Disclosures Act.

- **Personal detriment**

  It is not only the ability to provide for ourselves and our dependents, but our sense of purpose, belonging and self-esteem that can be lost when we are dismissed or hounded out of our positions.

  Those who work in regions with high levels of unemployment face the prospect of a jobless future. Those driven by a deep sense of care for the organisation, its people and those they serve, suffer anguish over their failure to get remedial action taken. In extreme cases, those intent on maintaining our silence at any cost may threaten the safety of ourselves and our loved ones, and the inevitable fear is compounded by feelings of guilt.

This kind of detriment is not always at the hands of an employer of course, as it can be others such as co-workers involved in crime syndicates targeting your workplace who make your work life intolerable if they suspect you will expose them.

Where brave people draw attention to business practices that are deceptive and harmful in the face of such danger, they make an enormous sacrifice in the interests of the greater good.

We must caution that if you ever consider openly exposing criminal wrongdoing and have reason to believe you could become the target of career or life-threatening retaliation, you should seek specialist guidance that is beyond the scope of this Fact Sheet.

All employers should ensure that they have in place expertly managed and credible safe reporting systems that guarantee anonymity. This will be one of the topics in the upcoming SABPP Fact Sheet 2019/8 that examines best practices in the management of whistleblowing in the workplace.

In the balance of our discussion we will focus on insights of value for the promotion of a speak-up culture in organisations that are intent on operating within the bounds of the law.

THE COUNTERACTIVE EFFECT OF COGNITIVE BIASES

Our ability to take mental shortcuts ('heuristics') in decision-making is an invaluable human ability in many but not all circumstances. Judging, in a split-second, the least dangerous route as we traverse foreign terrain can save our lives but applying the same style of thinking to other situations can be to our detriment. In some cases, these so-called cognitive biases cause us to behave irrationally.

Let's examine a few of the cognitive biases that can deter us from speaking up when we should, be that in our personal or work environments.

Do as I say or else: the authority bias and our obedience orientation

One of the first objectives of our caregivers is to instil in us at an early age a willingness to co-operate and take direction. As children we learn fast that we will find favour and avert sanction when we do as we are told. This early life experience keeps us from harm until we are old enough to judge danger for ourselves, amongst other benefits.

Central to the requirement that we obey those in authority is the implication that they are more knowledgeable and experienced – they know best. When we are young and know no better, we can develop an implicit faith in authority figures that can persist throughout our lives. It is reinforced by our dependence on the insights of others throughout our lives – the experts who guide our adult education and the professionals we consult for needs we cannot service ourselves.

Just how pervasive is this obedience orientation around the world? In an important study published in *Current Anthropology* (60:1, February 2019), researchers Oliver Scott Curry, Daniel Austin Mullins, and Harvey Whitehouse identified seven co-operative behaviours that are commonly prized across cultures. One of these cardinal behaviours, that was found in 99.9% of cases in a study of 60 societies (and based on 600 sources), is simply described as 'defer to superiors'.

This hierarchical orientation, inculcated in the family and the community, is the mainstay of the organisational command structure that we enter as adults. It's no wonder that the fear of being charged with insubordination drives us to obey instructions we do not agree. Unless first-line supervisors and managers invite and encourage challenging and dissenting views, they face the prospect of mute workers who render their bosses metaphorically deaf.

Fit in or else: the conformity bias

Our human desire for social acceptance and belonging has its roots in deep-seated social beliefs and practices that have enabled communities to survive over time despite adverse conditions.

The threat of social isolation if we do not conform to prevailing group norms has a powerful impact on our behaviour, compelling us to mask even our strong individual desires and beliefs. In the main, we have a strong aversion to standing out as different. We are wary of any action, such as expressing a contrary opinion, that could provoke a negative group response.

When we take the dual effect of the status quo bias and the conformity bias into consideration, it is little wonder that those who speak up have been labelled as 'sell-outs' and 'snitches' even when that person is acting in the interests of longer-term group sustainability and benefit.

Don't rock the boat: the status quo bias

The status quo bias is our tendency to favour the current reality over the prospect of uncertainty. It is such a powerful bias that it motivates us to tolerate and justify staying in dysfunctional relationships, both personal and professional, rather than risk the prospect of the uncertain future that a change would bring.

