

THE ETHICS OF GOOD GOVERNANCE AND WHISTLEBLOWING: SOCIAL AND LEGAL PERSPECTIVES

BY

RUSNIAH AHMAD

**SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT
UNIVERSITY UTARA MALAYSIA
E-MAIL: rusniah@uum.edu.my**

Abstract

Whistle blowing is a term used for disclosure by a person who is a member of an organization whether private or public, past or current of the illegal or unethical activity of an employer or colleague. The act, of wrongdoing may also come from members of top-level management of the organization including the calling of attention of genuine abuses of power by decision-makers in business and government. Whistle blowing is an unfamiliar territory of the concept of good governance and ethics particularly in this region. While in the United States of America and the United Kingdom the extent of development in this area has reached the legislative body in terms of having legal protection for whistle blowers, the extent of knowledge and recognition within this region is still premature. New forms of governance must not only require changes in values and attitudes but must be reflected by new ideas of policies and administration. This is the time to embrace new changes with effective policies regarding ethics by not only seeking formulation but also implementation.

From this premise this paper seeks to explore the issue of whistle blowing in social and legal perspectives including the aspect of holistic understanding of this important topic. This would mean the incorporation of the idea of whistle blowing in the Islamic context. Discussion would involve the significance of maintaining ethics within governmental organizations through whistle blowing policies which will not only benefit employees but the organization on a long term basis. As an important area of interest whistle blowing deserves attention not only from private organizations but also from public bodies alike.

INTRODUCTION

The whistleblower is a person who discloses the illegal or unethical activity of an employer or colleague within the organization. He/she is also a member either past or current of the organization which maybe a public or private body. The illegal or unethical activity referred to as wrongdoings may involve top-level management of the organization including the calling of attention to genuine abuses of power by decision-makers in business and government. Being a controversial figure a whistleblower, risks retaliations after he/she alerted the management over the commission of wrongdoings, which he/she has witnessed. Retaliations may be in the form of reduction in job specifications, harassments, involuntary transfers and more seriously termination. This is due to the danger that whistleblowing activity poses, the authority structure and functioning of the organization may be threatened and the possibility of a legal suit may

be inevitable. Thus whistleblowers are often perceived as disgruntled employees who maliciously and recklessly accuse individuals they feel have wronged them in order to attain their selfish goals.

However organizations may have to review this negative perception on whistleblowing activity due to a number of factors. This is because while there may perhaps be individuals who are only promoting their self-interests, the presence of genuine whistleblowers may provide or enable organizations to take investigative and corrective measures. This is only possible by the act of disclosing organizational wrongdoings to members of the management by individuals who are concerned about such practices that may harm not only the organization but also the public at large. Therefore it is important for the management to readily address internal whistleblowing to enable employees to take steps in communicating their ethical concerns internally.

Furthermore by acknowledging and addressing internal disclosures employers of the accused organization may be able to halt external whistleblowing, which could endanger its reputation and image. External whistleblowing will become the option for most whistleblowers who may find their concerns ignored and further have to face the risks of retaliations from unhappy employers. When external whistleblowing occurs, the employer will then lose control over the outcome of such disclosures because external reporting usually involves law enforcement authorities and more damagingly the media. News of the wrongdoing may be sensationalized and in cases where the whistleblower faces severe retaliations from their employers, the possibilities of a legal suit should be anticipated. On the other hand law enforcement authorities may be less discreet in their investigations and matters could become topsy-turvy over a period of time interrupting regular business. In fact studies in the United States have shown that there is a significant association between employees' knowledge of appropriate internal channels and the likelihood that they will report perceived wrongdoing (Micelli & Near 1985). In this respect, organizations whether public or private must readily accept and recognize that whistleblowing does occur within any organization and only then the management may be able to handle whistleblowing activities effectively. The intention of such a policy is not to eradicate or abolish whistleblowing but rather to avoid problems relating to whistleblowing activities. In effect the purpose of such a policy is to achieve an overall environment where employees have the confidence of communicating their concerns to the right party and in the long run promotes a more ethical environment for the workplace.

