Foreword

Whistleblowing, and whistleblowing research, have come a long way, and fast. I can still remember how in 2001, after several years of research on whistleblowing laws, and collaboration with Professor Janet Near on a study of their effectiveness, I approached her about helping to sponsor an international conference on whistleblowing. It had become evident that state whistleblowing statutes in the United States, passed to protect whistleblowers and encourage reporting, were not very effective. It seemed to me that we could benefit from an exchange of experiences, findings and ideas with researchers from other countries. The result was the world's first International Whistleblowing Conference, held at Indiana University's Bloomington campus in April 2002. It was an exciting time because the field was so new and rapidly developing, and it was a unique opportunity to discuss our interests and results with others. That event seems so very recent – only a little over a decade ago.

How could it only be so recently that the first international research meeting dedicated to whistleblowing was held? Perceived wrongdoing and individuals who report it to others to try and get it stopped have been around as long as humanity. So why is research into such a vital, ubiquitous phenomenon in social and political life so relatively young? Of course, research into whistleblowing has been going on longer than since 2002. In modern times, the first major gatherings and publications dealing with the increasingly important roles of organizational insiders who report wrongdoing began to emerge in the United States in the 1970s, spurred by Ralph Nader's encouragement of whistleblowing to help control government employees' wrongdoing. The importance of whistleblowing seems to have grown in line with the scale and complexity of institutions since the 1950s and 1960s, with the growth of ever more powerful government agencies and corporations, and with globalization. However, the first published studies of whistleblowing tended to be qualitative, case study or anecdotal accounts of different individual whistleblowers and their struggles to uncover wrongdoing in powerful institutions, as well as what happened to them. Unsurprisingly, these were usually prominent and public cases, and somewhat heroic but chilling tales.

How typical were these experiences? From the 1970s and 1980s on, governments began investigating changes to try and outlaw retaliation

against whistleblowers who 'did the right thing' and reported breaches of law and other organizational wrongdoing. This created a new focus for legal researchers, but how could we know, especially from those chilling tales, whether this new recognition of whistleblowing was working or not? Research was ad hoc, fragmented and under-valued. Whistleblowing may have become a recognized topic in the media, politics and law-making, but in research terms it was so recent and cut across so many areas of the social sciences that it seemed marginal to all of them.

All this began to change somewhat by accident, or good fortune, when Marcia Miceli and Janet Near recognized the potential of the data contained in the 1980 US Merit System Protection Board survey, and started on their now recognized analyses. Using the first large-scale survey data on the perception and reporting of wrongdoing in institutions, a more systematic way of studying whistleblowing as an element of organizational behavior was born. When Janet and I wrote our first whistleblowing article in 1987, there was little published research. Finding a journal that recognized whistleblowing as a legitimate area of scholarly endeavor was difficult. But that, too, began to change as more whistleblowing laws were passed, and more studies emerged. In 1992, publication of the Miceli and Near groundbreaking book, *Blowing the Whistle*, significantly changed the research landscape. It also gave me the chance to continue my collaboration by contributing the chapter on the law of whistleblowing.

By 2002, those who gathered in Indiana were in no doubt as to whistleblowing's potential and importance, and it seemed as if the rest of the world, too, was finally catching on. At the end of that year, *Time Magazine* listed three female US whistleblowers – Cynthia Cooper, Colleen Rowley and Sherron Watkins – as its Persons of the Year. The global consequences, if people inside organizations knew of major failures of integrity and governance but did not speak up, were becoming ever more obvious and more dire. Today, many countries embrace whistleblowing as an important tool in fighting corruption, enforcing laws, protecting public safety and helping ensure good governance. Laws designed to encourage whistleblowers and protect those who report wrongdoing have accelerated. For example, Australia has just adopted a federal whistleblowing statute, and in the United States, the recent Dodd-Frank legislation, passed to help prevent future financial crises, incorporates whistleblower sections to encourage the reporting of financial misdeeds. International anti-corruption treaties give priority to whistleblowing.

This book demonstrates how whistleblowing researchers, too, have been continuing to rise to this challenge, and how they should do so into

the future. It provides the world's most comprehensive and authoritative guide to whistleblowing research, to date. Responding to the wider awakening, researchers have banded together since 2009 through the International Whistleblowing Research Network, whose meetings that year and each year since 2011, at Middlesex University, London, and Seattle University show that the pace is picking up. In this book we see the work and forward plans of an unprecedented diversity of researchers and practitioners from different disciplines, as well as different parts of the globe. The sophistication of the chapters confirms how much has changed. Now, social scientists from all corners of the world are interested to follow the path blazed by Janet Near and Marcia Miceli and engage in far more systematic, empirical research. The Australian 'Whistling While They Work' research, which features prominently in this book, is just one further groundbreaking example.

