

# Need for Whistleblowing and Its Policies: A Literature Review

Dr. Saleh Mohammed Mashehdul Islam  
Professor, School of Business,  
Ahsanullah University of Science and Technology, Dhaka, Bangladesh

## Abstract

Whistleblowing can be termed as an exposure of information by an employee who contends for intended wrongdoing carried out by anyone within a company. Whistleblowing can be carried out through inside or outside networks. This can fortify an organization's extensive policy and program. Offering monetary incentives for whistleblowers is one of the crucial initiatives to support whistleblowing. The study argues the vital issues in whistleblowing from practical and theoretical points of view. It includes basis of whistleblowing for drawing some common guidelines to put into practice of whistleblowing in an organization. The application of whistleblowing has some constraints from both formal and moral perspectives. The paper recognizes some aspects that assist or restrict real whistleblowing. It finishes with some thoughts of different ways to endorse a constructive whistleblowing practice against any wrongdoing within a company.

**Keywords:** Whistleblowing and its policy, whistleblower, corporate inside and outside network.

**DOI:** 10.7176/IKM/12-3-03

**Publication date:** May 31<sup>st</sup> 2022

## 1. Introduction

Whistleblowing can be regarded as informing a wrongdoing that requires for rectifying or ceasing with the purpose of defending any public interest. Whistleblowing engages an employee's notice to an individual or a body that can perform anything regarding the noticed wrongdoing within an organization. Whistleblowing can be performed throughout inside or outside networks. Indoor or inside networks are means endorsed by an organization. As instance, inside networks are employee complaint committees, governance and compliance executives, internal auditors, and managers. Outdoor or outside networks of whistleblowing may include print or electronic media, government or public authorities.

The word whistleblower arises from the exercise of English Bobbies, who would usually blow their whistles when they observed any command of a crime. In standard, whistleblowers desire to correct or dismiss a wrongdoing that they detected in organizational settings. Whistleblowers are valued in organizations as they call for any attention to the problems before they turn into more harmful. Whistleblowers should be inspired and sheltered by regulation as they undertake unique as well as essential information about particular wrongdoings. Mostly, they hold information not yet in the hands of the authorities.

Most of the whistleblowers are from inside network, who inform any wrongdoing to a fellow employee or superior within their organization. One of the most exciting questions regarding whistleblowers from inside network is why and under what conditions one will either turn immediately to stop illegitimate and else improper conduct or report it.

There are some causes to consider that individuals are more expected to take any action regarding improper conduct, inside organization, if there are complaint systems that propose not just choices uttered by the organization, but a choice of options for individuals, including an option that proposes near outright secrecy. External whistleblowers, though, notice wrongdoing to outer people or bodies. In these cases, depending on the information's harshness and nature, whistleblowers may notice the wrongdoing to the media, lawyers, law enforcement or watchdog agencies.

The drives for whistleblowing and the absence of whistleblower protection have often given controversy to whistleblowing. Cultural impediments nevertheless, whistleblowing might be an encouraging exercise in a business. Yet its acceptance and ultimate institutionalization necessitates an intense look into the prevailing social, political, cultural and legitimate environments that impede and endorse such exercise, along with the level of awareness and approach towards whistleblowing among primary stakeholders. Moreover, any offered measure towards its acceptance should prudently be designed, factoring in inherent drawbacks together with possible benefits.

Thus, the study wishes to elucidate the theoretic and applied foundations of whistleblowing. It refers the consciousness, approaches, and concepts of offered policy on whistleblowing and its benefits. It also consolidates the propositions on how to endorse a more progressive whistleblowing attitude in a business through apposite whistleblowing legislation, and care for constructions of such legislation.

## 2. Need for Whistleblowing and Its Policies

Whistleblowing essentially provides aids for organizations. However, these aids are normally unacknowledged

in the heat of disagreements surrounding many whistleblowing occurrences. The organizational aids of whistleblowing are:

- initial identification of any conduction requiring rectification;
- initial identification of frail or faulty systems which make the organization exposed to damage, denunciation, or lawful action;
- prevention from significant financial losses;
- safeguarding progressive corporate repute;
- abolition of any risk to the health and safety of the employees or the community;
- care for a positive record on environmental safeguard;
- enhanced attention on accountability of administrators and staff.