The notion of whistleblowing

To accept whistleblowing as a new value is an incorrect view. While the term "whistleblowing" may seem an alien concept for the non-American or non-European world, it is not a foreign concept in Islam. As an ethical value conforming to the rules of morality, whistleblowing incorporates the idea of duties and responsibilities of members within an organization. Generally all religion promotes the idea of upholding good over evil and that the commission of wrongdoing must be corrected if not eradicated. These are the strong points in arguing that whistleblowing should be perceived positively. It is

therefore important that employers accept the concept of disclosure not only in policy *per se* but also in principle. This is because implementation of policies may be imposed to ultimately avoid litigation or employees from reporting externally but may not totally eradicate or reduce the commission of wrongdoing within the organization in the long run. Policies with long-term effect will not only benefit the organization concerned but will deliver advantages to the public at large.

The commission of wrongdoing is nowadays an epidemic in the corporate world. One cannot dispute that there is a continuing problem of unethical conduct in business and government. Achieving an ethical environment in business or government is not an easy ambition. This is because we are not in a perfect world whereby wrongdoing would be non-existent and obedient bound employees are common nature. Thus employers should not expect to exercise control over the actions of their employees instead should promote more ethical behaviour in the workplace by managing whistleblowing effectively.

In a social context previous studies have indicated that whistleblowing falls into a class of behaviour which does not require total unselfishness of the doer. As a pro-social behaviour whistleblowing is a positive social behaviour that is intended to benefit other persons. It is not wrong when a pro-social doer, gain benefit by the act of benefiting others. This is a typical whistleblowing scenario whereby the whistleblower is not only reporting for his own benefit but also thinks his act of reporting will generally benefit persons or organization other than the whistleblower. However it is more appropriate for whistleblowers to first report internally and later on takes an external route if further efforts become unfruitful. By first taking the matter internally the employees will reflect that disclosure was made in good faith with the intentions of correcting or stopping the wrongdoing from continuing. All the employers have to do is to allow a likely or speedy solution to the wrongdoing. Being unresponsive and volatile to incidents of wrongdoing or demanding discreetness over the incident will only aggravate matters to be out of control. Here 'out of control' refers to a situation where employees going for external reporting will in effect put the reputation of the organization at stake. For government agencies the matter will intimidate more curiosities from the public and the government is warranted to give the public an explanation with increased legal scrutiny.

Research has shown that there are reasons why some employees who observe wrongdoing report it while others prefer to ignore it. Certain characteristics of whistleblowers have been identified and relate to the fact that whistleblowing was more likely when observers of wrongdoing held professional positions, had more positive reactions to their work, had longer service, were recently recognized for good performance, were male, were members of larger work groups and were employed by organizations perceived by others responsive to complaints. (Near & Micelli, 1988) Simply put those who engages in whistleblowing activities do not come from questionable backgrounds. Often they are dedicated employees who believe that they owe the organization a duty to highlight objectionable practices, which are detrimental to the organization as a whole. It is not surprising that some literatures suggest that observers of wrongdoing consider whether they are responsible for correcting the wrongdoing before deciding whether to blow the whistle or not.

The wrongdoing that the organization is being accused of as given by the definition included illegal acts and unethical activities. The commission of illegal acts may not be difficult for the whistleblower to identify in comparison to unethical activities. This is because unethical activities relate to immorality, which is subjective to every individual. Standards of morality may depend not only on the whistleblower, the organization too may perceived certain actions differently. Therefore immoral behaviour may refer to any actions that are simply beyond the purview to what an organization legitimately can expect an employee to do. This is an area of concern, which the responsible authorities must take into consideration in the formulation of relevant policies. This is because studies have indicated that the decision whether to blow the whistle or not to blow the whistle will depend on the type of wrongdoing that the potential whistleblower has witnessed. He may prefer to whistleblow on an illegal incident rather than on an unethical activity to ensure that there is a likelihood that his concerns will be addressed. Illegal activities can only be exposed if there is sufficient evidence for him to cast any accusations against the wrongdoer. While unethical activities remain in the agenda, because the differences in the standard of morality and the lack of an ethical model, the possibility for disclosure to occur is uncertain.

