



Organisational Culture

Thematic analysis of data
from interviews and focus groups,
2014

Core Body of Knowledge for the
Generalist OHS Professional

10.2



AIHS

Australian Institute
of Health & Safety



Table of contents

A:	Interviewees and workshop participants	2
B:	Interview questions.....	4
C:	Perspectives on organisational culture as they relate to OHS.....	6
D:	The relationship between organisational culture and safety culture.....	20
E:	Defining culture.....	23
F:	Cultural dilemmas, tensions and unresolved issues.....	25
G:	Clarifying the distinction between ‘culture’ and ‘climate’	26
H:	Accident investigation and culture.....	29
I:	Clarifying the distinction between culture as an explanation and culture as a description 31	
J:	Clarifying the language of culture and exposing semantic dilemmas.....	32
K:	What does an organisation with a good OHS culture looks like in practice?	34
L:	Questions OHS professionals should ask about proprietary culture change programs .	39
M:	Exposing cultural myths.....	44

A: Interviewees and workshop participants

A1: Interviewees

OHS Professionals	
David Bond	Group Manager, Health & Safety, Thiess Pty Ltd
Debra Burlington	CEO, Enhance Solutions
Dennis Else	General Manager, Sustainability Safety & Health, Brookfield Multiplex
Kevin Figueiredo	General Manager, Safety Health & Wellbeing, Woolworths Ltd
Marian McLean	Managing Director, HSE & Delivery Integrity, WorleyParsons
Nicole Rosie	Director, Health & Safety, Fonterra Co-operative Group Ltd
Andrea Shaw	Mining for Development Specialist, Australia-Africa Partnerships Facility; Adjunct Associate Professor, La Trobe University
Phil Turner	General Manager, Risk & Sustainability, JKTech Pty Ltd
Union Representatives	
Cathy Butcher	OHS Coordinator, Victorian Trades Hall Council
Deborah Vallance	National OHS Coordinator, Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union
Employer Representatives	
Tracey Browne	Manager, National Safety & Workers' Compensation Policy & Membership Services, Australian Industry Group
Christopher Sutherland	Managing Director, Programmed
Researchers	
Sidney Dekker	Professor, Safety Science Innovation Lab, Griffith University
Andrew Hale	Emeritus Professor, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands; Chair, HASTAM, UK
Andrew Hopkins	Emeritus Professor, Sociology, Australian National University
Patrick Hudson	Emeritus Professor, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands
Dov Zohar	Professor, Faculty of IE & Management, Technion Israel Institute of Technology

A2: Participants of SME focus group

Ken Armanasco	Director, Safety Dynamics
John Darcy	OHS Consultant, Master Builders Association of Victoria
Theo Kanellos	Director, Kanellos Consulting Pty Ltd
Gloria Kyriacou Morosinotto	Consultant, Contract Safety Solutions
Carol Lapure	Consultant, Occupational Wellness
Leo Ruschena	Senior Lecturer, RMIT University
Glen Smith	Consultant
Geri Sumpter	Senior Consultant, VECCI
Denise Zumpe	Consultant, Safe Sense

A3: Participants of OHS professional and researcher focus group

Gerry Ayes	Manager, Occupational Health Safety and Environment Manager, CFMEU (Vic Branch)
David Bond	Group Manager, Health & Safety, Thiess Pty Ltd
Debra Burlington	CEO, Enhance Solutions
Malcolm Deery	Group General Manager, Health Safety & Environment, Programmed
Kevin Figueiredo	General Manager, Safety Health & Wellbeing, Woolworths Ltd
Andrew Hopkins	Emeritus Professor, Sociology, Australian National University
Rod Maule	Director Safety, Quality and Risk, Transdev
Peta Miller	Director, Australian Strategy, Safe Work Australia
Phil Turner	General Manager, Risk & Sustainability, JKTech Pty Ltd
Trang Vu	Research Fellow, Australian Centre for Research in Employment and Work

B: Interview questions

Chapter Objective	Industry Questions	Researcher Questions
a) Explore different perspectives on organisational culture, based on either evidence or persuasive argument, as they relate to OHS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How does your organisation approach changing culture in relation to safety? 2. Why is safety culture popular / not important / important? 3. What influences your approach to changing culture? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do you think about / conceptualise the relationship between organisational culture and safety culture?
b) Explore the dilemmas, tensions and unresolved issues that arise from these different perspectives on organisational culture	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. What dilemmas, tensions and unresolved issues do you encounter in attempting to change culture as it relates to safety? 5. How do you overcome these dilemmas, tensions and issues? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. There is a diverse literature in relation to both organisational culture and safety culture. In your opinion, what dilemmas, tensions and unresolved issues to you see in relation to this literature?
c) Expose any gaps between how researchers talk about and frame culture compared and how organisations attempt to change or influence culture, including safety	<i>Will emerge from interviewing the two groups?</i>	<i>Will emerge from interviewing the two groups?</i>
d) Clarify the distinction between 'culture' and 'climate'	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Do you distinguish between safety culture and safety climate? If yes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) How do you define safety culture? b) How do you define safety climate? c) How do you use one to inform the other? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. There is a distinction in the organisational and safety literature between 'culture' and 'climate.' How do you distinguish between and define these two concepts?
e) Clarify the distinction between culture as an explanation and culture as a description in relation to fatalities, injuries, disease and ill-health	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. If you were conducting an accident investigation, what role would safety culture play? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Some accident investigations have referred to culture as the cause of, or a significant contributing factor to, the accident. How do you conceptualise the role of culture in relation to accident investigation?
f) Clarify the language of culture or at least expose semantic dilemmas in relation to the concepts of 'culture' and 'safety culture'	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. What would you say is the relationship between organisational culture and safety culture? 9. What language do you use to discuss culture with workers and managers? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. In your view, what linguistic dilemmas abound in the scientific community in relation to the concept of 'culture' and 'safety culture'?
g) Describe what an organisation with a good	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. In your experience, what does an organisation with a 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. From your perspective, what would an organisation

OHS culture looks like in practice	good safety culture look like in practice?	with a good safety culture look like in practice?
h) Suggest questions OHS professionals should ask about proprietary culture change programs	11. There are many proprietary safety culture change programs. Have you used any of these programs? If yes: a) Why did you decide to use a proprietary program? b) What questions do you ask before selecting a program?	7. Are you familiar with propriety safety culture change programs? If yes: a) What advice would you give to an OHS professional who might be considering one of these programs? b) What questions do you think an OHS professional should ask before selecting a program?
i) Expose cultural myths	12. Much has been written about the role of safety culture in preventing accidents. Have you encountered any culture myths that should be debunked?	8. Returning to the idea that there is a diverse literature on organisational culture and safety culture, what cultural myths are perpetuated by this literature that in your view should be debunked?

C: Perspectives on organisational culture as they relate to OHS

SP = Safety Professional

WR = Worker Representative

ER = Employer Representative

MG = CEO

Researchers are named

Themes	Industry	Researchers
The role of leadership and change	<p>SP: The starting point is always with leadership.</p> <p>SP: I always ask to speak to firstly the highest-level person in that part of the business, but we also speak to the person on site who's got the highest level of authority.</p> <p>SP: Culture is created by the leaders of the organisation or what interests the boss...fascinates me.</p> <p>SP: It's all down to leadership.</p> <p>SP: Culture in an organisation doesn't change simply by the change of a leader, and particularly not if the leader's not attuned to some of the challenges.</p> <p>ER: Culture comes from the top and you'll never get people focussed on safety if the person at the top is not focussed.</p> <p>WR: Leaders' actions have to match their words.</p> <p>MG: Senior management, leadership, is actually really important. It definitely has to be led from the top.</p>	<p>Andrew Hopkins: It's not just about leaders saying safety is important around here. It's about, what Edgar Schein says, and I endorse this. How do leaders create or change cultures? Leaders create cultures, he says, by what they systematically pay attention to. This can be anything from what they notice and comment on to what they measure, control, reward and in other ways systematically deal with.</p> <p>Andrew Hale: I think [leadership is] critical, but it can be a little bit more distributed than it is sometimes written about. Sometimes you read it as though it's only the CEO who can determine that, and if the CEO is not 150% behind it then it won't work. I think that the intervention studies that I did in Holland showed it was a case of either the top manager or the really proactive safety manager (and we couldn't distinguish which was more important) that made a difference. The good companies had either a really active CEO or a really active safety manager or both.</p> <p>Dov Zohar: I believe in a 'dripping' kind of model in the sense that senior management is the source of both culture and climate in the organisation. But when you go down the organisational hierarchy, individual managers have discretion. Very often, some managers overweight the priority of safety based on their own personal beliefs and values, and other managers underweight the priority of safety, based on their sort of risk-taking biases and so on.</p> <p>Patrick Hudson: You can try and change the culture from the bottom, but that really doesn't work. But you can try at the top and it does. I typically work with the Executive Committee or as high as possible; it's important to have the CEO agree that things have got to change.</p>