Whistle-blowers, those persons who draw attention to potential wrongdoing within their organizations, are focused for much attention. Some state that whistleblowers are holding honorable characters, agreeing to sacrifice personally and professionally to uncover organizational practices that are dispensable, deceitful, or detrimental to the public safety. Others propose that whistleblowers are, in general, resented employees who malevolently and frantically allege persons they think have aggrieved them to achieve their own self-seeking goals.

Whistleblowing study proposes several conditions that are needed if whistleblowing is to be handled successfully. First, employees must be acquainted with suitable steps to be taken when noticing their moral concerns inside the organization. Researches of federal government employees specify that there is an important association between employees' awareness of suitable inside networks and the possibility that they will notice observed wrongdoing. Second, employees must realize that their concerns will be addressed seriously and will be examined accordingly. Researches endorse that many employees who first notice their concerns on the inside later go on outside the company with their information if they identify their organizations to be indifferent. Third, employees must be assertive that they will not experience personal retaliations for using inside networks to notice observed wrongdoing. Whistleblowing researches propose that employees who think that management will revenge for uttering the concerns may be expected to blow the whistle outside the organization.

Whistleblowing policies must have promise of top management and must effectively be informed to the employees. Policies should have at least following elements:

1. A plain declaration that employees who are information about potential wrongdoing inside organization have an accountability to release the information to proper authorities within the organization;
2. The designation of particular employee or group of employees outside any pecking order as grievance addressee;
3. An assurance that employees who in fine trust reveal observed wrongdoing to the nominated authorities within the organization will be sheltered from unfavorable service effects; and
4. The formation of impartial and unprejudiced investigative process.

This report patronizes that the whistleblowing study declared before specifies to legitimate, pragmatic, and moral requirements that coerce organizations to form whistleblowing policies. The discussion below elucidates why this study supports this, and shows the legitimate, pragmatic, and moral requirements that make whistleblowing policies desirable.

### *2.1 The Legitimate Requirement*

The legitimate developments create whistleblowing policies an imperative measure of organizations' complete moral values. A current event at University of Hong Kong disclosed the university's policy of revealing the whistleblower's identity to incriminate groups (Lim et. al. 2017). This was supposed to make hasty acts of reprisal, for instance, the whistleblower being supplied a letter of termination and alleged of thieving data from computers (Lim et. al. 2017). Hence, legislations to defend whistleblowers and raise employers' responsibilities to whistleblowers are essential. Growing legitimate security, shelters whistleblowers under the general policy exclusion to employment-at-will, lead to the account for legitimate requirement about whistleblowing.

*The growing security for whistleblowers:* Employees of maximum organizations are explicitly assured security against retaliations from their employers when they release movements that infringe specific acts. However, many legitimate researchers have suggested inclusive legislation defending both private and public sector whistleblowers.

*The growing number of whistleblower safety laws:* Numerous countries are stepping rapidly to fill any empty left by the shortage of inclusive legislation. Most of these employs alike to private and public sector employees. Many of these laws indicate that employees have a right to notice the illegitimate or illegal activities of their employers to supervisory authorities, government officials, law enforcement agencies, and the alike. They usually propose redresses, containing replacement and due payment, for employees who can demonstrate that they have experienced unfavorable employment concerns due to their whistleblowing activities.

Organizations should be informed about law regarding employee whistleblowers in which they drive.

*The growing corrosion of the employment-at-will principle:* Along with legitimate developments toward whistleblower safety, the law courts are progressively identifying exceptions to the old at-will principle which has ruled maximum private sector employee-employer relations for more than 100 years.

## 2.2 The Pragmatic Requirement

Though the legitimate issues discussed earlier make a worthy case for the need to get whistleblowing as a policy matter, this can be thought that there is a pragmatic requirement also. In the following deliberation, the briefing describes why this can be thought, and then state the pragmatic requirement.

*The certainty of wrongdoing:* An employee, answering to the questions regarding whistleblowing policies, expressed words to the effect; “We don’t have any policy. We don’t require for one in our company, as nobody is involved in wrongdoing.” It appears mainly an innocent view considering what we recognize about the state of moral conduct in business and government.

*The possibility of amplified whistleblowing:* Though experimental evidence is hard to obtain, there are common views that whistleblowing is on an increase for many potential grounds.