This individual bias is reinforced in the group context by sayings such as 'don't upset the apple cart'. The status quo bias of our colleagues means that we face the risk of antagonising them by speaking up, as our action can have the effect of threatening their own status quo bias.

Not surprisingly, we are more likely to act to change our circumstances when we are able to predict and control the outcome. When we contemplate making a report or disclosure to a supervisor or other authority, we realise that we have little control over how they will handle it. This uncertainty and ambiguity can be a deterrent that adds weight to the status quo bias.

Learn how our status quo bias prejudices us against whistleblowers even when they are our friends and we agree with them! Read Why We Love to Hate Whistleblowers by F Diane Barth in Psychology Today, 17 August 2018.

Don't make it your business: the passive bystander effect

How do we explain the fact that a group of people can see someone in need of help and not offer assistance? Why are we more likely to help a stranger in trouble when we are the only person in sight than we are when one of many? It's the powerful and complex 'bystander effect' at work.

Also described as the 'diffusion of responsibility effect', our impulse to act is dulled when in the presence of others. It seems that we can justify our non-action more easily when others are present.

In a fascinating link to the topic of speaking up, researchers Insiya Hussain and Subra Tangirala (HBR: January 2019) show that the more widely known wrongdoing in the workplace is, the less likely it is that anyone will report it. 'Everyone knew but nobody did anything?'. The passive bystander effect is the answer to incredulous outsiders when it comes to light that good people knew of the unethical conduct and did nothing.

Interested in the link between the passive bystander effect and speaking up? Read Why Open Secrets Exist in Organisations by Insiya Hussain and Subra Tangirala in Harvard Business Review (January, 2019)

Don't hurt anyone's feelings: the courtesy bias

Often described as the 'politeness barrier' that limits frank and honest communication, the courtesy bias describes our tendency to state opinions in a way that is as socially correct and inoffensive as possible. In the workplace, the courtesy bias and the authority and obedience orientations have a compounding effect in deterring the likelihood that we will speak up.

Just turn a blind eye: wilful blindness

In the process of reconciling ourselves to the status quo we engage in a process of rationalised justification that helps us

to resolve any cognitive dissonance. Wilful blindness is the label given to our behaviour when we avoid responsibility by intentionally keeping ourselves unaware of facts that would demand that we act.

Consciously or not, convincing ourselves that we don't know about or cannot foresee wrongdoing, helps us justify inaction when we should be speaking up.

There can be many reasons why we would succumb, to such a state of denial. What is certain is that the greater the potential payoff, the more likely we are to discount the importance of our own crises of conscience and to act against our better judgement. The most obvious of these payoffs, many of which are intangible, are large financial incentives attached to performance targets.

Interested in the fascinating phenomenon of wilful blindness? Read Margaret Heffernan's excellent book Wilful Blindness: Why we ignore the obvious at our peril (Simon and Schuster, 2019)

Today we increasingly see disciplinary and criminal charges against those in the know drafted as follows: 'they knew about or *reasonably should have known about…'*. This leaves the wilfully blind leader with little room to hide when they set impossible targets to which large incentives are attached and then turn a blind eye to how results are achieved.

Leaders can be unaware of the extent to which these cognitive biases, coupled with a fear of a 'shoot the messenger' response, prevent their employees from taking that first step through what is supposedly an open door.

Workplace ethics training must raise leader and employee awareness of the existence of cognitive biases and the ways that they can cause us to act against our better judgement. An ability to identify and make conscious our cognitive biases 'in action' is central to our ability to make considered ethical choices that are in the longer-term best interests of ourselves and others.

We now turn our attention to the general climate of honesty in the workplace and the influence that this has on the likelihood of employees speaking up against dishonesty when they would like to and should do.

THE TRUTH ABOUT HONESTY AT WORK

A culture of honesty in the workplace is the hallmark of an organisation in which people are able to express their views and raise concerns. But when we reflect critically, we realise the extent to which dishonesty can be a feature of communication in the workplace.

It's not all the bosses' fault.

From an early age we work out that making our caregivers happy is a good strategy, and that this involves telling them what they want to hear. We get punished or rewarded according to whether or not our words and deeds match their expectations.