Themes	Industry	Researchers
<p>Maturity model, leadership and change</p>	<p>SP: We use the maturity model. It's a journey model effectively...how people look at and understand safety risk throughout their business.</p> <p>SP: Where we think your organisation is up to on the maturity continuum.</p> <p>SP: I would describe the maturity levels within the organisation in terms of people's understanding of safety, what their commitments are. Whether the organisation has a value in terms of safety.</p> <p>SP: We have been using the Patrick Hudson model. Most business leaders can relate to Patrick's work very well because it's easier to read and understand. They look at it almost in a shock because people don't have a baseline. They're well-intentioned, but they don't actually have a comparison and so when you produce this comparison I've noticed people go oh! Right!</p> <p>SP: I continue to find the maturity model a helpful way of articulating these stages...it's not stages of change, it's just the painting of a picture using a Hudson maturity-type model. I think there's a bit of an ah-hah moment when people can start to see along a whole range of different dimensions the subtly but quite distinctly, different ways that you could approach this topic.</p> <p>WR: So one of the things that we refer to is called the four C's. It's a way of saying that within and across the board you could categorise employers under four headings. There are those that are committed, those that are compliant, those that are clueless and those that are criminal. So what you do in terms of organisation culture, to me, requires you to make an assessment of where that organisation sits.</p>	<p>Patrick Hudson: [referring to the culture ladder] ...the only thing that really comes out is leadership. Leadership at the top of the ladder is better than leadership at the bottom. Leaders at the top of the culture ladder are more humble,</p> <p>I have a rule of thumb which says that at the reactive level you need two disasters, because the first disaster you always know that you've got to brain the individuals; to have two in short succession maybe enough to wake you up and say, "Well may be there's more to this than meets the eye." And only when you get to proactive actually is the first time you can say, "Well, we don't actually need the disaster, just somebody else's disaster or we worked out that this is really, really dangerous and we need to think about how we're doing."</p> <p>So as you go up the ladder you are thinking about the number of disasters that you need. Pathological: any number of disasters won't shift you because you know who causes accidents, serve them right if they got killed, is their view. That's one of the beliefs. The deep belief is that individuals have accidents, so if you know the Just World hypothesis? One of the beliefs is the belief in the Just World in shall we say pernicious form down at the bottom, pathological, reactive.</p> <p>The calculative organisation basically starts to wean itself off that thought process. The proactive and generative organisations really are much more aware of the idea of, you know, people may screw up, but hey, who hired these people? If they're that bad who hired them in the first place? Then the first thing you do is turn to ... you need to have a serious talk with HR. But HR of course may be a little bit surprised by this.</p> <p>[Are there generative organisations?] No, I think it's a very, very hard place to be. It's hard to get there, it's hard to stay there. One of the things I've tried to stress is that it's not only a ladder but also snakes, and there's one snake actually which takes you straight from top to bottom. And the reason is that the generative culture, is actually individualist.</p> <p>The pathological culture is also individualist, but it's individualists at the top on the grounds of disciplined individualists who do the right things as opposed to undisciplined at the bottom who do the wrong things. But you know, do it for short-term rather than</p>

Themes	Industry	Researchers
		long-term benefit, and for themselves rather than for others. But it's easy to fall into that trap, and the trouble is that to get there you've got to go through becoming collectively consensus minded, and then throw that off; you change from being a collectivist consensus-oriented culture to becoming one that's much more individualist.
Identifying a change agent, a champion of change	SP: Identifying the right person in the organisation who is a change agent, and respected, to be the champion.	
Measuring change	SP: Finding ways to measure it because what gets measured gets done.	
Zero harm	SP: I think zero harm is a cultural statement. I don't think there's an awful lot of understanding what that actually means, particularly by people on the frontline. Very often they don't believe it. In my experience, they're looking for honesty from leadership. What frustrates people is when the leadership is saying "we believe in zero harm, we believe in doing everything right, we believe in empowering employees to make their decisions," and then don't follow through.	
Underpinning change with policies and procedures	SP: You have to have underpinning policies and procedures and activities to back it up.	
Don't mention the culture	SP: I never talk about being here to change the culture. We are to change the way people think and go about their work, which is cultural change.	
It's a group thing		Andrew Hopkins: Culture is a characteristic of a group, not an individual. An individual has a belief, for example, that is not an aspect of the individual's culture unless that belief is shared. Culture is not an individual phenomenon, it's a collective phenomenon. Andrew Hale: Safety culture is a group phenomenon; it can't exist unless there is a group which is interactive and facing problems or decisions together.
Culture as practices and beliefs		Andrew Hopkins: They must be collective practices or group practices or collective beliefs.
Changing culture by changing		Andrew Hopkins: Until we can focus on those organisational practices and change those, we're not going to do anything about

Themes	Industry	Researchers
organisational practices		an organisational culture. We certainly can't change the organisational culture by focusing on the individual; it's the organisation's practices that are crucial.
Source of culture as a battle ground	<p>SP: I'm not so sure it's useful to think about the source of the culture because that's sometimes a historical issue. What has caused these features to exist in this organisation? I think what's much more interesting is what are the features of the organisation that define its culture? So I don't think it's always useful to think about why this organisation has this particular set of values; it's more interesting to ask "what are those values and how might we change them?"</p>	<p>Andrew Hopkins: A sort of to-ing and fro-ing I guess – battle, if you like – between the various sources of culture and there are many sources of culture.</p> <p>Andrew Hale: I see them as many overlapping cultures. You've got different subcultures within companies. You have the civil engineering professional subculture, you have the management subculture and you have the workforce subculture. If you accept that there's a number of different subcultures then you've got two issues. One is how each of those subcultures interacts with safety and whether some of the interactions are negative toward safety. But you've also got the question of where those cultures touch and overlap, are there things there which because of a mismatch between those subcultures affect safety negatively?</p>
The pace of culture change		<p>Andrew Hopkins: When leaders start to do those things, cultures begin to change very quickly. I'm often asked how rapidly a leader can change a culture; does it take one year, three years or five years? My answer to that is as soon as the leaders start behaving differently the culture will start to change. People are very responsive to messages from the leadership.</p> <p>Andrew Hale: I'm not somebody who believes that culture is unchangeable or unchangeable except in the long term. There is plenty of case study evidence for culture changing quite dramatically even over periods of only six months to a year. If you work hard enough and you've got somebody driving it from the top then within a year you can make dramatic changes.</p>
Talk of culture as ontological alchemy		<p>Sidney Dekker: The most important thing for me to do in this discussion is to voice an essentially social scientific concern about the sheer questions and the reason people find these questions interesting, the reason being that I'm deeply sceptical about, let me call it ontological alchemy that we are willing to engage in when we talk about culture and climate.</p> <p>What I mean by ontological alchemy is that we take human constructions and turn them into fact. If you look at the number of</p>

Themes	Industry	Researchers
		<p>publications about safety culture and safety climate over the last decade there is a veritable explosion taking over and in fact completely dominating the safety scientific discourse. We should never overestimate our epistemological reach with concepts like safety culture or safety climate. They are our own constructions and as such all they do is make artificial distinctions with which we can deal with the buzzing, looming complexity of the social order.</p> <p>The fact that we start sharing this as a factual measurable object doesn't mean that it is real. We should never make that ontological alchemy type-one error, as far as I am concerned. I think that is a deep mistake of any social scientific project, but we are particularly vulnerable, using these social scientific or anthropological ideas in a world that relies on fact. "You've got everything in place, but you've got a bad safety culture. Fix that as well and then everything will be okay." All it is, as Foucault would say, is a set of discursive practices shared by institutions, organisations, individuals, regulators, engineers in which everybody seems to believe that they know what they're talking about and I think a belief that it may in fact encourage not only intellectual sloppiness, but also a moral slide.</p> <p>So to summarise what I just said, I would firmly position myself in saying safety culture is nothing but a discursive practice, a set of words, artificial distinctions, that create an object of knowledge. It is at our peril that we convert that in an active ontological alchemy way into a measurable fact that becomes a commodity that we can trade.</p>
Approaching culture – the functionalist and interpretive approach		<p>Sidney Dekker: Now, of course when it comes to culture you have these two approaches, interpretivist and functionalist. This is very binary, but interpretivist would be the sociological or anthropological approach to culture driven by qualitative methodologies and it's very much positioned around seeing culture as something that a set of people, or in this case an organisation, does. It's about the bottom of emerging behaviours that collectively can be seen to form a sum coherence. That coherence we then call culture.</p> <p>The functionalist approach would be the one taken more by psychology,</p>

Themes	Industry	Researchers
		<p>management science and indeed I think safety science, engineering; driven by more etic approaches rather than emic. So rather than from the inside out it goes from the outside in, very quantitative. We measure, we count, we tabulate. Of course that which we tabulate and count is pretty much how people feel or believe about certain things.</p> <p>The whole point I think of the interpretivist rather than functionalist approach to culture (I wouldn't necessarily call it descriptive versus measurable – I think both are measurable and both are descriptive)... A more interpretivist approach is to say, let me try to get into your head and look through your eyes at the world and see what makes sense. What distinctions do you make? What's relevant? What's not? What do you hang your practice on? What's dodgy? What are the things that frustrate you on a daily basis? That bottom-up understanding of culture becomes ultimately much more powerful and much more respectful of those who constitute the culture.</p>
<p>The process of cultural change</p>	<p>SP: First help them understand where they'd like to go, and then find out where are they now.</p> <p>SP: The first thing I do is talk to a lot of people and listen and not impose my views at all, but really try to ascertain what I would describe as the maturity levels within the organisation in terms of people's understanding of safety, what their commitments are and whether the organisation has a value in terms of safety. So I do a lot of listening. And then depending on what I'm hearing we start to work through what we need to do. We start by telling stories about where things worked well and try to get people to understand the different styles and behaviours which were leading good teams on a good path.</p> <p>SP: So in that sense I don't think it is something you can manage; it's not something that you can say "well, we're going to change our procurement system", or "we're going to change our training, the competency standards that we use to guide our training," it's not like that. I do think you can seek to influence it, but it's not straightforward or simple, and it's about power.</p>	<p>Dov Zohar: There is a distinction here between scientists and practitioners. When you look at the practitioner literature – books and journals – you see multiple claims for success. And each consulting company or safety consulting company suggests that they have developed a certain strategy for modifying the safety culture in the organisation. When you look at the scientific literature, you find very few studies that try to modify the safety culture or climate in an organisation.</p> <p>I mean it's another sort of issue that I'd like to investigate more; in the same sense symbolic interactionism is pretty much the foundation of organisational climate perceptions. Its like, how do we make sense of the environment we work in? I'd love to be able to do a project in which I either record or somehow get information about the kind of communication that goes among workers, like...did you see this event yesterday where the supervisor walked past and didn't pay attention to Joe, who was obviously breaking safety rules? That's symbolic interaction. You have to be able to record the havoc arising that indicates how it actually evolves into climate.</p>