First, there is an ongoing trouble of immoral conduct in business and government. Individual cannot read the newspaper or turn on the television without hearing of a fresh scandal, and there is slight requirement to list the several well-exposed cases of current years. We can perhaps assume that for every single event of immoral conduct we hear out, several others do not create the headings.

The second cause for growing whistleblowing is that our society tends to permit blowing the whistle as an approach to promote more moral conduct in business. Large business and government are mostly viewed as too influential, and as practicing excessive control over our lives. Whistleblowers are observed as the losers, taking on dominant organizations for society’s welfare.

Lastly, the world is becoming progressively intricate. Corporations must contract with varied and challenging stakeholder groups. Progressively more disputes between corporation and the groups can be predicted regarding debatable matters such as product safety, civil rights, animal rights, environment, and several other matters. Employees who commiserate with protestors in various interest groups may be detached between their approaches toward these groups and allegiance to their organizations.

*The futility of reprisal:* Though it appears that organizations occasionally penalize whistleblowers to make them silent or to convince other employees to keep quiet, there is small if any experimental indication that such strategies work. Indeed, employees who blow the whistle to exterior parties of the organization usually do so as their labors at inner intent have been discouraged by apathetic or antagonistic top administrators.

*The possibility for inner intent:* As the stance mentioned before obviously indicate, when organizational “filthy wash” is showed overtly, it can damage excessively. The reputability of the firm hurts. The monetary performance of the organization may be worsened. The company can get itself litigated by the protestors who think they have been impaired by the organizational actions.

## 2.3 The Moral Requirement

To this point, this study has demonstrated both legitimate and pragmatic requirement for companies to form whistleblowing policies. It also offers there is a moral requirement, which is described following.

*The possibility for uplifting the moral environment:* This study has already pointed out the ongoing trouble of immoral conduct in business and government. Several corporate leaders elicit concern about uplifting the moral environment within their companies without knowing how to ensure the same. They have accordingly been advised to form moral codes which clarify norms of conduct.

*The significance for justice:* Many organizations form an extensive diversity of policies regarding issues like selection, performance evaluation, promotion, and financial benefits. One of the vital motives for making such policies is an essential to offer fair attitude to employees. In alternative expression, the purpose of several employment policies is to warrant that employees are being given justice.

The moral requirement is to develop a fair workstation. In this perspective, it is viewed a fair workstation to be one where:

- the company is dedicated to great values of moral conduct;
- employees’ rights to elicit issues about observed ethical or moral difficulties to suitable parties within the organization are preserved; and
- all employees are dealt with fairly when questions of immoral conduct or wrongdoing are addressed.

Whistleblowing policies can provide a fair workstation by facilitating to develop a moral environment and by assisting to confirm that employee rights are valued.

## 3. Critical Issues Affecting Whistleblowing Success

There are numerous issues that influence one’s whistleblowing choice or attitude. The issues are i) views on

urgency of wrongdoing; ii) individual obligation pertaining to a wrongdoing; iii) ethical impartiality consideration; iv) private expenses; and v) corporate culture.

*Urgency of wrongdoing and whistleblowing:* Whistleblowing will possibly happen when individuals are more conscious and really think that a wrongdoing has certainly impaired the organization. However, views on urgency of a wrongdoing are biased. These are affected by several issues. One of these is the prevalent *social or organizational* value. When the leading social or organizational value permits wrongdoing, then whistleblowing will not possibly happen. Though a possible whistleblower may apprehend that wrongdoing is important enough, whistleblowing will not inevitably happen particularly in the absence of definite indication of the wrongdoing. When the whistleblower has solid proof about a wrong exercise, it fortifies his/her trust that the wrongdoing is severe enough and essential to be conveyed. Views on urgency of a wrongdoing may also be affected by pure policy principles on what creates wrongdoing. Laws ascertaining immoral acts, for instance, may offer clues to the possible whistleblower in determining whether perceived wrongdoing is severe or not.

*Individual obligation and whistleblowing:* When individuals are conscious and think that it is their obligation to inform a wrongdoing, they are more inclined to blow the whistle. The ascription of individual obligation to response is a key interpretation why persons have a greater tendency to inform an immoral act compared to others.