This early experience tends to pervade our future relationships with authority figures, particularly in the workplace where we again find ourselves in an asymmetrical power relationship – this time with our supervisors and managers. Dependence upon a parent for sustenance as a child is a precursor to the adult experience of dependence on our employer for continued remuneration. It's not surprising that we share an aversion to the thought of being the bearer of bad news at work.

Sometimes we are co-opted into deception by our bosses.

Just as we have a need to stay in our supervisors' good books, so do they. Even at the highest level, executives have a need to stay in favour with the board and shareholders. And so begin the many ways in which we are co-opted into the deception of others by those responsible for setting an example to us.

It can be a thoughtless request to cover for them ('if the boss /wife phones, just tell her I am at the bank') or it can be considered instruction to gild or fudge an explanation in a report. Either way, these are just two instances of supervisor co-opted dishonesty that constitute approved lying.

Dishonesty may pervade official communication.

The need to manage the organisation's reputation, in the interests of its' sustainability, requires that leaders carefully consider the impact of communications on the perceptions and actions of customers, shareholders, regulators and other influential stakeholders. The internal marketing function and the external media both play significant roles in shaping these stakeholder perceptions.

In managing their reputation, organisations vary in the extent to which they are transparent and honest. But there is a difference between shining your shoes before stepping out the door and frank deception and manipulation of stakeholder sentiment.

Marketing campaigns that ring hollow in the ears of employees put the employer at risk of losing the loyalty of their internal audience. Remember Vale S.A., the mining company who failed to respond to employee concerns about the integrity of its Brumaldhino dam, which killed 237 people when it collapsed? Their list of stated corporate values starts with the statement 'lives matter most'.

How do employees respond when there is a discrepancy between their experienced reality and the version their organisation portrays? The discomfort of these contradictions creates a state of cognitive dissonance that is hard to sustain, and a way of reconciling them must be found for the employee who wishes to or has no option other than to continue in the organisation's service. Two recent articles together capture the impact of such discrepancies on employee proneness to speak the truth:

- 'When employees perceive duplicity between their organisation's stated intentions and actions, they eventually follow suit'. These are the powerful words of Ron Carucci in '4 Ways Lying Becomes the Norm in a Company' (HBR, 15 February 2019).
- A 'cultural numbness' develops in us as we accommodate over time to contexts in which our own values and the prevailing norms are at odds. This can lead us to experience a type of 'moral capture' in which we become immune to and even stop seeing that which we previously found so wrong. In effect, explains Dr Merete Wedell-Wedellsborg in The Psychology Behind Unethical Behavior (HBR, 12 April 2019), the warning bells in our minds stop ringing. It should come as no surprise then that we don't always think to ring a warning bell for others.

Having considered some of the rational and other factors that dissuade us from speaking up at work, we now examine the features of an organisation culture that encourages employees to express their views and concerns.

CREATING A CLIMATE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY

An organisation in which employees are not afraid to speak up is one that is characterised by psychological safety.

A psychologically safe environment can be described as one in which:

- Dignity, respect and honesty are cardinal values that are practiced and not only preached.
- Each employee is seen as a job expert who can contribute valuable observations from their unique vantage point.
- Everyone is expected to contribute to continuous improvement in all aspects of the organisation. This approach makes critical reflection on the status quo a legitimate activity that does not arouse a defensive response.
- People are encouraged to talk about things that have gone wrong rather than conceal mistakes. They are met with a solution-oriented approach by supervisors, one that avoids blaming or shaming. This applies to both ongoing and formal performance review and planning discussions.
- Leaders are trained to constrain expressions of strong emotion when receiving bad news from subordinates, as this deters future disclosures. Where root-cause analysis reveals the need to hold an individual accountable, this is handled in a considered process away from the heat of the moment.
- There is social proof that speaking up is safe to do. Employees must see that others who speak out in the best interests of the organisation can do so without adverse consequences. Above all, no-one should be threatened or humiliated for expressing a view. Ideally, constructive inputs should be warmly welcomed and acted on where appropriate.
- All management practices are carried out in a manner that avoids the unnecessary arousal of fear, be that fear of humiliation, isolation, powerlessness, indignity, disrespect or unfairness.