Themes	Industry	Researchers
	<p>SP: It is important to know what the burning platform is. What is the sense of urgency that's required? And linking that urgency or that burning platform to our strategy for change. So the first step is about creating that urgency and that burning platform and linking it back to an organisational strategy.</p> <p>The second step is to understand where and who my champion is. Who can you partner with; who's that powerful sponsor?</p> <p>The next thing is creating the vision.</p> <p>So it's about creating a vision, but not getting caught up in the branding. A lot of safety people, from my experience, will say things like vision zero, destination zero, zero harm and say that's the vision. That's not the vision, that's the tag line, the brand, the symbol that people can identify with. The vision, as I describe it, is what people will say, what they will do, how they will think, how they will act, how they will behave in the context of culture into the future.</p> <p>To me culture is a collection of organisational behaviours that predict to a large degree what people are actually doing rather than what they think. I don't believe attitudes define the culture; behaviours define the culture. My bias is that I focus more on behaviours and behaviour change and symbols and what I call myths and legends. So creating symbols is equally important. The symbol might be a behaviour of the leader; it might be a sign, it might be a logo, and it might be a behaviour or activity.</p> <p>MG: I think the first thing to think about is what kind of culture? And often it's just the way you do things. So it isn't necessarily, oh we've got a document that says a process that's followed. If the practice is something else, well that is the culture. And if you think of it like that, we ask what would be the culture you desire or you want? And so if we rephrase it and then look through those things, and you start doing those things, you can actually change the culture to reflect that desired state. So that's actually how we approach it. We said to ourselves, what is the desired outcome, what does it look like, what</p>	<p>Patrick Hudson: The approach I've taken to safety culture is to say, "Well look, what behaviours, what actions, what are you doing and how are you doing things now?" And then say, "What are the typical behaviours and actions of an organisation that's better than you are? And can you pick any of those?" You say, "Well, we could do that, so we could for instance, actually listen to reporting." And how would you set it up? Well the answer of course is that you measure the number of responses made, or the number of reports and you then maybe incentivise the people who are making the responses, so that they have to do it whether they like it or not. And you pick those sort of things quite specifically.</p> <p>Now that may or may not answer one question, but what then happens is the behaviour changes because in a sense the activity has no choice but to change and you induce what's called 'cognitive dissonance,' that is when your behaviour is inconsistent with your beliefs, when you have no choice, then your beliefs change. And it's a lovely mechanism because it comes for free; every single human employee comes equipped with it as part of a kit. You don't have to buy cognitive dissonance consultancy organisations or do cognitive dissonance courses.</p> <p>I get them to pick three of the 18 dimensions in the safety culture ladder survey. I say, "Which ones are the ones that you think you could work with, either have the biggest delta, maximum impact, or take the worst and take it up a bit?" There's a whole lot of different ways you can do it. Then we try and come to something which is basically in terms of, "Okay, let's take a task, let's define 'milestones', 'deliverables', 'measurable KPIs,' and nominate an individual who's personally accountable to the CEO ensuring that it happens.</p> <p>And everyone's very comfortable with that because that's pretty much how they run things anyway. I say, "Don't worry about culture; these things are things that we know impact on culture. Don't worry about culture, worry about getting them to work in the first place." So one of those might be for instance: who we hire, what's our hiring system, could we change the hiring system? Well, let's do it. Then the person gets to fiddle around with it and sort of optimise it, and the one person who's not</p>

Themes	Industry	Researchers
	would be the things you would expect to be seeing happening in that cultural state?	allowed to be brought into that list is the HSE manager.
Leaving aside culture to manage safety	<p>WR: For a long time in health and safety we used to have those six things that showed an organisation was taking health and safety seriously. Leaving aside the term 'culture' those things are: management commitment, representation, consultation, dealing with the issues, continuous improvement and that they value worker participation. I see that link gets into, what was around for a long time – OHS management systems. They're the same components; we just didn't call it culture. It's the same thing, just repackaged. How much is repackaging and how much is actually new ideas?</p> <p>SP: I just think it's an over-sold consultant's piece. I think having a culture that is supportive of managing safety effectively and understanding what we need to do to improve our chances of success is crucially important, but I just don't call that a safety culture.</p>	
Culture as changing the conversation	<p>SP: It has allowed us, through the managing director, to change the conversation in the business from just pure compliance with the leading indicators to the quality of the compliance with the leading indicators. The ratio of hard to soft controls, for example, was part of the conversation. You start introducing those sorts of conversations and to me this is when the real culture change starts to occur. What happened through this process was we altered the conversation in the business, so the culture altered on the basis that the conversation in the business started to be focused on very different things, being focused on the things we do to manage safety.</p> <p>So people are focused on the things that they do in the absence of incidents, the things they do on a day-to-day basis. The workers see a very different conversation around safety. Engaging them in a conversation and getting them to tell us stories about work, what works well in the workplace and what doesn't work so well. But importantly again, the conversation is not about safety per se; the conversation is about</p>	

Themes	Industry	Researchers
	<p>“tell us when work is difficult and why it’s difficult.” The idea of the storytelling initiative is that by forcing the issue to have a story, you’ve got to have players, you’ve got to have a timeframe.</p> <p>MG: One of the biggest ways that we change culture is through what we call safety conversations. So everybody has to go and have a conversation with someone in the field from our board members down.</p>	
<p>Challenging the role of the OHS professional</p>	<p>SP: Probably one of the biggest challenges I face is our safety professionals. We’ve got between 250 and 300 safety professionals or practitioners in the business, so there’s a large volume of people. The vast majority, 70%, would be extraordinarily traditional safety people out there looking for people to have their hardhats on and wear their glasses, and dealing with issues in the workplace rather than dealing with them through line management. So that culture is probably one of the biggest things I have to try and change. But the focus first and foremost has to be on the organisational approach; have we provided everything that was required to allow the person to succeed?</p> <p>SP: I think one of the big things is probably that the safety professionals have done themselves a little bit of a disservice by focusing on some of the very technical aspects of safety. It’s a bit like the old concept years ago with the safety officer going around with a checklist and being a bit like the policeman and being the person with power who could stop the job and all of that. I think that might have been needed back in the ‘80s, but today for your safety program to work well you need everybody understanding how they can do that and everybody engaged.</p> <p>It’s not the power thing for the safety person. The safety people just need to be there, in my belief, to support and help and be there with that technical background if needed. But really it’s much better if it comes from the supervisor or the line manager. It’s very easy for managers to default to that</p>	

Themes	Industry	Researchers
	<p>and say “oh the safety guy or safety girl will do that” and not take on that responsibility themselves.</p> <p>Probably the most important thing is to effectively communicate, in the language and manner that people will understand, what it is you want done and how that will benefit the business.</p> <p>SP: I am convinced that when safety professionals hit a performance plateau, rather than achieving breakthrough in that plateau they will change their own belief system to say, well let’s focus on something else because I don’t know what to do with this as opposed to saying I don’t know actually how to get the cut through, if that makes any sense. We switch and we switch and we switch without really embedding and optimising it because we don’t know what to do.</p>	
<p>Don’t carve off safety from the business – talk the language of the business</p> <p>Conversations</p>	<p>SP: A lot of organisations talk about safety and safety culture. I feel that’s a flawed approach because every time you do that, you carve safety away from the business.</p> <p>Rarely do you actually get into a conversation about the challenges of just doing work. What we find and what we’ve found in most of our recent significant investigations is that the weak signals that exist prior to an event occurring (and sometimes the weak signals are there for significant periods), aren’t obviously linked to safety; they’re weak signals of just difficult work, and people having to struggle, to innovate, to put different methodologies in place to make something work that’s less than ideal. And every time they do that the risk increases. If we can intervene in those cases sometimes we can see the direct benefit from a safety perspective.</p> <p>ER: If we separate the conversation of safety culture from the conversation of how we do business, then we’re just continuing to say safety is different to everything else we do. So I think we need to be careful about that. We also need to look at not just what the theory says about culture that you as a safety professional need to understand, but how you influence that in your business. Something we’ve talked about in relation to safety people for</p>	

