Ladies and Gentlemen:

I would like to begin by acknowledging the support of the New Zealand Department of Labour and the SAFEGUARD group for providing this opportunity to share some of my thinking about workplace safety with you all this evening.

I would also like to acknowledge each and every one of you here tonight. Your presence here is a testament to your commitment to the workplace health and safety of those around you. That is NO SMALL THING. A little later I shall draw your attention to the “ripple effect” within workplace safety.

Before we begin though I would like to spend a few moments just engaging with the safety side of our brains.

What we are going to do now is just play a little reductionist game for a few moments. So bear with me there is a purpose here.

OK……. Now how many of the movers and shakers in the room, travel in the course of their work……………..That’s a fair proportion of the room……………..Now lets see how many of us have been known to stay above the 10th floor……………..Numbers haven’t shrunk much have they……………..By the way did I mention that the ladder on the fire engine generally does not reach above the 4th Floor……………..OK now don’t go putting those arms down yet. Of those of us who stay above the 10th floor how many
check the emergency evacuation routes/assembly points on the back of the door? Feeling pretty good I wonder. Anywhere here is the Tester……………… How many of you check that the emergency exit doors on your floor and the ground floor access point are unlocked and reasonably accessible……………Oops that just shrunk the room. Finally do we have anyone in the room who “walks” the emergency egress route prior to putting the head on the pillow?

Now let’s think about what this all means. One thing it may mean is that of those of us who don’t check the doors for function we just might cook. There might be a few more people checking the doors before they hit the pillows tonight. Oh and by the way, this is a room full of people with a keen interest in safety. Imagine what happens in the general population.

OK so I am hoping that now we are truly thinking about our safety.

The title of this presentation tonight is

Transforming Safety: Beyond Behaviour and Towards Belief

Let me begin by telling a true story about an anonymous safety concern at a to-remain-nameless workplace of approximately 300. The CEO at this plant was dedicated to the health and safety of all employees and took these concerns very seriously. He desperately wanted to talk to the person concerned to find out more about the safety issue, and to ensure it was resolved. So he called all the employees together as a group and asked the author to identify themself. Now, there are a couple of different ways to look at this situation. If there was really a strong positive safety culture on this site, the concerned employee would have an incentive to jump up and enthusiastically claim authorship of the letter so that he or she could be appropriately congratulated and rewarded for identifying an issue that if left unchecked, could have potentially led to an unsafe working environment. On the other hand, if the safety culture at this plant was not so strong, the CEO’s actions could in and of themselves be seen as retaliatory and intimidating.

If we focus for a quick moment on the fact that the concern was raised anonymously, I think we have our answer.

For many of us in this room workplace safety is a high priority. I have no doubt if we were to play the “hands up” game again we would have a significant number in the room throwing their hands up to the question “Who has safety as their 1st priority within the workplace?” I am going to suggest to you that despite it sounding like the right thing to do and say “that we have workplace safety as our No 1 priority” this is indeed an error. For a start in many of our workplaces we have safety as our No 1 priority so long as it does not cause us too much distress. When I am involved with workplaces I regularly hear stories where, when things are “tight” it is often the safety program that seems to temporarily suffer a priority shift. At the very point where the safety program needs to demonstrate how robust it is, it is reported to be compromised. I know as managers we might find it difficult to confront this observation, yet we find it often repeated.

So let me suggest to you that safety needs to shift away from the nice politically correct term of “1st priority” and needs to become an organisational value. Now this is more than a lesson in semantics. Let me spend a few moments exploring the reason why we need to make safety a “value” and not a “priority”. What are your values?
In my own situation I operate my life and my business using what I have called the HILT principle. This probably comes from my interest in Chinese Medicine and Tai Chi Chuan. Within Tai Chi we use a sword which is called the Seven Star or Lung Chuan Sword. The power of a sword comes from the HILT. Honesty, Integrity, Loyalty and Trust. As values these are “immovable objects” as far as I am concerned. Consider again your own values. What would it take for you to put them aside. I would suggest that if they are true values then for you, like me, they are immovable objects.

Priorities change as a consequence of external pressures, Values DO NOT! Now what that means is that we need to be aiming to transform the way safety is experienced within many of our businesses. Later in this address I aim to provide you with some food for thought on how to achieve this critical transformation.