Therefore before whistleblowing can be initiated the whistleblower must be able to assess whether to proceed with the act of disclosure or otherwise. If disclosure is inevitable the organization must ensure that whistleblowing activities are handled effectively by conducting investigations and giving opportunities to the parties involved to present their case in a civilized manner.

Motivating whistleblowing

Before whistleblowing activities can be motivated employers must first recognize the advantages of such activities if they want to acknowledge them within the organization. This is because if the employers or the management do not perceived whistleblowing in a different perception than as a controversial element of organizational behaviour, employees may feel demotivated by the false representation. In this respect genuine whistleblowers is apprehensive of coming out in the open and the purpose of realizing such policy will be hampered.

Genuine concerns of illegal or unethical activities, which occur within the organization must be disclosed in the right manner. Therefore whistleblowers should know that their concerns would be entertained by the complaint receiver. They must also feel that if they call attention to effect or implement change solutions will follow dismissing the assumption that organizational norms may require certain situations be "overlooked". Employers or the organization concern should perceived whistleblowing in a positive manner. Often employees who report the commission of wrongdoings are treated as traitors or deserters of the organization. The question of loyalty to the organization is frequently raised. By blowing the whistle the employee in question is being disloyal to his organization and thus reporting becomes a morally repugnant norm.

An employee owes the public a duty to disclose any activities of any organization that may cause harm and undue danger if non-disclosure will lead to such calamities. Therefore the concept of loyalty must be viewed rationally to avoid the practice of 'blind loyalty'. The employer too owes the public a duty to manufacture safe products and to ensure that their production activities or services do not caused undue damage to public safety. If an employer is in breach of this rule then the duty of the employee to obey should not hold any bearings in either legal or moral values.

It must be asserted here that state legislators in the United States perceived whistleblowing in a favourable manner as a means to reduce fraud, misuse of funds and other forms of wrongdoing. Most of state statutes share a common premise that whistleblowing will be encouraged if whistleblowers are protected from retaliations. In advocating this idea the intention of every whistleblower is essential that is to correct, eradicate or stop the entire illegal or unethical activity that the organization is being accused of. At the same time the whistleblower expects the management to instigate investigation and take corrective action if necessary. Organizations may have to re-examine their modes of retaliations either in the past or present since disproportionate responds to any reporting activities must be avoided as this may be the cause of the problem of why employees refraining themselves from reporting for fear of reprisals. When employees prefer to turn a blind eye to wrongdoings the purpose of motivating whistleblowing is in dire straits.

If organizations recognize the importance of knowing the views of the employees where whistleblowing is concern, they must be more open-minded and only then they can explore areas regarding whistleblowing positively. Clearly these areas must be addressed; how do employers feel about the idea of loyalty of employee to an employer? Should the employees have legal protection from employer's retaliation? Could whistleblowing be treated as an effective management tool or otherwise? Are organizations willing to act upon any reporting of wrongdoing in good faith? However before these questions are asked the organization must first and foremost accept and acknowledge that the occurrence of wrongdoings and whistleblowing is part and parcel of organizational behaviour that must be handled effectively rather than shunned upon. These initial steps of recognition should apply generally whether in private organizations or government organizations. From this premise whistleblowing should be perceived to be consistent with the concept of good governance embracing the fine traditions of accountability and transparency in the management of public service.

Legal perspectives

The drive for legal protection for whistleblowers in the United States was spearheaded by previous experiences reflected in several whistleblowing cases. These cases illustrated how whistleblowers that came forward with certain damaging information to the responsible authorities of the organization have to endure in most cases severe retaliations in the form of reduction in salary or job specification, demotion or even termination. Legal protection could be realized through legislation that is by having

specific protection for whistleblowers against reprisals from their employers, which ideally should include both private and public employees. In the United States legislation in both federal and state level offers protection for whistleblowers in the form of anti-retaliation provisions is further strengthened by court decisions that protects whistleblowers under the public policy exception to employment at will. Another positive impact of this trend in providing protection for whistleblowers is, state level statutes will not hesitate to fill in the vacuum in federal legislation.