Themes	Industry	Researchers
	years and years is if you're going to influence the business you've got to talk in their language and if their business language doesn't include culture, then don't try and talk culture.	
Culture as organisational values and beliefs – the gap between espoused values and enacted values	<p>SP: Really making sure that safety is a key part of the organisational values and beliefs and that what's coming out of the leaders' mouths is consistent, all the time. It's almost like it's what you hear, it's what you see and it's also what you feel and you could almost smell it.</p> <p>SP: And really you can't change culture, which means changing people's behaviours, if the belief system is not altered. You will get some behavioural movement, but it may not be sustainable if you really haven't changed the belief system. And so when we go back to those belief systems you have to listen carefully to what people are really saying when they say they don't want to do something or it won't work.</p>	<p>Dov Zohar: But we have values in the company, I mean enacted values, rather than espoused values, right? Does the company really prioritise employee health over, let's say, short-term profits? I'm trying to develop a methodology for measuring the size of the discrepancy between the espousal of employee safety and health and its enactment, on a daily basis. I think it's worth starting in that direction to help us understand the relationship between safety climate and safety culture.</p> <p>Patrick Hudson: We've got a lot of questionnaires measuring attitudes, but we have very measuring beliefs and values, and that's because we teach students how to measure attitudes; we don't have a methodology to teach them how to measure and unpick beliefs.</p> <p>Beliefs, I think, refer to in a sense the things which you believe to be, and so are immutable, and the processes that you understand, in your understanding of how to achieve or achieve ends or to move things or how things work.</p> <p>The belief that people who have accidents, in a sense, cause those accidents is to do with that. Just World structure that they're bad people: bad people don't look, bad people are internally focused.</p> <p>I think values are interesting. Like safety's a good thing. Making money is a good thing. When you've got a belief structure that says you can't make money because safety costs money, profits make money, production makes money, then you've got a value but the beliefs are getting in the way.</p> <p>I really think that almost everybody you talk to will hold safety as a value, and so the paradox that you have to explain is if everybody holds safety as a value, how come they do it so badly? And the answer is, most of them don't believe it's actually achievable.</p>
Small business and getting on with the job of controlling risk because it's	ER: I think SMEs are not normally thinking culture. You tell them that they've got a problem they need to fix and they just go and do it.	

Themes	Industry	Researchers
the right thing to do		
Behaviour-based safety tainting safety culture	<p>ER: I think in some ways the bad reputation that the concept of safety culture has is closely linked to behaviour-based safety in people's minds. Behaviour-based safety has a bad reputation amongst a lot of people; that behaviour-based safety is about telling the operator how to do things safely and not fixing the rest of the organisation. There's been a lot of work in that area under the banner of safety culture which has been about safety observations and telling people you did this right nine times out of ten but you did it wrong the last time.</p> <p>The true application of behaviour-based safety actually recognises that the biggest behavioural influence is what managers and supervisors do, decisions about how they manage the business so that people can be safe. But it's got a really bad reputation; you mention safety culture to most of my union colleagues and they will immediately say behaviour-based safety, it's about telling workers to work more safely.</p> <p>WR: Within our industry there has been an avalanche in the last five years (well probably five to ten, but definitely the last five) of a real push around behaviour-based safety. These programs work initially, but they don't actually tend to work in the long run. And they definitely don't have any impact on health. They supposedly have managerial commitment, but often they actually miss proper risk control and higher-level controls. So they focus down at the bottom of the hierarchy.</p>	<p>Sidney Dekker: The claim I want to make most strongly is that safety culture is becoming, or has already become, the new human error in that it fits hand in glove with behavioural-based safety programs, which really are code for blaming the worker.</p>
Don't stop talking about safety culture		<p>Dov Zohar: I don't agree with it [stop talking about safety culture]. Safety culture is a very important concept.</p> <p>Patrick Hudson: [is safety culture a relevant concept?] Yes. It is; you can smell it.</p>
Changing culture by changing the metaphor	<p>SP: Part of it is unpacking the organising metaphors that are powerful in that organisation; are they damaging metaphors or are they empowering ... metaphors that value humans? You've</p>	

Themes	Industry	Researchers
	got to work out a way of changing those [damaging] metaphors.	
Management systems and culture		Patrick Hudson: If you've got a good management system and a lousy culture, the management system, forget it. If you've got a good culture and a lousy management system you'd probably get away with it.
Having a go	WR: Even if you end up with a lower order control but have considered a higher control and for whatever reasons you can't really implement the higher order control, the fact that you've considered and talked about and thought about the higher order control is actually quite different than just implementing the lower order control. It changes the way that people think. So even if the outcome is not always the best in terms of the hierarchy of control, if you've tried, that again is a difference about how people perceive things, about how people interact, because they know that people are willing to have a go at doing a better job. And if you can't, well you can't, but if you're willing to have a go, then people actually go oh well, they're willing to have a go, so that's a good thing, maybe we'll have a go too.	
The organisational context for safety	SP: I come from a view that what's important is the way the organisation does things and the way in which it thinks about safety within the context of what it does. Injury and disease are things that emerge from the work of the organisation – a sort of emergent property – so therefore I'm trying all the time to say, "how can you understand the organisation enough to help safety emerge from the activities rather than fatality, injury and disease?" It is an enabling backdrop that cascades down the organisation, providing a respective environment down through the organisation that enables things to bubble away a bit from below and in different pockets and so on, and encourages an openness about what's going on. I suppose it's a strong belief in social processes. It also demonstrates that this is an issue that the organisation wants to be taken seriously and hopefully can articulate down through the organisation.	

Themes	Industry	Researchers
	<p>Finding what it is that the organisation holds dear and then trying to align wherever you can the aspects of health and safety that are coincident with that or supportive of that. Where's the energy in this organisation for cultural change, and how do I articulate and embed health and safety in that conversation about the cultural change?</p>	

D: The relationship between organisational culture and safety culture

Themes	Industry	Researchers
Safety culture is directly linked to one part or aspect of the organisational culture	<p>SP: There's a direct relationship. Safety culture is ultimately about how people work together and control risk. At the end of the day that's what safety is about – controlling risk – and organisational culture is about how people work together and control risk. The organisational culture and the safety culture are directly linked.</p> <p>SP: I think they can be closely aligned because if an organisation is mature it will recognise that safety is a key contributor to this and they'll understand that a good safety culture usually translates to good business.</p> <p>SP: I am more concerned about the overall organisational culture and seeing safety as just one aspect of that overall organisational culture.</p> <p>MG: I think you talk about organisational culture and its relevance to safety.</p>	<p>Patrick Hudson: Safety culture is part of the organisational culture, but it's only a part. I think that to obsess about safety issues is to fail to understand the context of the wider organisational culture.</p>
An organisational culture that prioritises safety		<p>Andrew Hopkins: I would say the primary concept is the organisational culture; culture in general is a more fundamental term than safety culture. So if you take organisational culture as the primary term, then we can then define safety culture in those two ways I talked about earlier. Safety culture is simply an organisational culture that prioritises safety.</p> <p>Andrew Hale: I see safety culture as an aspect of organisational culture. It's a bit like the relationship between safety management and management; it's an aspect, not a separate element.</p> <p>Safety purveys the organisational culture so I prefer a definition of safety culture that makes it clear it is the aspect of organisational culture that impacts on safety. Is that aspect in favour of safety or against safety? We need to distinguish those two concepts very clearly. The safety management system is the structure and functions, and the safety culture is why it works or doesn't work in favour of safety, the attitudes, beliefs and motivation to use those structures and functions in particular ways.</p>

<p>A subset of organisational culture</p>	<p>SP: Health and safety culture is just a subset of organisational culture. It is one aspect of organisational culture, which is about our people's health, safety and wellbeing.</p> <p>SP: Cultures can be described in a whole range of ways, and some of those descriptors would be the amount of emphasis or time they give to safety and how actively they manage safety, but I don't see that as a safety culture; that's just a part of the culture of the organisation. And for me, to affect the safety aspects, affect the culture of the organisation, not just the safety culture. Every time I separate safety out I'm removing safety from normal work, and to me that's a big mistake.</p> <p>SP: I think it is important for people to understand that we need to have a safety culture, but as I said it has to be wrapped up within the organisational culture. Safety culture is a subset within the organisational culture</p> <p>ER: I don't think they can be separated. If you try and separate the two, then you're saying safety is separate to how we do business. I think when safety professionals are talking to the organisation, if they start talking about safety culture as something separate, then they're setting up that whole concept that safety is different to running a business.</p> <p>WR: I think we're all getting a bit caught up in whether safety culture is part of organisational culture, and then you sort of go over into your HR and IR bit. The bottom line is it's all about the way in which people are treated and valued at work. Because unless you do that you'll never have a good culture.</p>	
<p>Organisational culture as the higher-level construct</p>		<p>Dov Zohar: Generally I think that organisational culture is the higher-level construct that tells us what should be included in the facet of safety culture. So I perceive safety culture as a particular expression or a particular dimension of organisational culture.</p>
<p>Organisations have cultures</p>	<p>SP: I find that using the term 'safety culture' as if it was somehow in opposition to 'organisational culture' is quite bizarre.</p> <p>Organisations have cultures, and the way they deal with and treat issues to do with people's health and safety is part of their organisational culture.</p> <p>I don't even think it's sensible to think about safety culture as a subset of organisational</p>	

	<p>culture because that still implies somehow there are boundaries that you can draw between the two.</p> <p>Organisations come with values, beliefs, norms, artefacts and symbols, and all of those things impact on the way people are treated within the organisation. So I don't think it's a useful distinction to draw. You're looking at the ways organisations deal with people.</p>	
<p>No such thing as safety culture</p>	<p>SP: There's no such thing as a safety culture, it's an organisational culture.</p> <p>WR: My fundamental problem is I'm not sure what people mean by safety culture and safety climate. I mean, if it's the way you do things in an organisation, I don't understand that safety's any different to how you should do things anyway, or how things work. So I find it really difficult, this cutting off and branching off to calling it safety culture, something different to the overall sort of managerial culture and the way things are done in an organisation. So I have a fundamental problem with it.</p>	