*Ethical impartiality consideration and whistleblowing:* Whistleblowers are less prone to inform occurrences when they did not think ethically or by custom guidelines to perform alike. It is a perfect idea of whistleblowing as a deliberate performance on the side of the individual. Nevertheless, for the objective of inspiring whistleblowing as a policy to combat fraud, it may be useful to search for the advantages and disadvantages of creating whistleblowing as a legitimate responsibility of public officers and employees. Furthermore, it may similarly be required to augment prevailing shelters provided to role-performed whistleblowers like Compliance Officers and Internal Auditors.

*Private expenses and whistleblowing:* Whistleblowing seldom arises as the private expenses of notifying increase. When individuals observe that the private expenses have increased, then they would not blow the whistle. This perception does not imply, however, that when private expenses surpass predicted benefits, then no whistleblowing will eventuate. It merely denotes that there are verges of bearable personal costs wherein individuals are still bold or keen enough to blow the whistle. Beyond the verge of tolerance, whistleblowing will be more occasional, if it will occur somewhat. The dread of reprisal is the key hindrance to whistleblowing. It is one of the focal causes why several persons like to keep quiet than blow the whistle against perceived wrongdoings. The lack of active legitimate safety for whistleblowers raises the private expenses of and prevents whistleblowing.

*Corporate culture and whistleblowing:* Corporate culture is an added issue influencing individual's tendency to blow the whistle against perceived as well as observed ways of wrongdoing. As "combined sets", corporate culture covers morals that prescribe not only public consciousness and approaches of "ethical" and "unethical" turns, but also pay attention to the "acceptance of orderly discord in the organization". Persons will not likewise be enthusiastic to blow the whistle when administrators, whether inside or outside the organization, routinely miscarry to perform on conveyed wrongdoings. The insight that nothing will be happened about an informed wrongdoing may donate possible whistleblower's dread of reprisal from influential wrongdoers.

Besides specific variables, incidental variables also affect the aftermath of the whistleblowing process. Two variables are vital: corporate features and the features of the wrongdoing. The level of corporate dependency on a wrongdoing and the lawful foundation for the whistleblowing may affect its effects.

### *3.1 Legitimate and Corporate Principles on Preserved Whistleblowing*

Whistleblowing will be further operative when whistleblowers notice actions that are undoubtedly unlawful paralleled to those that are only immoral. Acts that outline the methods of wrongdoing that are unlawful also authorize complaint-receivers to perform on whistleblower's release. Whistleblowing will be added active in companies with moral environments that dampen misconduct, stimulate the notice of wrongdoing, and depress reprisal against whistleblowers. The moral environments in companies affect insights of the suitability of whistleblowing. Generally, if the company's environment dampens wrongdoing, then personnel will be more stimulated to notice a wrongdoing.

### *3.2 Social or Organizational Structures for Whistleblowing*

An influential complaint-receiver, who is caring for the whistleblower, augments the whistleblower's trustworthiness, consequently growing complete whistleblowing efficacy.

### *3.3 Whistleblowing with Concealing Whistleblower's Name*

Concealment of whistleblower's name might either increase or decrease whistleblowing efficacy. On one side, it can raise whistleblowing efficacy by decreasing the possibility of reprisal against whistleblowers and by averting

outbreaks against the drives of whistleblowers having dubious characters but, nevertheless, delivered expensive information about wrongdoings. Conversely, maintaining secrecy of whistleblower's name lessens the trustworthiness of the complaint itself; it increases doubts about the worth of the noticed information and the intention for whistleblowing. Without disclosing whistleblower's name makes it too tough for complaint-receivers to search for further proof to endorse the whistleblower's assertions of wrongdoing, thus decreasing whistleblowing efficacy in the course.

### *3.4 Abundant Whistleblowing Networks*

Inside whistleblowing will be less active particularly when a company shows excessive reliance on a doubtful practice. When the company is extremely reliant on the wrongdoing for its existence, upper authority might be unable to dismiss a complained wrongdoing. In such situations, outside whistleblowing will be more active in correcting or dismissing a wrongdoing. Ensuring fairness on whistleblowing, organizations must make accord not only on inside whistleblowing actions, but also on the standards and actions that would develop it authentic for personnel to use outside whistleblowing networks.