A critical observation made by Edmondson (2018) is that the immediate supervisor plays a pivotal role in the employees' likelihood of speaking up. This is to be understood given that regardless of top management commitment, it is the immediate supervisor who holds the power to determine an employee's quality of day-to-day work life and access to advancement opportunities. As the author writes, 'Psychological safety is very much shaped by local leaders' (Edmondson, 2018).

'Psychological safety is very much shaped by local leaders' *– from The Fearless Organisation by Amy C Edmondson (2018).*

PROMOTING SOCIAL COURAGE

We have discussed how social pressure and cognitive biases discourage people from speaking up. Derogatory terms such as 'snitch', 'sell-out' and 'traitor' immediately elicit a strong fear of social rejection and isolation. Having recognised this reality, our organisation development efforts must prioritise the replacement of these stigmatising characterisations with positive and pride-inducing alternatives.

It's not impossible, but it requires a concerted campaign grounded in equally powerful societal expectations.

We spoke earlier of the seven co-operative behaviours, including 'defer to superiors', found to be highly prized in diverse cultures and countries around the world by Scott Curry, Mullins and Whitehouse (2019). Included in the list of seven behaviours are those we can leverage to powerful positive effect in the promotion of a speak-up culture.

When we look at the full list, we find that the other six universal behaviours are: Help your family, help your group, return favours, be brave, divide resources and respect other's property.

By linking the act of speaking up to the behaviours described as 'help your family', 'help your group' and 'be brave', we can tap into and develop in our employees the personal attribute that researchers are calling 'social courage'.

How do we do this? Workplace ethics training for all levels of employees must raise awareness of the link between unethical activity and negative consequences for 'the greater good' – not only ourselves but our colleagues, families, friends and communities. Speaking up must be positioned as a courageous activity that is prized because it demonstrates the employee's care and sense of responsibility to others.

Excited by the idea of promoting courage at work? Read James R. Detert's valuable guidance in his article, Cultivating Everyday Courage (HBR, November 2018).

Studies of social courage are also offering advice for the personality characteristics to look for when recruiting for a speak-up culture. Howard and Cogswell (2018) found that employees most likely to speak up are those who demonstrate grit and have proactive personalities. Their research is well summarised by Greenberg (2018) who explains, 'Gritty people are determined, passionate about their goals and willing to persevere. Proactive people take action to address and fix problems, rather than avoiding them'.

While there will be significant individual differences in the extent to which your existing employees possess these characteristics, Howard and Cogswell note that empowering leadership can embolden employees and increase the likelihood of their speaking up.

In our final section we reflect on management practices that will have a positive empowering impact on your employees.

ENSURING EMPLOYEES KNOW WHETHER, HOW AND WHEN TO SPEAK UP

There are many practical steps that you can take to increase the likelihood that your employees will speak up in the organisation's best interests. Here are six questions to guide a self-assessment process for your organisation:

Is the requirement explicit?

Don't assume that your employees know that the organisation genuinely wants them to speak up. It is necessary to be explicit if we are to counter that deeply-ingrained 'mind your business' message.

Just as we convey our speak-up expectation to employees, we must require every supervisor, manager and executive to elicit their employees' views and concerns, and to respond constructively to them.

Does everyone have the necessary skills?

As with all workplace requirements, relevant training should be provided. This includes not only speak-up skills training for employees, but 'listen-up' skills for leaders.

Looking for a quick start? Read these excellent articles and then distribute them widely in your organisation:

For all employees: How to Speak Up When It Matters by Smith, Grant and Rock, *Harvard Business Review* 4 March 2019.

For all leaders: How to be the kind of boss that people speak up to by Smith, Weller and Rock in *Quartz at Work*, 4 February 2019.

Is the legal obligation understood?

Employee induction and awareness initiatives need to cover common law concepts at the foundation of the employment relationship including the duty of care and the duty to act in good faith. These are legal and moral duties that we are expected to fulfil regardless of whether or not it is comfortable for us to do so.

An employee who allows harm to come to the organisation while turning a blind eye, or fails to co-operate when asked for such information, can be guilty of the offence of derivative misconduct. Learning that they may be disciplined due to the wrongdoing of others can embolden those who are reluctant to speak up.