E: Defining culture

Themes	Industry	Researchers
The way we do things around here (safety culture)	<p>SP: I think culture is, in the simplest form, the way we do things around here, so be that from an operational perspective or a safety perspective and so on, and it's just the way we do things.</p> <p>WR: Safety culture, I mean isn't it basically the way we do things? So the way we do things is the way we talk to people, we make decisions that involve people, we listen to people, we take responsibility for our decisions. We're willing to re-look at our decisions and go back and check and change. That's a good organisational culture. It's a growing culture. It's a culture that is the way of doing things to improve things and accepting that it's continuous, that it involves everyone. And that it's not the privilege of any particular group.</p> <p>MG: Culture is the way you do things.</p>	<p>Andrew Hopkins: One is the way we do things around here, so that's collective practices. And the other is the mindset; it's the way we think around here, if you like. So we have those two different ways of focusing on the notion of culture.</p> <p>It is important to recognise that those two approaches are complementary, not contradictory. Having said that, I would want to go on and say it's much easier to observe people's practices than it is to know what's inside their head.</p> <p>So from a point of view of researching or studying what the culture of the organisation is, it's simpler to start with What are those practices? Now I want to also say that these two things are not inconsistent, they're actually complementary, and you have to understand that they are complementary, that the reason why we do things around here this way is because we think we ought to be doing things around here this way.</p> <p>Patrick Hudson: The thing about culture is that what people don't realise is because they're in it (and as one of my definitions of culture, it's the bit that people don't talk about), it's quite hard to get them to talk about it simply because they think that that's how things are, that's normal. It's not just how we do things around here, but how things should be; it's that concept of 'normal' which of course leads to the idea of normalisation gets you in to what is normal. One of the metaphors I use: it's rather like asking fish about water; basically the most that they can usually say about water is they swim in it, but they don't realise really just how much it directs what they do.</p>
Groups interacting as they solve problems (safety culture)		<p>Andrew Hale: I tend to go with Schein's definitions: that culture comes from the group interacting with its environment and solving problems. If you're not doing work together, you can't have a culture of that group; work in the very broader sense that's where the beliefs and attitudes come from and get built up and get confirmed. So that needs to be very clear in conceptualising the culture.</p>

A snapshot picture (safety climate)		Andrew Hale: I think climate is a snapshot which is the starting point for understanding culture. I mean it's a snapshot in the sense that it's not rounded or deep and it's also time limited.
The perceived priority given to safety (safety climate)		Dov Zohar: I think climate, safety climate in particular, has to do with the perceived priority of safety in the workplace.
The way the organisation operates (organisational culture)	SP: The values, beliefs, norms and artefacts that guide the way an organisation operates. It varies obviously within organisations as well as between.	
Beware of definitions		Patrick Hudson: You may notice that I've never given a definition of safety culture? And I'm not planning on doing that because I think that the moment you do that you're hung on your particular hook, and it's your favourite hook.
A collection of people's safety-related behaviours (safety culture)	SP: Safety culture is a collection of people's safety-related behaviours that form the organisational view.	
No idea what the difference is between culture and climate	WR: How do I define safety culture? How do I define safety climate? I don't know what the difference is.	

F: Cultural dilemmas, tensions and unresolved issues

Themes	Industry	Researchers
Time	<p>SP: There might be a difference between what a senior leader wants and what the site leader is prepared to deliver. The site leader might say “how do I fit that in and do the job that I’m also paid to do, which is a processing productivity kind of a role.” You always have that tension. You have to free them up a little bit.</p> <p>SP: People go “well where are we going to find the time?”</p>	
Linking culture/climate to performance		<p>Andrew Hale: One of the things which I think is a dilemma is that we still don’t have a vast amount of evidence linking safety culture to safety performance. So we still in my view have quite a lot of problems deciding what is good in the safety culture and in interpreting the safety climate surveys.</p>
Between the unitary and diversity view of culture		<p>Andrew Hale: Tensions between the unitary view and the diversity view of culture. Culture in organisations is a Venn diagram of different group cultures which overlap. The common core could be seen as the ‘culture of that organisation.’ The bigger the common core, the stronger the organisation’s culture and the greater its influence on the behaviour of all members.</p>
Resourcing	<p>SP: How much is that going to cost? Dilemmas often rise with regard to resourcing. So often people think that to introduce a positive safety culture or to change a culture will take a lot of time and a lot of money.</p>	
What to do with the results of climate surveys		<p>Patrick Hudson: [referring to a conversation with safety climate researchers at a conference] Look, it’s very interesting as you all said, ‘Yes, yes very interesting,’ and you all went back into your comfort zone. But when on the second day especially you started talking about how to change culture you started to use my vocabulary rather than your vocabulary because your vocabulary doesn’t give you any way of talking about what you wanted to talk about. My vocabulary does.</p>

G: Clarifying the distinction between ‘culture’ and ‘climate’

Themes	Industry	Researchers
Not sure	<p>SP: I’m not quite sure how to answer it to be honest. I guess safety climate is the expectation if you talk about a business or if you talk about a country.</p> <p>SP: I’m not sure there’s a thing called safety climate as such; I do think there is a climate that impacts the safety culture.</p>	
Synonymous		<p>Andrew Hopkins: People use these terms in all kinds of different ways and I think there’s some confusion. It’s very hard to make a distinction and the simplest thing is to try and treat them as synonymous.</p> <p>But if you’re going to make a distinction, then this is the way I would make the distinction. I’ve already defined culture as the practices, the collective practices of the work group or the organisation, so that’s my bedrock definition. Then safety climate simply is the opinion people will have about how important safety is here.</p> <p>Culture can seldom, or not easily, be ascertained by means of opinion surveys. Culture is best studied, I think, by observation, by enquiry and ultimately by participant observation on deep, deep involvement in an organisation, by ethnographic means.</p>
Triangulation		<p>Andrew Hale: [referring to Schein’s three levels of organisational culture] Climate surveys tap into the artefacts and to an extent the values, but don’t, by their nature, get through to the basic assumptions. I think safety climate surveys are part of the triangulation process which you need to get through to the culture. An attitude survey could be a part of that, but it won’t be sufficient on its own; it needs ways of interpreting it.</p>
Irrelevant		<p>Sidney Dekker: I don’t even care about the distinction between climate and culture. Let me put it this way. One does not have any epistemological or ontological privilege over the other category. They are both objective knowledge. They are both constructions that we create in order to get our hands on this vacuum of human behaviour that seems to be that systems that are</p>

		technically okay, whether it's climate or culture.
Maturity and feel – one informs the other	SP: I thought safety culture is what happens on a day-to-day basis that illustrates the maturity of the organisation from a safety perspective. Safety climate is more about how people feel about safety – is it embraced? is it seen as difficult? – so that's sort of like climate. If the climate around safety seems negative, then I would be looking at what is happening in the culture that is driving this and, if it is positive, I would find out what is driving this and encourage them to do more of it.	
Can cause confusion – subset	SP: We don't ever use the term safety climate. If we think about organisational culture and we think about how safety culture underpins that, then if you look at some of those definitions, then safety climate would be a subset of your overarching safety culture. It's more about perhaps how a team operates or whatever, but to be perfectly honest, I don't use that term. I think if you start to get too technical like that it causes confusion. People start to say "what's the difference between safety climate and safety culture and what do you really mean?" For us we just talk about culture and we leave it at that. MG: I probably don't really use the word safety climate.	
Complex		Dov Zohar: I think the relationship between safety climate and culture is quite complex. I haven't seen a model that I can really accept as a model that solves the issues. How do you differentiate precisely between safety climate and culture? I've dealt with it myself, but basically my approach was that safety climate is an expression of the underlying safety culture. It offers some mechanisms or some tools for understanding part or some of the elements of safety culture. There is still a lot of work that needs to be done to untangle these. Climate, no one understands what it is. People who are not in academia and haven't investigated it have no idea what climate is. I'm sorry to say, but some of my close friends and colleagues in this field also mix up the two. And very often they use the two terms interchangeably, in the same paper. I think mostly practitioners are responsible for this fact, but also scientists who

		somehow are not aware of the distinction between the two constructs.
Semantic	<p>SP: I find the climate literature to be nonsense because it's making distinctions as I suggested before that don't actually exist...seems to be quite semantic.</p> <p>What's interesting is how people get treated by an organisation, and how you go about changing it. Whether you'd call it culture or climate or atmosphere or whatever, I think it is really not particularly interesting or useful.</p>	
One is deeper	<p>SP: The safety culture or the organisational culture is much deeper than the safety climate which is just a spot sampling of something on the surface.</p>	