## **4. Literature Review**

### *4.1 Whistleblowing*

Currently, the word whistleblower is related with individuals who “sound an apprehension from within the organization in which they work, pointing to attention disregard or exploitations that thwart the public interests” (Jablin 1988). Additionally, grounded on the outcomes of Felli and Hortala-Vallve (2016, p. 280), “eminent whistleblowers such as Sherron Watkins for Enron, Irene Frachon for Servier and Edward Snowden for the NSA, (amid several ones) have left an enduring and hardly debatable feeling on civic view about the influence of whistleblowing and its corrective role within community and company life.” Whistleblowing has been well-defined in several ways, for instance, expresses whistleblowing as a disparity with higher administration concerning a conventional practice. Mathews (1987) outlines whistleblowing as the “action of an individual who considers that the public interest overpasses the organizational interest he/she performs”. Nader et al. (1972) state whistleblowing as: the performance of one individual who, considering that the public interest ignores the organizational interest he attends, overtly “blows the whistle” if the organization is engaged with unlawful, unethical, deceitful, or detrimental activity. Lastly, Near and Miceli (1985) delineate whistleblowing as “the release by organizational affiliates (past or present) of unethical, unlawful, or dishonest performs under the control of their employers, to individuals or organizations that may be capable to upshot action”.

Near and Miceli's (1985) delineation of whistleblowing delivers two aspects that the prior definitions fall through to contain. Firstly, Near and Miceli point that whistleblowers may be present or past employees of the organization. Subject to several aspects such as reprisal, organizational backing, and authority of the reformer, a whistleblower may leave the organization (either willingly or unwillingly) and blow the whistle or stay with the organization after release. Secondly, the action must be characterized as either unlawful or immoral in order to be considered a wrongdoing. Responses to actions that are not considered unfair do not establish whistleblowing. An activating affair (i.e. unlawful or immoral wrongdoing) establishes the commencement of whistleblowing. “The activating affair is an action that is regarded wrongful, rather than only a tolerable but not prime organizational action”. According to Miceli and Near (1992), organizational affiliates must observe the imperpness or intentionality of the wrongdoer and decide whether their activities will eradicate the wrongdoing before it establishes whistleblowing. Lastly, the wrongdoing must be unveiled to persons or bodies that may be capable to reduce such activity. That is to say, the wrongdoing must be revealed to the member's direct supervisor, higher management, or bodies outside organization who may be capable to upshot any change. Therefore, both inside and outside networks may be used for whistleblowing under this definition.

Though studies have observed whistleblowing mainly from an organizational behavior phenomenon, the method of disclosing a wrongdoing is a communication perspective. Prior whistleblowing studies have mostly overlooked the interpersonal issues related to revealing a wrongdoing. Though Greenberger et al. (1987) deliver some understanding into the upshots of group conformity and cohesiveness, the study does not report the interpersonal matters of whistleblowing. The objective of this study is to inspect whistleblowing from a communication phenomenon, by concentrating on two possibly interrelating variables, interactive intimacy and keenness of the wrongdoing.

### *4.2 Understanding of Whistleblowing Networks*

Whistleblowing studies have noticed the concern of notifying immoral action through the proper networks. According to Miceli and Near (1992), organizational individuals who designate to notify immoral conduct attempt to select means that will carry out rapid and active change in the wrongdoing. Specifically, certain individuals select to notify immoral conduct internally rather than externally to officers who can eradicate the wrongdoing.



Organizational communication studies have originated, though, that juniors are less expected to notify improper action or information to upper officials inside the organization. Jablin (1988), for example, marked that information material observed as adverse or damaging may not be conveyed to individuals of higher officials. Explicitly, if the grievance addressee has supremacy over the subordinate, “negative information” is less possible to be conversed with upper of the organizational hierarchy.

Viewers who have witnessed immoral conduct inside an organization may have a more conversance of probable complaint networks, as they have formerly faced a situation not met by non-viewers. Conversely, viewer of a wrongdoing may not notify an occurrence as he/she might not be conversant with the networks for notifying immoral conduct. Miceli and Near (1992) pointed out that “whistleblowers (and to a minor level, non-viewers) supposed they had more knowledge of where to notice wrongdoing inside their organizations than did passive viewers, who perceived but did not notify the wrongdoing”. Thus, one may presume that understanding of perfect and suitable networks for notifying immoral conduct inside an organization may augment inside rather than outside whistleblowing activities. (Ferguson 1987)

Whistleblowers have traditionally performed vital roles in transmitting critical information from down level of organizations to upper level officials. In 2002, Cynthia Cooper of WorldCom and Sherron Watkins of Enron both achieved praise for their parts in revealing management abnormalities in their respective companies. For years, it has been claimed that companies must retain a “chain of command,” whereby juniors notify only to close seniors (e.g., Bolton and Dewatripont 1994, Fayol 1949). Among other justifications, the inhibition of “skip-level” reporting develops act by eliminating aberrant managerial impetus. A senior apprehensive about being overtly uncovered by a junior might turn aside attempt toward repressing subordinates, or choice wicked employees as subordinates (e.g., Friebel and Raith 2004).