What is more interesting in this development is that the move to increasingly protect whistleblowing activities has in effect compelled organizations in the United States to make whistleblowing policies as part of an overall code of ethics for the company. In this respect the legal obligation imposed on companies to specify that employees have a right to report the illegal or illegitimate actions of their employers to relevant agencies has managed not only to compelled companies with certain legal obligations but also created awareness for the effective management of whistleblowing. If companies have a clear organizational directive against retaliations to any report of wrongdoings internally, they may be able to avoid violation of any state or federal law and even lawsuits from employees who may have suffered reprisals from the organization. As a result it is safer for organizations to secure an internal disclosure mechanism for employees to voice their concerns whether for illegal or unethical wrongdoings.

In the non-Western and non-American world, the concept of disclosure is still premature and whistleblowing is not a recognized practice in most organizations. Whether or not whistleblowing occurs companies everywhere in the world cannot deny that wrongdoings occur in every workplace. Hence there is a need first to acknowledge and admit that the occurrence of wrongdoings is an inevitable element in organization. However this admission must not exclude the desire to promote and create a more ethical environment at the workplace. From this premise employers could readily accept and subsequently address the problems posed by whistleblowing activities. The desire to change must be followed by the desire to implement.

At the moment in this part of the world, the only main legal protection a whistleblower can expect to find is the constitution, which is the symbol of every democratic country. Other protection may be in the form of employment handbooks or laws relating to employer-employee relationships such as industrial relations or trade Union. Moreover if the desire to legally protect whistleblowers is not only to prevent reprisals from the accused organizations but also to encourage whistleblowing activities then the responsible authorities that is the legislators, government and others must believed that the act of blowing the whistle is in general an ethical act. If this acceptance can be communicated to employees the intention of legislation could be attained. Such a move could avoid the practice of only having provisions of law without the effects of enforcements.

Generally when a person blows the whistle, he/she is in fact exercising his/her right to freedom of speech and this right is a basic constitutional right that is provided by the constitution. The right to freedom of speech is usually associated with the media when reporting news or events or when expressing an opinion. In whistleblowing the right to free speech is applied to the individual in question who blows the whistle on any illegal or unethical practices within the organization. However there are limits to a person's right to expression and most constitutions provide for these restrictions. Even the United States Constitution, which has been heralded in championing this right, has provisions that guarantee some form of freedom of expression that is limited in both scope and application. The first amendment to the United States Constitution provides for a limited guarantee of free speech for government employees. To be entitled to the protection of the first amendment, speech must be related to matters of political, social or other concern to the community. The Supreme Court has interpreted that where the speech involves a matter of public concern, the court stated that it must seek a balance between the interest of the employee to comment on matters of public concern and the interest of the state to promote the efficiency of its employees. (Connick v Myers 461 U.S. 138)

Restrictions to freedom of speech outlined in the constitution provide what kind of information, which could be disclosed or should remain confidential on the grounds of security. Just like the situation in the United States this may differ if the person is an employee of the government or private company. In Article 10 of the Federal Constitution of Malaysia, Parliament may by law impose restrictions on the right to freedom of speech as it deems necessary or expedient in the interest of the security of the Federation or any part thereof, friendly relations with other countries, public order or morality and restrictions designed to protect the privileges of Parliament or any Legislative Assembly or to provide against contempt of court, defamation or incitement to any offence. Of course at the moment there is a range of statutes which in one way or another provide for the curtailment of the rights in Article 10 including the right to free speech. The Sedition Act 1948, Official Secrets Act 1972, Printing Presses and Publishing Act 1948 and Control of Imported Publications Act 1959 are the list of laws in Malaysia that a whistleblower has to be aware of where disclosure is concern. This is especially so if he is a member of the civil service subjected to rules and regulations governing his terms of service. As an institution of administration the government is still not free from the commission of wrongdoings within the organization. Despite these obstacles a whistleblower that genuinely believes his act of reporting incidents of wrongdoing will contribute to public safety including for the benefit of the government as an employer deserves to be addressed (if not offered any legal protection meant for whistleblowers in the long run). In an ethical perspective this is a very valuable contribution for the organization especially government enabling the management to correct practices that may harm the course of administrative process. In any event the presence of these restrictions in the form of legislation would probably ensure that only genuine whistleblowers would come forward. Thus legal protection for whistleblowers is an option that should remain open.