H: Accident investigation and culture

Themes	Industry	Researchers
Culture does not play a part	<p>SP: It doesn't play any part.</p> <p>SP: We haven't been looking at cultural issues.</p> <p>SP: I don't think I'd be talking about safety culture because I think I'd be talking about more specific things.</p> <p>MG: Well I think when you're looking at the root causes, those systemic issues are part of that culture. I don't know if we specifically go "what role does culture play?" But our process will look at the systemic issues around management and systems and so on.</p>	
An aspect	<p>SP: Yes, definitely. So we'd obviously have a look at all the technical issues around it, so maintenance, etc., but also looking at the behaviour around the incident as well.</p> <p>We'd look at things like hours worked, breaks, experience, knowledge, supervision, contractor, non-contractor, non-English speaking, training, all that sort of basic stuff. Then we would have a look at the culture in the business. Is it one where you take your breaks? Is it one where you rush and get things done? Is it the hero who gets the most done? Is it that people have said "this is too much" in the past, but it hasn't been listened to? That sort of communication and consultation that's been happening behind or before the incident, we'd be having a look at that.</p> <p>SP: Yes we do. It's part of the decision tree. When we're doing an incident investigation there's a whole lot of things to consider: the culture of how the team operated, the value set of the lead person or the supervisor, that's all important.</p> <p>Part of your report might go about addressing whether you felt there were gaps or there could be improvements.</p> <p>I think culture certainly has a part to play. It's not the be all and end all because as you know when you're doing a root cause analysis there are a number of things that can feed into that. But it's one aspect that we certainly consider.</p>	<p>Andrew Hale: It fits in fairly distally from the accident. If you work back from the accident then the things you look at first are the barriers and risk controls and you work your way back through the technology to the behaviour in using technology in the organisation. That's about where you come to culture, but as an explanatory factor, which explains why people fail to do the things that in hindsight they wished they'd done.</p> <p>Sometimes in accident investigations you come to individual behaviour where you look for and may find causes in that individual's competence or motivation, but you also ask the question at that point: "if I'd plucked that person out of that role and put somebody else in it, would they have made the same decision?" If the answer is 'yes,' then it suggests that you need to look at that group level to find out why this would be a pervasive way of behaving or reacting. And that's when you're into culture.</p>

Culture as cause is not scientific		Dov Zohar: [Referring to major accident investigation reports] The underlying cause was the safety culture. In my words, the lack of enacted value that prioritised the employee health and safety. If you read the reports now, about other major accidents, they all come to the same conclusion, which is not science, it's not scientific.
Irrelevant	SP: Safety culture is a contributing factor to accidents? I mean, goodness me, how silly is that? They didn't have the right values and the safety culture is wrong, well, yeah, but what are you going to do about it?	

I: Clarifying the distinction between culture as an explanation and culture as a description

Themes	Industry	Researchers
Description more useful than cause		<p>Andrew Hopkins: That sense of the way we do things around here will become the cause of the individual's behaviour. But that's a very limited focus on why an individual behaves the way he or she does. A much more important thing is why an accident happened, or why we do things around here in that way. I think as soon as you move beyond the individual you are getting into the notion of culture, which is as a description. And I think that's by far the most useful way of thinking about culture; it's a description. A descriptive term.</p> <p>Treating the concept of culture as descriptive – this is the way things are done here – and then asking why they are done in this way is a very productive way to think about culture and a very productive line of enquiry. It gets at what I would want to call the root causes; while there are no such things as root causes, if we can accept that as a kind of a metaphor, then yes, this line of enquiry gets at much more fundamental causes, root causes, than any other line of enquiry.</p>
Contributing factor more useful than cause		<p>Andrew Hale: Maybe a contributing factor is a better word than cause because cause has a tendency to become monocausal in people's thinking and speaking; but certainly it's a contributing factor. However, I would see the link as causal. Because this culture, in relating to rules or use of protective equipment or whatever, was the way it was, that explains why the people, the individuals, broke the rules or failed to use the protective equipment or whatever. So it's causal, yes. It's causal in the sense that by identifying it you are saying: if we change this then that sort of thing will not happen again.</p>

J: Clarifying the language of culture and exposing semantic dilemmas

Themes	Industry	Researchers
How culture is defined		<p>Andrew Hopkins: Safety culture is understood in two quite different ways; people don't seem to understand the inconsistency of these two ways.</p> <p>First, I will quote from the International Atomic Energy Agency definition of 1988: safety culture is "that assembly of characteristics and attitudes in organisations and individuals which establishes that, as an overriding priority, safety issues receive the attention warranted by their significance." That's a very common definition; the implication is that not all organisations have a safety culture.</p> <p>When you look at Jim Reason's development of safety culture in his 1997 book on organisational accidents, it's very much consistent with that. Because he says an organisation which has a safety culture has a highly developed incident reporting system, a highly developed information dissemination process. It has a no-blame culture or at least a just culture; it has a bunch of characteristics many organisations don't have. So in other words, the safety culture is a rare culture.</p> <p>The second approach to safety culture is that all organisations have a safety culture. This is a fundamentally different use of the term – that all organisations have a safety culture. It may be good, bad or indifferent, but all organisations have a safety culture.</p> <p>That confusion runs right through all the literature and people just seem to gloss over it... for that reason I don't like the term safety culture, because that dilemma has never been resolved.</p> <p>I would want to use other terms when I'm talking about an organisation which is focused on safety. I would want to call it a safety-focused culture or a culture of safety. Or a risk-aware culture or a culture that prioritises safety. Jim Reason is now calling it a safe culture.</p> <p>These are cultures which do indeed prioritise safety. By no means then do all organisations have a safe culture or a safety-focused culture. It is in fact a rare organisation that does. I will never ever use the term safety culture in my own work.</p>
Don't use the word culture	<p>SP: [In our language] we probably don't use the word culture at all.</p> <p>SP: They might use the term the 'culture of the place,' but they</p>	

	<p>wouldn't tend to use 'safety culture' in their language.</p> <p>MG: In the field, we won't talk about culture; we won't use the phrase culture. If we say we want to improve the culture here they're not going to know what we're talking about.</p>	
--	---	--

K: What does an organisation with a good OHS culture look like in practice?

Themes	Industry	Researchers
<p>Good culture:</p> <p>Understanding of risk is controlled</p> <p>Line of report for the safety professional</p> <p>Design of incentives schemes for managers</p> <p>CEO making decisions in favour of safety</p> <p>Bad news is rewarded</p> <p>Good news is challenged</p> <p>Workforce engagement</p> <p>Clear and shared picture of risk</p> <p>Improving procedures</p> <p>Reporting</p> <p>Champion, either a senior leader or the safety professional</p> <p>Creative mistrust</p> <p>Providing resources</p> <p>Visibility of senior managers/leaders actively engaged</p> <p>Structures</p> <p>Conversations</p> <p>Integrated</p> <p>Tools and equipment</p> <p>Ongoing learning</p> <p>Symbols</p>	<p>SP: You get an understanding of what risk is and an acceptance of how it's going to be controlled.</p> <p>You will just naturally have great housekeeping because why would you do anything else.</p> <p>When you talk to people they'll be able to talk to you knowledgeably about why there are certain standards in place and what they mean and how they use them in practice.</p> <p>A good safety culture is where people understand what it is that are controlling the risks of their everyday life, how they contribute, how they are sure that others contribute, what they would do if they saw someone doing something wrong, even if it was the CEO...I've seen this on plenty of occasions, where you walk through with the CEO and someone will walk up and say, "look guys, you're not supposed to actually be there" or "you're not wearing your hat properly" you know, not people being smart about it, people are actually saying, "we have these things because we really believe in them."</p> <p>SP: I would say that it's extremely visible. The managing director, or whoever the top person is, is actively and visibly promoting safety at all opportunities.</p> <p>There are clear structures for dealing with safety within the business. It's a conversation that's readily had.</p> <p>I often see organisations that say it's on our every agenda. And then I pick up their agenda and it says safety and I say to them "well, what did you talk about?" Oh nothing, we had nothing to discuss. An organisation with a positive safety culture truly will take the time to have something in that section on safety on their agenda.</p> <p>They'll have resources for it. It'll be integrated into the way they advertise jobs, recruit, induct people; the way they purchase; the way they buy stuff in; the way they contract manage. It's just, you know, it really is a part of the way they do business. When I speak to people in</p>	<p>Andrew Hopkins: That is an organisation which does indeed prioritise safety. If we're talking about any kind of hazardous industry, then it's an organisation that has a very strong engineering or safety function, that is, a set of professionals organised in a bureaucratic hierarchy that goes towards the top of the organisation. It's a parallel technical stream within the organisation that runs parallel to the commercial profit-focused stream.</p> <p>The sort of rule of thumb is that if the top safety or risk manager reports to the CEO, then this is an organisation that does give priority to safety. So it's one of the first things I ask when I'm looking at organisations. Who is your most senior risk or safety manager? Where do they sit in the hierarchy? Who do they report to? If they report to the CEO then I'm impressed.</p> <p>What are the incentive schemes that operate within the organisation? And what kind of behaviour is being driven by those incentive schemes? I would say unless an organisation is giving a great deal of attention to thinking about this, it's likely those incentive schemes are going to be undermining safety in various ways.</p> <p>The CEO is visibly making decisions in favour of safety. So not just making statements in favour of safety, but making decisions in favour of safety. For example, to close down something for safety reasons or to spend more money on something for safety reasons.</p> <p>It's an organisation where bad news is rewarded, indeed celebrated. And that is the movement of bad news up the organisation. The people further down are aware of things that are wrong or not as they should be and they report those things up the organisation. That bad news is not only accepted, but it's actually</p>