Up to now, there has been comparatively small examination of whistleblowing outcomes on organizational performance. There is a little and latest industrial organization literature that observes whistleblowing as divorce from collusive performance amongst associates in a recurrent game setting.

For instance, Aubert, Rey and Kovacic (2006) anticipate that inducements such as prosecutorial clemency for guilty companies will weaken cartels. Conversely, Apestequia, Dufwenberg and Selten (2007) offer diverse investigational proof for the efficacy of such inducements. Owing to the mix of ethical danger and hint, the model essentially figures out two important groups of models of bureaucracies. The first acknowledges the arrangement of inducements inside companies (Gibbons 1998, Dixit 2002, Gailmard and Patty 2007). Of specific significance are models of numerous tasks (Holmstrom and Milgrom 1991, Ting 2002) and common agency (Dixit 1998, Wilson 2000, Gailmard 2007). In allowing for an employee who does two “tasks” (attempt and whistleblowing) together with a superior who successfully faces two principals, the current effort adds both viewpoints. Differences in managerial likings can be measured through the balance of action employees in relation to that of their political principals (e.g., Lewis 2008).

#### *4.3 Issue Importance*

Studies have asserted that the attempt to disclose an illegitimate conduct frequently leans on the kind or form of wrongdoing that has been addressed. Miceli and Near (1985), for instance, claimed that viewers of a wrongdoing were further expected to notify occurrences of wrongdoing if “they had considerable proof of the wrongdoing, if the wrongdoing was severe, and if it straight disturbed them”. Due to lack of prescribed procedures, corporate and social customs can make substantial force to whistleblowers wherein they are keen to withstand savagery and dissension (Banisar, 2011). Therefore, A. C. G. Council (2014) endorses the existence as well as practice of code of conduct inside the organizations as an approach of allowing personnel to alarm and notice (in noble trust and without dread of reprisal) any possible wrongdoing to administration besides the board and the code should also entail addressing and inquiry of such alarms and notices.

Phares and Wilson (1992) have also inspected the significance of whistleblowing and issue importance. Using plots, Phares and Wilson affirmed that in circumstances where the wrongdoing was visibly marked, obligation ascription significantly augmented with the harshness of the performance. Moreover, Graham (1986) asserted in determining the harshness of a wrongdoing, one must factually inspect the features, repetition, and how other ones inside the organization may feel the wrongful conduct.

Earlier studies have connected issue importance to outside whistleblowing. Specifically, “when the wrongdoing was sincere viewers went outdoor” the organization to notify the wrongdoing. Outside reporting is positively correlated to the observed occurrence of organizational reprisal that arises against whistleblowers. Additionally, Ferguson and Near (1989) emphasized that viewers of wrongdoing may drive outward the organization as strong and wide networks for notifying the wrongdoing are indefinite.

Communication studies have also informed the worth of strong and wide networks for the broadcasting of information inside organizations. Stewart (1990), for instance, pointed out that one dominant influence in inspecting the operation of whistleblowing is the dispatch of information up the organizational hierarchy. Stewart endorsed that exposed networks of communication between seniors and juniors could assuage the

possible for external whistleblowing. That is to say, personnel who believe their seniors are more expected to exhibit more upward (i.e. internal) communication concerning important difficulties contrary to their workmates. Personnel should comprehend how the organization would consider their worries in terms of an inspective procedure (Barnett 1991). Alongside these similar lines, Glauser (1984) observed organizations with recognized networks for upward communication are likely to communicate pertinent and significant information up the organizational hierarchy more so than immaterial information.

## 5. CONCLUSION

It may sound be that those who select the method of objection have the greatest of intents for the organization and its individuals in mind when they arise in a decision to perform or fail to make wrongdoing public. As an auxiliary for any more pertinent or pragmatic guidance, then, possibly as good a guide as any is whistleblowing if required. The report has conversed briefly the critical components of whistleblowing policies and has showed three essentials that coerce an organization to deliberate accepting such a policy. In short, organizations should introduce whistleblowing policies to:

- avert reprisal against personnel for voicing concerns regarding observed wrongdoing (the legitimate exigent);
- inhibit public releases of charged organizational wrongdoing (the pragmatic exigent); and
- ensure a more fair workstation (the moral exigent).