Are contributions acknowledged and valued?

One of the key reasons that employees give for not speaking up is a belief that their input will fall on deaf ears. If they are to be encouraged to share their views and concerns, these need to be responded to, even if their ideas cannot be pursued or their suspicion is without foundation. The greatest reward for an employee who makes an input is to know that it has been considered and to see it acted upon where appropriate.

Financial rewards from an employer to an employee for speaking up or blowing the whistle are not recommended, with the latest research showing that this can in fact decrease rather than increase speaking up.

Are escalation procedures clear and communicated?

Do your employees know the avenues available to them to raise issues of concern and do they know how to escalate important matters when these are ignored or swept under the carpet by the first line recipient? Look out for our upcoming Fact Sheet 2019/8 where we discuss this topic in more detail.

People are more likely to speak up at work when:

- Expectations are made clear

- Common law obligations are understood

- Speak up and listen up skills are developed

- Opportunities are created

- Contributions are valued

- Escalation protocols are unambiguous

- Derivative misconduct is sanctioned

Are opportunities prioritised and engineered?

The fast pace of the contemporary workplace offers little opportunity for discussion of matters beyond immediate operational demands. Even scheduled one-on-one meetings between supervisor and employee suffer from time-pressure as urgent matters take precedence. Opportunities in which each employee is put at ease and time is made available for them to raise matters on their mind need to be created.

Curious as to why you shouldn't offer financial incentives to your employees for speaking up? Read 'Hijacking the Moral Imperative: How Financial Incentives Can Discourage Whistleblower Reporting' by Berger, Perrault and Wainberg (2017).

How different would your life be if someone didn't tell you about
SABPP?

?

SABPP A VOICE FOR THE HR PROFESSION
REFER HR PROFESSIONALS FOR REGISTRATION!
professional@sabpp.co.za

SABPP ™
SA BOARD FOR PEOPLE PRACTICES
Setting HR standards

CONCLUSION

The development of a speak-up culture could be the most important contribution you make to the sustainability of the organisations that you serve during your career.

When employees are empowered to voice their opinions, suggestions and concerns, organisational performance is enhanced, and ethical risks are identified and can be addressed before reputation harm occurs.

Regardless of individual personality differences, leadership and management practices can have a significant impact on the likelihood that your employees will speak up, by:

• instilling a culture of honesty

• creating the experience of psychological safety

• promoting the importance of social courage; and

• ensuring that all people management practices equip and embolden employees to speak up:

we can deliver profound value to individual employees and organisations while serving the interests of society as a whole.

Look out for the September 2019 Fact Sheet on a related topic: Best Practices in the Management of Whistleblowing. For an understanding of the requirements of South Africa's Protected Disclosures Act see our May 2019 Fact Sheet.

This Fact Sheet was written by:

Penny Milner-Smyth
Director: Ethicalways
SABPP: MHRP

REFERENCES AND RECOMMENDED READING

Barth, F.D. (2018, August 17). Why we love to hate whistleblowers. Psychology Today.
https://www.psychologytoday.com/intl/blog/the-couch/201808/why-we-love-hate-whistleblowers

Berger, L., Perrault, S., Wainberg, J. (2017). Hijacking the moral imperative: how financial incentives can discourage whistleblower reporting. Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory, American Accounting Association, 36:3.
https://aaapubs.org/doi/abs/10.2308/ajpt-51663

Carucci, R. (2019, February 15). 4 ways lying becomes the norm in a company. Harvard Business Review.
https://hbr.org/2019/02/4-ways-lying-becomes-the-norm-at-a-company

Detert, J.R. (2018). Cultivating everyday courage. Harvard Business Review, November - December.
https://hbr.org/2018/11/cultivating-everyday-courage

Edmondson, A.C. (2018). The Fearless Organisation. New Jersey, USA: Wiley.