<p>Understands complexity and the linear</p> <p>Clear expectations and accountability</p> <p>Understands the difficulties people face in the workplace</p> <p>Provides all the right materials for workers to succeed</p> <p>Changes the initial conditions – trial new ideas, less proscriptive requirements, more freedom – greater review</p> <p>Understands variability</p> <p>Focuses on success</p> <p>What you hear and what you see when you walk in the door</p> <p>How the organisation prioritises safety – the ethical thing to do</p> <p>Makes the invisible visible</p> <p>People are allowed to complain</p> <p>People feel looked after</p> <p>Disciplined, repeatable</p> <p>Intent</p> <p>Encourages whistleblowing</p> <p>Realism</p> <p>Puts safety alongside business objectives</p>	<p>those companies they are positive around safety; they don't say oh it's a pain, but you know we have to do it.</p> <p>So looking at tools and equipment, ongoing learning, symbols such as walkways and health programs, hazard reporting is clearly understood, utilised and followed through. I've seen some people say "we've got a hazard reporting system," but when you talk to the guys on the shop floor, they've got to go and fill out five pieces of paperwork, get it off the intranet, get three people to sign it, do the secret handshake; they're not going to do that are they?</p> <p>SP: I think the first thing is what you sense immediately you enter the door of the organisation. It'll be intrinsically embedded in their culture. For example, people will talk to you about safety as part of your initial discussions, whether it's in your induction or interview there will be questions about health and safety. They'll talk about it, they'll talk about the importance of it.</p> <p>SP: To me it's an organisation that understands. I think there's a combination in safety of needing to understand the aspects of complexity and some of the linear pieces as well.</p> <p>Clear expectations around the things we do to manage safety and manage those accountabilities as well. The organisation also understands the difficulties that are faced by the workers, and has good engagement processes in place to understand, engage with the workforce to understand the difficulties they're facing but also to make sure that we adequately provide all the right materials and support for them to succeed. To me an organisation with a good culture focuses on all those aspects to support success, and success can be in a whole range of ways.</p> <p>You set people up for success. You're putting a whole range of starting points in place out there, so you're changing the initial conditions and you've then got to observe to see what the outcomes are.</p> <p>One of the things as well is that people are reluctant in safety to trial new ideas, and then one of the things for us is how do we release control somewhat, in other words have less prescriptive requirements on the workers, allow more freedom but try and also allow a greater</p>	<p>celebrated and rewarded further up the organisation.</p> <p>Correspondingly, good news is challenged. If you get a message from further down that everything is fine and you're constantly getting these messages that everything is fine, then you don't believe that and you're sceptical of that. A senior leader is sceptical of that and saying "can I really rely on this good news that I'm getting?"</p> <p>Andrew Hale: Very strong, active engagement with the workforce: not just being told to do things but being engaged in the process of deciding what to do and continuously checking.</p> <p>Having a clear and shared risk picture so that when you ask people, anybody in the company, what are the safety priorities, they will come up with roughly the same answer because the organisation has a very clear picture of the way things can go wrong and what the results would be if they did and that is shared.</p> <p>Also the belief that things can be improved. And the activity would be finding ways to be busy with issues of safety such as when you're reconsidering procedures by reporting dangerous situations or undesirable situations.</p> <p>What we talked about with the leadership would be, yes top management but also somebody who is the safety and health champion. And that's where you get into the difficulties with the small companies where one of your options is not there. So it's got to be at the top manager's level because there's nobody (no safety professional) prodding them and poking them and giving them ideas to getting them enthusiastic.</p> <p>What I've always called creative mistrust; being critical, not being complacent.</p> <p>And providing resources.</p> <p>Dov Zohar: If management in the company – senior management and middle-level managers – adopt values that prioritise employee safety and health, because health is pretty much the same as injury, except it develops</p>
---	---	---

<p>Housekeeping</p>	<p>level of review over when people come up with new ideas or new ways of doing things to be able to review that. And so it's approving some of the initiatives and the changes that are occurring out there.</p> <p>Understand that it's a variable workplace; things are going to change and we expect our people to come up with ideas. This is where we want these conversations around what was difficult because difficult work is often a sign of this increased variability. What we find then is we can come up with the solutions that are a way to improve or make the work process more efficient, to have an agreed way, a different way, of getting around that piece. That in itself embraces variability, but also looks to dampen the parts that we wish to dampen.</p> <p>Having an organisation that focuses on success rather than on managing failure or reacting to failure. If safety people are focused on success, then that's beneficial. Not only from a safety perspective because it also gives the safety people within the organisation greater credibility. But because we are helping organisations to become more successful as well as achieving good safety outcomes.</p> <p>SP: If you're visiting a company it's the first thing you see when you walk in and the first person you talk to.</p> <p>SP: Once you get into the organisation it's what you hear from people; it's how they demonstrate, it's what they do, it's how they look after you, it's all those small things that you hear and you become aware of and you realise that it is an important value for the organisation.</p> <p>SP: Get people to see what they can't see at the moment, so make the unthinkable visible, so that they're able to act on it.</p> <p>A place where people are allowed to complain and whinge; where people are respected. Even though they may be a whinging, moaning, complaining pain, having someone in the organisation playing that role is actually really important; you need to be able to get the bad news.</p> <p>It's an organisation where people do legitimately feel that they're looked after, that people care about them, and that the</p>	<p>40 years later, in terms of all sorts of diseases. Prioritising safety and health is probably the more ethical thing to do, rather than increasing profits by turning a blind eye to safety and health issues.</p>
---------------------	--	---

	<p>work they're doing is important and worthwhile.</p> <p>SP: It is discipline, it is repeatable, and it is consistent. It happens again and again and again.</p> <p>SP: People in the organisation have a creative mistrust in the risk-control system, which means always expecting emergent problems and they're never convinced that the safety culture or organisational performance is ideal.</p> <p>The safety whistle-blowers are accepted and safety personnel, everyone, is constantly seeking to identify risks within the organisation.</p> <p>I think it's all about whether the organisation has that sort of realism about it in which it's clearly trying to make sure that everyone gets home okay, but it's very realistic and not silly.</p> <p>It's an organisational culture that puts safety alongside its other objectives, balances them well, tries to blend them and not separate them out, because I think the moment they're separated they're going to get lost.</p> <p>MG: Leaders across the organisation are all actively engaged and involved in talking about safety. If there's an issue it's dealt with straight away. I think a very good safety culture also means that you've got lots of people in the organisation who are actually seeing things outside of their own work premises and practice and thinking gee whizz, I might progress that. A big thing for me is general housekeeping.</p>	
<p>Bad culture:</p> <p>People doing their own thing</p> <p>By the book</p> <p>Poor modelling by leadership</p> <p>Ticking a box</p> <p>Bonus arrangements</p>	<p>SP: A bad culture would look like something where people are operating on their own, doing their own thing, not quite sure of why they're doing it.</p> <p>SP: A poor safety culture's simply complying and transacting with a task and ticking a box. You have to constantly change the situational leadership and you've got to get the leadership modelling and demonstrating that time in a consistent way. So that is one example of how I see good culture versus just a transactional culture.</p> <p>MG Personally I am dead against [manager KPIs and bonuses for safety]. I think culturally again, that's actually trying to measure safety from a point of view of if you achieve that you get a bonus; if you</p>	

	don't you don't. It drives a lot of wrong behaviours, including hiding behaviour where you won't hear about a near miss or all sorts of issues.	
--	---	--

L: Questions OHS professionals should ask about proprietary culture change programs

Themes	Industry	Researchers
<p>Don't like them – don't be a follower of fashion</p>	<p>SP: I actually dislike them a lot; I don't think they help that much because they reflect the tensions of a point in time, not the climate.</p> <p>SP: I've got to say I find most of them [behaviour-based safety (BBS) programs] quite flawed. The proprietary versions of those that are floating around I wouldn't give the time of day.</p> <p>SP: I think it's difficult to have a proprietary program that really fits perfectly in an organisation. Particularly in an organisation that is bigger than four factory walls with a whole lot of diverse areas and different operations.</p> <p>SP: I don't like them [BBS]. They reinforce existing relationships of power and control, which are the ones that are causing damage, and create further barriers between the undiscussables and what's visible in the organisation.</p> <p>I'm not a great fan of the normative models with a series of steps you have to go through. I don't think that's a useful approach, because the way I've seen it operate in practice is it has given people in organisations excuses for not doing things. So "Oh, we can't deal with the way our training system treats people because we're not compliant in these other areas, and we've got to get all that done before we can move to the next step of the culture change process," and I do think that's a normative model.</p> <p>I don't have a problem with using these to highlight particular aspects of the organisation, but I do think that to give the impression that there's a series of sequential steps and there's only one way through them with a beginning, middle and end, is misleading and mythical. Change is always messy, it's always about power. It's not always predictable, and it doesn't always happen according to plan.</p> <p>WR: I don't think you'd start with an off-the-shelf program.</p>	<p>Andrew Hale: This is a really important question and my first response was a sort of negative one, don't be a dedicated follow of fashion. What I'm objecting to strongly is what I see as being the way the market works: that some companies talk to their fellows, their colleagues, and they hear, "oh we just introduced this program" and they say "oh, that sounds good, let's do the same." And maybe it's appropriate, maybe it isn't, but if they don't really ask the critical questions deeply in advance about whether and why it works there, then they could spend a lot of money and they're missing what the real problem is and maybe there isn't even a real culture problem.</p> <p>Patrick Hudson: They'd been doing these safety culture surveys and we looked at them and we thought, "Well, no wonder they're not getting anywhere, because you look at this and say, "Where do I go next? I don't know."</p>