In the author's view the obligation for generating an exposed and communicative culture must rest with top management rather than the human resources department. It virtually goes without saying that if everybody in the organization is to comprehend why a whistleblowing process is being introduced and what it is attempting to attain, it is pivotal to acquire the promise of both top management and employee representatives. Personnel are repeatedly the forerunner to comprehend that there may be something very wrong inside an organization. Nevertheless, they may not elicit their worries as they think that 'speaking up' would be treacherous to their coworkers or to their employer. They may also dread ill-treatment. In these conditions it may be comfortable to turn a blind eye rather than notice what may just be a doubt of wrongdoing.

A whistleblowing process should provide individuals the option of uplifting their worries orally or in black and white. Individuals desiring to supply a black and white report could be spurred to employ a precise format. Noticeably, the human resources department could have a part to act here. Preferably, the format should be agreed with employee representatives. The whistleblowing process should mention that certain concerns may be dealt with by agreed turn without the necessity for enquiry. Similarly, now and then, burning turn may be necessary before an enquiry is conducted. So as to maintain the secrecy both of the individual noticing and the matter of the concern, it should be provided that the individual being inspected will not be acquainted till it turns out to be needed to do so. It must also be mentioned that where there are severe complaints of wrongdoing an individual under enquiry may have to be postponed.

## 6. RECOMMENDATION

It is not surely understood that whistleblowing policies are a solution for all moral problems. Actually, forming such policies is just the beginning step. Moral training sessions should be carried out to accustom personnel with moral quandaries distinctive to the organization. Material instances of the forms of actions that should be released through inside whistleblowing networks should be conversed with employees. Personnel should realize that they must be accountable in building charges of wrongdoing and that wicked or imprudent accusations are not endorsed. The policy must be more than words in black and white.

Equipped with the fact, the organization is far better fortified to protect against the accusations. If an inside enquiry discloses that the whistleblower's accusations hold worth, the organization is in a better situation to stop the case and come to a suitable out-of-court settlement. Conversely, if the inside enquiry gets that the accusations are not correct, the organization is equipped both overtly and in the courtroom with the proof to contest and refute the charges. The organization might still face some potential public embarrassment, however showing the fact may provide the whistleblower plenty cause to turn back from the situation. If an employee is bothered by wrongdoing he observes or faces at work, there is every chance that he will blow the whistle, irrespective of whether or not the organization patronizes it. The protest for in-house auditors, and for the organization itself, is not to inhibit whistleblowing, but to cherish a supportive culture that inspires its employee to notice wrongdoing internally and permit those reports to be exhaustively inspected.

The alternate, outside whistleblowing could be mortifying to the reputation of the company. The crucial to comprising whistleblowing protests inside the organization is creating employee credence that their concerns will be addressed utterly by the management. Greatest performs targeted at exciting such credence contain a perfect and well-notified anti-reprisal policy; employee participation in the development of policies concerning to whistleblowing; and proposing rapid and constant responses to inside allegations-in further words, keeping the whistleblower in the management eye.

The organization's justice in managing the ways for dealing with whistleblowing cases ascertains the

whistleblower content or discontent with the whistleblowing arrangement. Individuals of the organization will comprehend that there is routine fairness when the whistleblower pursues 'rational' way to notice any wrongdoing, perhaps notifying the wrongdoing through inside networks than getting it acquainted to the public by reporting it to some external agencies or the media. The whistleblower will be contented with the product of his or her whistleblowing when the organization altered or ended a wrongdoing and did not avenge against him or her.