The right to know is another basic general right, which is applicable to citizens of democratic systems of government. While to a certain degree under certain circumstances the privilege of non-disclosure may be justifiable for the protection of the interests of the State and more importantly the public, the individual's right to know should always be safeguarded. Two most important element of the right to know concerns the rights of the general public to information and secondly the rights of an individual to have information on matters affecting his own rights and interests. Information, which is in the form of public interest, must be communicated to the public by executive or administrative authorities. This is an extension to the right of expression as embodied in Article 10 (1) (a) enabling the public to have access to important information to make their own choices and decisions on public or private matters.

However it is important to point out that if the government or relevant authorities readily allows the restrictions to free speech be relaxed it will not loose its sole role to judge what information should be kept secret and what could be made public. This too is an important power to restrict the communication of information affecting the security of the country. This could be the reason why most countries legislated for the right to request and be given access to any record under the control of a government institution known as the Freedom of Information Act. In this sense the right of the public to know could be exercised and monitored under the control of the government. A general public, which have access to more information will not be exposed to unhealthy rumours and suspicions over the conduct of government. Until such laws are legislated upon the whistleblower must remain cautious when disclosing issues or information, which are of sensitive nature.

In cases where the act of whistleblowing involves the disclosure of documents, which are related to the wrongdoing uncovered by the whistleblower, in most circumstances if they are confidential information, the government may under the guise of government privilege sought for non-disclosure of such information. It is not uncommon for the executive to refuse disclosure of such information, mainly on the ground that the disclosure of the information sought affects the interests of the State. The government may withheld certain information that would cause some embarrassment to the government on the ground that protection against disclosure would be prejudicial to the public. Like any other administrative power given in such a wide manner, this privilege is subjected to abuse. Within the limitations set by the Official Secrets Act 1972 the courts have excelled by establishing that the government's protection against disclosure by asserting the effect of disclosure is not a conclusive reason and it was for the courts to inspect the documents in question privately in order to determine whether public interest in suppressing them outweighed the interests of the parties to the proceedings and the general public. The Malaysian case of BA Rao v Sapuran Kaur & Anor [1978] 2 MLJ 146 would help to illustrate this further. In delivering the judgement of the Federal Court Gill CJ and HS Ong FJ made the following statement:-

“In this country, objection as to production as well as admissibility contemplated in sections 123 and 162 of the Evidence Act is decided by the court in an enquiry of all available evidence. This is because the court understands better than all others the process of balancing competing considerations. It has power to call for the documents, examine them, and determine for itself the validity of the claim. Unless the court is satisfied that there exists a valid basis for assertion of the privilege, the evidence must be produced. This strikes a legitimate balance between the public and private interest. Where there is a danger that disclosure will divulge, say, state secrets in military and international affairs or Cabinet documents or departmental policy documents, private interest must give way. It is for the court, not the executive, ultimately to determine that there is a real basis for the claim that “affairs of state is involved”, before it permits non-disclosure.”

Therefore the court holds the ultimate power of deciding whether documents are entitled to non-disclosures due to the nature of its contents that is documents relating to the affairs of the state.

Legal protection of whistleblowers afforded in the United States and the United Kingdom is designed to protect employees from reprisals when an employee decides to blow the whistle. Reprisals that are most severe is when the employee lost his job having faced so many modes of retaliations from the organization. For government servants due to the many restrictions present in his term of service, if whistleblowing becomes inevitable a government employee still possesses certain rights in case of dismissal from service. A constitutional right under article 135(1) of the Federal Constitution provide that no member of the public service shall be dismissed or reduced in rank by an authority subordinate to that, which, at the time of the dismissal or reduction, has power to appoint a member of that service to equal rank. Article 135(2) provides for the principles of natural justice where such an employee shall not be dismissed or reduced in rank without being given a reasonable opportunity of being heard.