<p>Can the program be tailored to suit the organisation?</p>	<p>SP: I'm a little cynical on most proprietary programs. The problem with them is that they're rigid and any cultural change program has to be tailored carefully to suit the organisation.</p>	
<p>Is the CEO committed?</p>		<p>Andrew Hopkins: My advice on this is that details of the program are secondary. The most important thing is whether the CEO is committed to it. Does the request come from the CEO or is it coming from much further down the line? If it's coming just from the site level, then forget it. If it's coming from the CEO then that's an indication that they're serious.</p> <p>My advice is make sure that you've got commitment from the highest possible level within the organisation. If you haven't, then it's just not going to work, no matter the nature of the program. Is the CEO committed to it and in particular willing to make the resourcing decisions that are necessary to make it work?</p>
<p>Whose behaviour are we trying to change?</p>	<p>SP: The ones I've seen, the behavioural-based safety programs, drive the simple response that the managers are smart, workers are dumb; if they just followed the rules, and we can influence their behaviour by going and observing them and having a conversation around safety then they'll suddenly see the light and understand why it's so important for them to follow the rules and do what's right. But these are none of the things that I think are important from a safety perspective. To me all of those behavioural programs and the safety culture programs are just looking at the individual; they're not looking at the organisational context.</p> <p>SP: They're behaviour-based programs masquerading as a wolf in sheep's clothing, or old wine in new bottles, whatever metaphor you use.</p> <p>That your values dictate your behaviour is just facile, it neglects the role of environment in influencing behaviour. A culture change program is just about changing people's behaviour; it's not a culture change program.</p> <p>SP: I fear that I am one-eyed about it, but I still do find myself asking questions to find out whether the organisation that's offering the [BBS] program is just trying to change the behaviour of the individual.</p> <p>If I find that they're not just trying to change the individual, that they're doing it</p>	<p>Andrew Hopkins: Is the culture change program aimed at changing the behaviour of top managers as well as workers? If it's not, if it's only focused on changing the way people at the grass roots think and behave, again, forget it. Because it's top managers whose behaviour needs to be changed.</p>

	with a view to looking at groups of people and a social process, I'm less worried than when they're doing it with an individual and they're thinking that what's inside one person's head is going to dramatically change. I am concerned when I see that it's focused on the individuals with the least chance to change the exposure to risk. So it's whether they're focusing on the worker rather than the management.	
What is the problem?	<p>ER: I would talk to them about making sure you're doing this for the right reasons and that you've got your general safety obligations covered before you do this, otherwise all that it's going to tell you is what you could know by walking around your workplace and seeing that you've got guarding not addressed, etc. So make sure that you're using it at the right time I suppose.</p> <p>WR: We have no time for behaviour-based safety.</p>	<p>Andrew Hale: Analyse what the problem is in your organisation before you start looking to see what an appropriate culture change package is. You need to analyse the gaps. You need to say whose culture, why am I unhappy with what we've got at the moment, is it something where the culture needs to change or something else needs to change?</p> <p>So what is the appropriate target of change and how does that part of the organisation currently see its own performance, its own culture, especially when you're facing a change process where you've got strong opposition. Or is it that you think the problem is more in terms of competence and knowledge? Where does the problem lie? And then matching that with a suitable culture change program.</p>
What do they want to achieve?	SP: Firstly [providers] should ask the manager what do they want to achieve, why do they feel like they need a cultural change process, what were the triggers for that? And what outcome would they like to see as a result of the culture change process? What resources are they willing to put into that? What time are they willing to put into that?	
What is the basis of the program?	SP: And then from the provider, I expect them to talk to managers about the basis for their program. What is the program based on? What are the outcomes that the program will achieve? What is the consultation communication method? How flexible is it? What level of the organisation is it aimed at?	
Can be useful	<p>SP: I have used them. I think some of those are good tools. So the thing about proprietary products is that you've become dependent on a third party, and ultimately that's very useful if you need a kick to get yourself going.</p> <p>SP: Definitely, they're [safety climate surveys] a very useful metaphor because they provide a veneer of scientific</p>	

	<p>reliability to what's not a scientifically valid concept. I use them often, but I'd only ever use them in the context of qualitative data collection. We'll also interview people. And I do find getting the statistical data as well quite useful.</p> <p>So that reinforced for me the value of the surveys, not on their own, but in the context of triangulation, it can be quite helpful. Certainly from a polemic point of view it was very handy to have that quantitative data as well as the qualitative data.</p> <p>Don't bother spending your money buying a proprietary survey. There are plenty of surveys out there and questions that you can use that you don't have to pay for. What's important is to talk to people.</p>	
<p>How will the program be introduced?</p>	<p>WR: Unless there is full, open and honest discussion involving workers and their representatives about the program then it will always be an imposition... anything that's imposed always fails. So the first thing will be not so much the what, but the how.</p>	
<p>What will the organisation do with the results?</p>	<p>ER: Whether it's a safety climate survey or just a general employee opinion survey which has got safety as part of it, it's what you do with the results that makes the difference. Do you take the results and go out and do something about it or do you, as I've seen a couple of organisations do, take the results and rationalise why it really isn't a true outcome. It comes down once again to the genuine intention of doing the survey, whether everyone is on board, what management is going to do with the results and whether it gives them something meaningful.</p>	
<p>Who is the best person for the job?</p>		<p>Dov Zohar: I'd say you can choose a consultant who claims lots of success, which may be true, but there's no evidence, scientific evidence that that's true. Versus a scientist who may have a lot less experience in the field, but he or she follows scientifically based methodologies and data collection methodologies and so on. You make the decision. That's what I do when I'm being approached every once in a while for consulting jobs. They say, you know, we could get it elsewhere and I make the distinction between practitioners versus scientists. You have to make the decision.</p>

<p>Will it build dignity and respect?</p>	<p>SP: It doesn't matter what you do as long as how you do it is about building the kinds of values that we know check people. It's about asking the questions, "Will this build dignity and respect in our workplace?" So in a sense it doesn't matter what tool you use, and you can use a shiny, off-the-shelf thing if it makes people feel more comfortable in the organisation, as long as it's applied with dignity and respect, giving people the opportunity to grow and develop at work, helping people see how things might be different within the organisation.</p>	
---	---	--

M: Exposing cultural myths

Themes	Industry	Researchers
Culture is an add-on		Andrew Hopkins: One of the myths is that culture is a kind of add-on. I don't think culture is an add-on. Culture is the way we do things around here. People often say it's an add-on because procedures and systems are not enough. What additional magical ingredient do we need? It's culture.
That culture is organic or imposed by leaders		Andrew Hopkins: Another myth, there's some sort of debate which seems to be a bit misguided, about whether culture is organic to the work group or can be imposed from the outside by leaders. A lot of literature takes this as contradictory positions – that culture is either organic to the workgroup or it can be imposed from the outside by leaders. I think the resolution is simply to say what do we mean by culture? It's the way we do things around here. Okay, where does this come from? It may come from the work group. It can come from the outside if leaders are sufficiently consistent, then it will happen. It's a myth that is widely propagated. I think it is a dangerous myth.
How we currently study culture may be misleading or unhelpful		Andrew Hale: My point about my ethnographic approach is that it can perpetuate the idea that culture is really not changeable. I mean that literature is very descriptive and not related to change. I suppose the other point was about the other end of the spectrum that is the attitude survey literature, which pretends that it can tell you everything you need to know about safety culture, when it doesn't really dig deep enough.
There is one culture	SP: I think there's a myth that exists that there is some amazing ideal model of culture that you can apply that will produce this wonderful safety culture.	
All this is new	WR: There is a myth that somehow this is all new.	
The behaviour of workers will change culture	WR: That it's the behaviour of workers which will change culture. Behaviour-based safety and culture are often used interchangeably or a proxy for one another. It's a myth that if you want to change the culture, you need to change the behaviour of the workers, and that's a culture change program.	

Culture prevents accidents	SP: The whole concept of 'safety culture prevents accidents' is just a flawed concept. The safety culture doesn't prevent accidents. The people who are doing the work and the resources and how we set up work is what will prevent the accidents from occurring.	
Safety inhibits production	SP: That safety inhibits your production and schedule, those sort of myths, they get thrown up at you still. That idea that safety perhaps doesn't contribute to the bottom line. I think that's a myth that is certainly not true. I think safety professionals need to be a bit cleverer in pitching how their programs can actually help improve the bottom line, so you debunk that myth immediately. MG: The myth that there is a conflict between meeting budget requirements and time pressures, and not hurting anyone. I think we've been able to demonstrate quite clearly in the organisation that having a schedule to meet as well as doing it safely aren't in conflict with each other.	
The safety department will fix everything	SP: The belief that the safety department will fix everything for you and the line guys don't need to do anything. I think that's something that is certainly not true. The safety department is totally ineffective without line management support.	
Safety first	ER: One of the things that concerns me in the whole culture debate is that whole 'we're committed to safety and we put safety first.' Because I don't think business goes into business for the purposes of safety; they go into business for the purposes of making money and safety should be part of how we do everything around here. We should think about safety with everything we do, but I'm really sceptical of organisations that say we put safety first.	
Consulting companies are doing scientific work		Dov Zohar: What's perpetuated here is the belief that we, the consulting company, are doing scientific work.
The organisation is only one thing	SP: I like the metaphor of collage, in that organisations are lots of different things depending on what model you use, and the interesting questions are around how the organisation defines itself and aspects of it. So I'm not sure, I suppose the myth that the organisation is only one thing or the other.	

You can't change people	SP: One of the biggest myths I think is that you can't change people.	
It's impossible	SP: The other one is people say it's impossible.	
Individual responsibility	WR: The individual focus and not seeing stuff as part of a systemic way of doing things. The fundamental one about the individual. It's coming back, it's got a resurgence. It doesn't talk about the careless worker, but it's in 'individual responsibility' and 'everybody has a role' and 'everybody has a responsibility.' Those sorts of terminologies, which in practice mean, well it's your fault.	
What interests my boss fascinates me	SP: It's getting to the point where it's approaching a myth, isn't it? It does cast a view of the organisation being so top-down.	
Zero harm	SP: I think the one that's always the challenge is this whole idea of a goal of zero harm, and whether all injuries are preventable. There are people in organisations we deal with who refer to it as 'that stupid saying,' so I think they would say it's a myth that they can achieve it. So why have a goal you can't achieve?	