## References

- A. C. G. Council (2014). Corporate Governance Principles and Recommendations, 3rd edn (ASX, Sydney).
- Apestequia, J., Dufwenberg, M., & Selten, R. (2007). Blowing the Whistle. *Economic Theory*, 31, 143-166.
- Aubert, C., Rey, P., & Kovacic, W. E. (2006). The Impact of Leniency and Whistle-blowing Programs on Cartels. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 24, 1241-1266.
- Banisar, D. (2011). Whistleblowing: International Standards and Developments. Corruption and Transparency: Debating the Frontiers between State, Market and Society, I. Sandoval, Ed., World Bank-Institute for Social Research, Unam, Washington, D.C., 2011
- Barnett, T. R., & Cochran, D. S. (1991). Making Room for the Whistleblower. *HRMagazine*, January, 58-61.
- Bolton, P., & Dewatripont, M. (1994). The Firm as a Communication Network. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109(4), 809-839.
- Bowman, J. S. (1983). Whistle Blowing: Literature and Resource Materials. *Public Administration Review*, 43(3), 271-276.
- Dixit, A. K. (1998). The Making of Economic Policy: A Transaction Cost Politics Perspective. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Dixit, A. K. (2002). Incentives and Organizations in the Public Sector: An Interpretative Review. *Journal of Human Resources*, 37(4): 696-727.
- Fayol, H. (1949). General and Industrial Management. London: Pitman.
- Felli, L., & Hortala-Vallve, R. (2016). Collusion, blackmail and whistle-blowing. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 11(3), 279-312.
- Ferguson, L. J., & Near, J. P. (1987). The whistleblowing phenomenon: A look at social, situational, and personality influences. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Academy of Management*, Bloomington, IN, 171-175.
- Ferguson, L. J., & Near, J. P. (1989). Whistleblowing in the lab. *Unpublished manuscript*, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Friebel, G., & Michael R. (2004). Abuse of Authority and Hierarchical Communication. *Rand Journal of Economics*, 35(2), 224-244.
- Gailmard, S. (2007). Multiple Principals and Oversight of Bureaucratic Policy-Making. *Unpublished manuscript*, University of California at Berkeley.
- Gailmard, S., & Patty, J. W. (2007). Slackers and Zealots: Civil Service, Policy Discretion and Bureaucratic Expertise. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(4), 873-889.
- Gibbons, R. (1998). Incentives in Organizations. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(4), 115-132.
- Glaser, M. J. (1984). Upward information flow in organizations: Review and conceptual analysis. *Human Relations*, 37, 613-643.
- Graham, J. W. (1986). Principled organizational dissent: A theoretical essay.
- Greenberger, D. B., Miceli, M. P., & Cohen, D. J. (1987). Oppositionists and group norms: The reciprocal influence of whistle-blowers and co-workers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 6, 527-542.
- Holmstrom, B., & Milgrom, P. (1991). Multitask Principal Agent Analyses: Incentive Contracts, Asset Ownership and Job Design. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 7(Special Issue), 24-52.
- Jablin, F. M. (1988). Message-response and "openness" in superior-subordinate communication. In B. D. Ruben (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 2*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 293-309.
- Lewis, D. E. (2008). The Politics of Presidential Appointments: Political Control and Bureaucratic Performance. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lim, C. R., Zhang, M. W., Hussain, S. F., & Ho, R. C. (2017). The Consequences of Whistle-blowing: An Integrative Review. *Journal of patient safety*, June, 1-6.
- Mathews, M.C. (1987). Whistleblowing: acts of courage are often discouraged. *Business and Society Review*, (Fall edition), 40-44.
- Miceli, M. P., & Near, J. P. (1985). Characteristics of organizational climate and perceived wrongdoing associated with whistleblowing decisions. *Personnel Psychology*, 38, 525-544.
- Miceli, M. P., & Near, J. P. (1992). Blowing the whistle. New York: Lexington Books.
- Nader, R., Petkas, P. J., & Blackwell, K. (1972). Whistleblowing: The report of the conference on professional responsibility. New York: Grossman Publishers.



- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1996). Whistle-Blowing: Myth and Reality. *Journal of Management*, 22(3), 507-526.
- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1985). Organizational dissidence: The case of whistleblowing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 4, 1-16.
- Phares, E. J., & Wilson, K. G. (1992). Responsibility attribution: Role of outcome severity, situational ambiguity, and internal-external control. *Journal of Personality*, 40, 392-406.
- Stewart, L. P. (1990). Whistleblowing: Implications for organizational communication. In S. D. Ferguson & S. Ferguson (Eds.), *Organizational communication*, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 303-316.
- Ting, M. M. (2002). A Theory of Jurisdictional Assignments in Bureaucracies. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46(2), 364-378.
- Wilson, J. Q. (2000). *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Basic Books.