Greenberg, M. (2018, January 30). New research shows How to facilitate social courage. What makes us willing to speak up and take a stand? Psychology Today.
https://www.psychologytoday.com/intl/blog/the-mindful-self-express/201801/new-research-shows-how-facilitate-social-courage

Heffernan, M. (2019). Wilful Blindness: Why we ignore the obvious at our peril (London, UK: Simon and Schuster)

Howard, M.C. and Cogswell, J.E. (2018, January 17). The left side of courage: Three exploratory studies on the antecedents of social courage. Journal of Positive Psychology.
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17439760.2018.1426780

Hussain, I. and Tangirala, S. (2019, January 14). Why open secrets exist in organizations. Harvard Business Review.
https://hbr.org/2019/01/why-open-secrets-exist-in-organizations

Scott Curry, O., Mullins, D.A., Whitehouse, H (2019). Is it good to cooperate? Testing the theory of morality as cooperation in 60 Societies. Current Anthropology, 60 (1).

Smith, K., Grant, H. and Rock, D. (2019, March 4). How to speak up when it matters. Harvard Business Review.
https://hbr.org/2019/03/how-to-speak-up-when-it-matters

Smith, K, Weller, C. and Rock, D. (2019, February 4). How to be the kind of boss that people speak up to. Quartz at Work.
https://qz.com/work/1540631/how-to-be-the-kind-of-boss-that-people-speak-up-to/

FACT SHEET

SABPP™
SA BOARD FOR PEOPLE PRACTICES
Setting HR standards

DATE	NUMBER	SUBJECT
2016		
February	1	**PRODUCTIVITY BASICS**
March	2	**SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT**
April	3	**TALENT MANAGEMENT: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE**
May	4	**BUILDING ORGANISATIONAL CAPABILITIES**
June	5	**CHANGE MANAGEMENT**
July	6	**INNOVATION IN HR**
August	7	**HR TECHNOLOGY**
September	8	**HR IN BUSINESS SUSTAINABILITY**
October	9	**THE LEARNING & DEVELOPMENT LANDSCAPE IN SA**
2017		
February	1	**MODERN SLAVERY**
March	2	**PENSION LAW FOR EMPLOYERS**
April	3	**THE GAME CHANGER: ROLE OF HR**
May	4	**HR GOVERNANCE**
June	5	**INTEGRATING SKILLS DEVELOPMENT, EMPLOYMENT EQUITY AND B-BBEE TRANSFORMATION**
July	6	**STRESS MANAGEMENT**
August	7	**REMUNERATION: RECENT TRENDS**
September	8	**HOW CEOs AND CHROs CAN USE THE SABPP TO CREATE EXCELLENCE IN HR MANAGEMENT**
October	9	**PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES**
November	10	**RETRENCHMENT**
December	11	**THE SOUTH AFRICAN LEADERSHIP STANDARD**

For more information about SABPP, visit our website www.sabpp.co.za or follow us on twitter @Sabpp1 for daily HR information

FACT SHEET

SABPP™
SA BOARD FOR
PEOPLE PRACTICES
Setting HR standards

DATE	NUMBER	SUBJECT
2018		
February	1	**STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**
March	2	**BULLYING IN THE WORKPLACE**
April	3	**LISTERIOSIS AND FOOD SAFETY IN THE WORKPLACE**
May	4	**FLEXIBLE WORK PRACTICES**
June	5	**YOUTH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE**
July	6	**HR PRACTITIONERS AS EX-OFFICIO COMMISSIONERS OF OATHS**
August	7	**NATIONAL MINIMUM WAGE (NMW)**
September	8	**EMPLOYEE RETRENCHMENT**
October	9	**THE FUTURE OF YOUTH IN SOUTH AFRICA**
November	10	**BOARD EXAMINATIONS: A SIGNIFICANT STEP FORWARD FOR HR PROFESSIONALISATION**
December	11	**CHRONIC DISEASE MANAGEMENT: CANCER IN THE WORK PLACE**
2019		
February	1	**EMPLOYER VALUE PROPOSITION**
March	2	**QUALITY COUNCIL FOR TRADES AND OCCUPATIONS**
April	3	**RECENT TRENDS ON REMUNERATION GOVERNANCE**
May	4	**THE PROTECTED DISCLOSURES ACT**
June	5	**HR SERVICE DELIVERY MODELS**
July	6	**CREATING A SPEAK UP CULTURE AT WORK**

For more information about SABPP, visit our website www.sabpp.co.za or follow us on twitter @Sabpp1 for daily HR information