Allow me to now move on to the world of workplace and employee behaviour. For the last couple of decades there has been great emphasis on the behaviour of employees as being the key factor in accident causation. It has been suggested that employee behaviour contributes directly to well in excess of 90% of all accidents. There are some well known organisations out there that have hung their corporate hat on this statement. Du Pont, BST and Scott Gellers group are just a few that you may be familiar with. At the same time the International Labour Organisation (ILO) is on record as being opposed to the application of Behavioural Safety as it is commonly practiced. Their primary criticism is that behavioural safety places an imbalanced level of attention on the acts of individual employees, and that this level of personal attention sails closely to the word “blame”.

At this point we shall take a small historical detour. In 1926 Walter Heinrich was an Insurance Investigator for the Liberty Insurance Company in the US. Walter conducted one of the reviews of accidents that had been performed to date. It was based upon this work that the Domino Theory of accident causation began to show its head. It is also the work of Walter Heinrich that became the foundation for the behavioural schools of safety intervention. So what we have is a series of dominos that start with something like “Unsafe Act or Unsafe Mechanical or Physical Condition”. As a consequence of this “unsafe act” (we seem to have lost in translation the mechanical or physical conditions quite often) there is some sort of accident. As a consequence of the “accident” there may well be an “injury”. This is a linear sequential model so it stands to reason that if we remove this “unsafe act” domino then there is no “fall” and thus no injury. Oh…..if only life, love and the world of work were so simple.
We do really have to look at Walter Heinrichs’ work in its entirety. Many of the BBS prophets leave this little bit out. Walter actually had a domino which came before the unsafe act. This was essentially “fault of person”. OUCH!!! Am I hearing those ILO bods jumping up and down at the back of the room. Is it any wonder that we often find the implementation of an effective behavioural safety program quite challenging at the operational level. Many employees report that this is “how it feels”. Now the power of “emotion” is one of the most powerful motivators we have. The majority of us enter into caring/sharing relationships for that innocuous word “love”. At the other end of that continuum we have the observation, at least in Oz, that more police are injured attending domestic disputes than armed robberies. So when our employees start saying that the safety program “feels” like it is about “blame”; we refuse to listen at our peril.

Now let’s take a step back to Walter’s first domino. He called it “Ancestry and Social Environment”.

I would like us to spend a few moments considering the source of all these wonderful dominos. That is, the original work of our old mate Walter. His data set were accident reports filed with Liberty Insurance Company. These accident reports had been filed by injured workers immediate supervisors. Literacy was very sporadic in many operational roles within the 1920’s. In almost all cases it was being suggested that the injured worker had “done something wrong” – there’s that “unsafe act”. I don’t find it at all surprising that during these difficult times frontline supervisors might be reluctant to acknowledge that systemic failures, supervisory oversights, etc might have been a contributor here. With the information at his disposal Walter did an exceptional job and is clearly one of the fathers of accident causation.

Anyway now I would like to take a chance and change Walters model a tad. For a start when I see “ancestry and social environment” I see “personal values & safety culture”. When I see “Fault of Person” I see “Thinking Style: Personal & Organisational”. Now time does not allow me extend this particular argument much further as I have a few other points I would like to share with you before the big hook comes out from the corner and whisks me away.

Now I am going to leave Walter and the world of behaviour for the moment, although he does have a habit of turning up when you least expect him. I am now going to jump ahead 60 odd years to the work of James Reason. Now James is truly considered the father of modern accident causation. Those in the room from the aviation industry have probably spent a bit of time with James’ material; as have many of the rest of us.
Not many of us are aware as to why James Reason directed his very agile mind to this whole arena of human error. It seems that one morning he was preparing his “wheaties” (that might be breakky or breakfast over here). At the same time he was also preparing the morning repast for the family moggie (cat). Believing himself to be a highly multi-tasking individual he was also boiling the jug for the morning intake of caffeine. James was surprised to lift the mug to his mouth to find a bucketful of catfood; we don’t know the reaction of the cat to a caffeine hit in the bowl. Anyway this escapade resulted in James Reason spending a lot of time thinking about why we make errors.