The definition of whistleblowing developed by Professors Miceli and Near three decades ago has become the standard one used by most researchers. Perhaps even more important, though, is their influence on the recognition that whistleblowing is a process composed of multiple steps: noticing the wrongdoing, deciding to act, getting some managerial response to the evidence of wrongdoing, and dealing with actual or potential retaliation against the whistleblower. Depending on the organizational or governmental response, the whistleblower may decide to report externally, with different effects on both the whistleblower and the organization. By structuring research in this manner, social scientists have been able to paint a picture that sometimes challenges media stereotypes, and provides pointers that can be useful to legislators and agencies in addressing problems.

The research presented in this book utilizes and builds on this systematic approach. The editors have assembled a team of authors who, step by step, demonstrate what knowledge we have worldwide, and what knowledge we need, to achieve more effective whistleblowing and greater protection for whistleblowers, as well as the public policy steps that can and should be taken. For example, researchers examine what types of wrongdoing should be reported, and importantly, various factors that motivate and could induce observers of wrongdoing to report it. Relevant to this is the question of whether rewards, which are heavily relied upon in the United States but seldom used elsewhere, should be used as an incentive to report. A chapter on role-prescribed whistleblowing offers a different perspective on inducements. Other research focuses on the complaint recipients, their reactions and how to better protect whistleblowers from retaliation. Equally important are recommendations for new research into the real purpose of whistleblowing: how to

protect society when decision-makers and organizations do not respond adequately to allegations of wrongdoing. Related to this is research on whistleblowing in the new media, how whistleblowers react to detriments suffered and criminal penalties for retaliation or making knowingly false allegations. Crucial to understanding these questions is research that examines cultural influences on whistleblowing and theories that can support more nuanced and complex future studies. Throughout these topics, there is conceptual and practical advice on how the research should be done. In some ways, this handbook comes full circle with the chapter by Miceli, Dreyfus and Near who re-examine definitional questions and whether there is a need for a new or expanded reporting terminology.

This book is also set to become the standard reference on whistleblowing research for many years, because it not only takes stock of existing research, but sets out the questions that are yet to be answered. These are inclusive of all the key topics, from basic definitional questions about what whistleblowing is, to extremely complex questions about how organizations and governments are responding to it, and whether they are doing enough to sufficiently maximize it. Recent events emphasize how timely this is, because public policy and legislative responses to whistleblowing continue to show how difficult these processes can be, and how selectively the principles of whistleblower protection may be embraced. The revelations of Edward Snowden and Private Manning have been met with condemnation and criminal prosecution by the US government, as well as praise and support from other quarters as the repercussions of the revelations continue internationally. Their actions have also generated much discussion centered on what is legitimate whistleblowing, and whether, or when, whistleblowing deserves praise and protection. Countries and organizations are struggling to find the best way to recognize the role of whistleblowing in their governance systems. There is real demand for evidence as to how the different values associated with whistleblowing can be reconciled and how effective whistleblowing can be made to work.

While the pursuit of systematic, empirical research is a common thread throughout this book, its implications for the real world are never lost. As many examples show, whistleblowing remains fundamentally about the people who make up organizations and institutions: the individuals who speak up, and those who must decide what to do in response. Giving voice and meaning to the humanity of these people, and the challenges they face, continues to lie at the heart of whistleblowing research. However, with the disciplined approaches suggested here, focused on

new questions, and through comparative research conducted more consistently across more organizations and more countries, whistleblowing research stands to provide many more insights into how our institutions should respond.

The publication of this book presents a tremendous opportunity to reflect on the progress and acceptance of whistleblowing research. It was pure fortune that Professors Near, Miceli and I were at the Indiana University Business School at the same time and recognized a mutual interest in whistleblowing – their's from a social science perspective and mine from a legal one. I have greatly benefited from having the opportunity to work with them, as have many students and scholars. This book not only documents the growing body of interdisciplinary research that stands as testament to their careers, but sets out clear questions and challenges for a whole new generation of researchers to follow in their distinguished footsteps. The book provides a welcome invitation to scholars and practitioners from every branch of social science, including law and government, to engage with one of the most challenging but important fields of research of our time.

TERRY MOREHEAD DWORKIN
Seattle, November 2013