The right to be heard, one of the elements of the rules of natural justice could only be realized if a citizen whose rights have been affected by administrative actions is told of the basis of the action taken against him. One has to know the reasons of the charges made against him and on what grounds. Therefore the whistleblower could at least rely on these rules to enable him to defend himself in case of dismissal from service. On the other hand this rule also requires the public service to furnish the grounds of his dismissal. Since genuine whistleblowers are usually dedicated and honest employees seeking for nothing more than a more ethical environment to work in, it is a heavy onus on the employer to give reasons or grounds for his dismissal.

On the other hand if the desire for change is strong enough for this part of the world to have a specific legislation for the protection of whistleblowers, the Michigan Whistleblower's Protection Act may provide an example. The statute has served as a model for subsequent attempts at providing a limited protection for private employees in the United States. Consider the following provision:-

“An employer shall not discharge, threaten, or otherwise discriminate against an employee regarding the employee’s compensation, terms, conditions, locations or privileges of employment because the employee or a person acting on behalf of the employee, reports or is about to report verbally or in writing, a violation or a suspected violation of a law or regulation or rule promulgated pursuant to law of this state, a political subdivision of this state, or the United States to a public body, unless the employee knows that the report is false, or because an employee is requested by a public body to participate in an investigation, hearing or inquiry held by that public body or a court action”.

Of course the option remains clear, even though the responsible authorities are reluctant to embrace the idea of whistleblowing in policy formulation or law this should not in any way hampered internal efforts of employers and organizations in addressing and recognizing that whistleblowing and the occurrence of wrongdoing are two elements strongly connected with each other. There must be initially within the organization a mechanism whereby employees can feel secure enough to communicate their concerns so that the wrongdoing uncovered by the whistleblowers will either be stopped or corrected.

Islamic perspectives

Whatever our view of whistleblowing and whistleblowers, controversial matters must be considered objectively within different perspectives and alternatives. The ethics of whistleblowing in Islam is illustrated by two most important sources of syariah law or Islamic law, the Al-Quran and Al-Hadis. The idea of disclosure in Islam lies in the concept of correction of wrongdoing known as **an-nahyu-a-nil-munkar**. Imam Al-Ghazali described this concept as the core of Ad-Deen or religion and that most religions are governed by this same concept. The idea frowns upon the commission of wrongdoings and that evildoing must be prevented. In fact it will be shown that these sources condemned those who purposefully ignore the commission or occurrence of wrongdoings and placed them on equal footing with the wrongdoers.

Disclosure in Islam must be steered in a holistic path with good faith and intention to either correct or stop the wrongdoing from continuing in any environment. Universally Islam is not only a faith of Muslims but it is a way of life that must be incorporated into the daily routines of every follower. This is the identity and lifestyle that must be carried on from generations to generations. By encouraging ethical and moral actions every Muslim strive for excellence in terms of committing good deeds, sincerely hoping for the reward in the afterlife and nothing more. Therefore the commission of wrongdoing or al-Munkar must be discouraged and prevented. The correction of wrongdoing must be initiated immediately after the wrongdoing is uncovered. In this respect the invocation of such responsibilities does not only bind the employees of organizations but on all parties concerned. Therefore whistleblowing activities within the organization is the narrow version of the same concept preached by the religion of Islam.

There is no doubt that Islam seeks both to encourage and promote genuine whistleblowing made in good faith. Even though there is no direct reference to whistleblowing *per se* but the authorities or dalil confers that wrongdoings must be prevented and this is strongly asserted when the person has witnessed such actions personally. Among the relevant verses in the Quran are as follows;-

- a) "Let there arise out of you a group of people inviting to all that is good (Islam) enjoining Al-Maaruf (i.e Islamic Monotheism and all that Islam orders one to do) and forbidding Al-Munkar (polytheism and disbelief and all that Islam has forbidden) and it is they who are successful." (**Al-Imran verse 104**)
- b) "Those among the Children of Israel who disbelief were cursed by the tongues of Dawud (David) and Isa (Jesus), son of Maryam (Mary). That was because they disobeyed (Allah and the Messenger) and were ever transgressing beyond bounds. They used not to forbid one another from Al-Munkar (wrongdoing, evil-doing, sins, polytheism, disbelief), which they committed. Vile indeed was what they used to do". (**Al-Maidah verses 78-79**)
- c) "If only there had been among the generations before you persons having wisdom, prohibiting others from Al-Fasad (disbelief, polytheism and all kinds of crimes and sins) in the earth, except a few of those whom We save from among them! Those who did wrong pursued the enjoyment of good things of (this worldly life) and were Mujrimun (criminals, disbelievers in Allah, polytheist, sinners)." (**Hud verse 116**)

Islam believes that in an environment where correction of wrongdoing becomes part of everyday life every Muslim should readily recognize that no person is exempted from committing mistakes or sins. If there appears among them a person who is responsible enough to voice his concern over the commission of any wrongdoings then it is also the duty of the wrongdoer or complaint receiver to take action by first accepting the complaint or report. The words of the Prophet Muhammad S.A.W in the form of the Al-Hadith further demonstrate these assertions;-

- a) Narrated by Abu Said, the Prophet said, "Those who witness the Al-Munkar must correct it firstly with his hand, if cannot with his mouth (orally), if cannot with his heart and that is the lowest of Iman. (**Hadis Sahih Muslim**)
- b) Narrated by Aisyah R.A. the Prophet said, "Allah S.W.T send torments to a city where 18,000 of its population have deeds equalizes the deeds of Prophets and they asked him (the Prophet) why? The Prophet said they have never been angry as God is with the commission of the Al-Munkar and they have never asked people to do deeds in a gentle manner and they never prohibit people from committing the wrongdoing, which is the Al-Munkar. (**Hadis Sahih Muslim**)

These values do not expressly favor a legal protection of whistleblowers but uphold the concept of whistleblowing in another aspect that is Islam. Since legal protection of whistleblowers from reprisals of employers or organization will consequently compelled employers to refrain from retaliating, organizations should be more willing to address disclosures and reporting of wrongdoings internally, within the organization. This is because the employees knowing that their actions of blowing the whistle will be protected might not hesitate to blow the whistle externally if they find that internal channels are non-existent or less receptive. Moreover holistic issues nowadays are understated since the modern generations of today lead a different way of life in society, distancing them from religious consciousness. They are quick to accept the advancement of material wealth rather than spiritual alternative. It is therefore the responsibility of the government machinery to legislate on these matters to seek obedience and thereby generate an awareness campaign among the population at large. Of course implementation of such policies must be expressed sincerely (lillahi taala) without any political elements.

REFERENCES

- Barnett T, "Why your company should have a whistle blowing policy" (1992) SAM Advanced Management Journal Autumn 37.
- Callahan and Collins, "Employee attitudes toward whistle blowing: Management and public policy implications" 1992 Journal of Business Ethics 939
- Dworkin and Callahan, "Internal whistle blowing: Protecting the interests of the employee, the organization, and society" (1991) American Business Law Journal 267
- E.S. Callahan and T.M.Dworkin, "Internal whistle blowing : Protecting the interests of the employee, the organization and society." (1991) American Business Law Journal 267
- His Royal Highness Tuanku Sultan Azlan Syah, "The right to know" (1986) Journal of Malaysian Comparative law 1
- Ihya Ul-Muddin, Vol.2, Dar-el-fikr Publications 1999
- Keenan, J.P. 1988 "Communication climate, whistle blowing, and the first level manager : A preliminary study" Paper presented at the Southern Management Association annual Meeting, Atlanta.
- Larmer, "Whistleblowing and employee loyalty" 1992 American Business Law Journal
- Miceli, M.P. and Near J.P. "Retaliation against whistleblowers: Predictors and effects" (1994) Journal of applied psychology Vol. 71, No.1, pp 137-145

Nicolas M. Rongine, "Toward a coherent legal response to the public policy dilemma posed by whistle blowing." (1985) *American Business Law Journal* 281

Parliman G.C. "Protecting the whistleblower" *Personnel Administrator* July 1987.

Parmerlee, Near and Jensen "Correlates of whistleblowers, perceptions of organizational retaliation" 1982 *Administrative Science Quarterly* 6 pp17-34

Shad Faruqi, "Removing the barriers to unity" in *Focus*, The Sunday Star, April 14 2002.

The Federal Constitution 1957, International Law Book Services.

The Noble Quran in the English language, Maktba Dar-us-salam, Publishers and Distributors, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.