James is most well known for development of what has become known as the “Swiss Cheese” Model of Accident Causation. This approach moves away from the more simplistic approach of Walter Heinrich and comes up with the notion that there are holes within our safety control measures. The number of holes, and size of those holes, are a product of how well the control measure has been developed. There is an underlying assumption that each control measure (or slice of swiss cheese) has at least one hole in it somewhere. Essentially, and very simply, the primary means of reducing your likelihood of a system event is to insert further control measures for identified hazards. So again we have a 2-dimensional linear model! The theory asserts that you have a system event when the holes in the cheese line-up and the system energy is able to find a path from one side to the other. The unfortunate outcome is that there may well be people at the other end. What we end up with is a battery of control measures all designed to stop in its tracks any rogue system energy trying to find a way through. Here’s the tough bit though. Many workplaces continue to report system events; even though they have some of the most rigorous control measures you might imagine. To quote a very famous physicist and communicator of science, Julius Sumner-Miller, “Why is it so?”
Now here is a new bit. The slices of the cheese are forever vibrating or moving though a plane. So what we have is an image where the holes in the cheese are forever finding new locations in “space” relative to the “energy” trying to find its way through to the danger end. The greater the degree of vibration the more likely that a clear path to danger shall be found. This explains why system events may occur in a seemingly random pattern.

Randomness is the cruellest outcome for a behavioural scientist.

This then leads us, I hope to a pretty predictable question. If we accept that the “cheese” is vibrating, and that this vibration is a key input toward the seeming randomness of events, then we have to ask ourselves; How do we minimise the level of vibration, and thus reduce the number of times that the holes in the cheese are going to line-up.

Now before I attempt to answer that question, I need to take a brief step back to some traditional leadership research. Over the last twenty (20) odd years we are seeing more and more evidence based research exploring the relationships between particular leadership competencies and all sorts of business outcomes. By far and away the most scientifically sound is what has become known as “transformational leadership”. Now I don’t expect you to just take my word for this. Satisfy your own curiosity by using the key tool of all scientists everywhere, “Google”. Search on any leadership approach you think of, and then Google “transformational leadership” and you shall be blown away by the evidence available as to the effectiveness of this approach to understanding the organisational impacts of leadership behaviours. If you are even keener go to the peer reviewed journals themselves.

Anyway lets bring this back to the world of safety! One of the worlds leading commentators on safety and safety culture is Professor Dov Zohar. He has more recently been looking at how leadership effects safety cultures. The leadership
model that Dov Zohar is using is, you guessed it, “transformational leadership”. Another very famous psychologist who hails from the University of Aberdeen is Professor Rhona Flin. For some years Rhona Flin has been exploring the impacts that first level supervisors have upon the safety behaviours of those around them. More recently Rhona has been looking at what particular types of leadership behaviours seem to have the greatest impact on safe work behaviours. Her current publications reference one family of leadership behaviours as having high impact on behavioural outcomes. You don’t need me to tell you what she is using do you? “Transformational Leadership” it is. And then I have to tell you about the watershed work of Professor Julian Barling from Queens University Canada. Julian in 2002 published a well structured study where he was able to show a relationship between workplaces that were demonstrating particular styles of leadership behaviour and a range of business safety metrics; right down to number of injuries. In other words this guy from Canada was able to show that the number of injuries occurring in a workplace had a measurable relationship to the type of leadership being practiced within that workplace. You now know what type of leadership that was don’t you; “Transformational”.

Now in 2004 a bloke by the name of David Broadbent was asked to speak at the International Congress of Psychology in Beijing; particularly about leadership and safety culture. At that time he was referencing traditional transformational leadership and presenting a business case for organisations aligning their leadership behaviours in the transformational direction. Over 500 Multimedia CD’s were generated for that meeting and they were swallowed within 10 minutes. Large numbers of delegates from all over the world then asked that he extend the direction of his work specifically toward transformational safety; rather than using a generic leadership tool.

This began the gestation of the Transformational Safety Culture Improvement System. It was at that meeting in 2004 that the term “transformational safety” was coined for the first time. “Transformational Safety” is now a global trademark and the FREE Newsletter has over 2000 subscribers from all around the globe. More about that a little later.

Remember our vibrating slices of cheese and the question “how do we minimise the movement of the cheese and reduce the likelihood of a system event occurring”?
Well to achieve this lofty goal we are seeking greater consistency in application of systems, procedures, behaviours etc. What that means is, we are wanting to influence the system in such a way as to encourage these outcomes. We also know that some of the key influencers we have are those that touch at the level of emotion. You may recall, I hope, that we touched the impacts of “emotion” earlier.

I contend that the most powerful influencing vehicle is an effective transformational safety culture, within which is embedded consistent and appropriate safety leadership. What is happening here is that the emotional power of effective transformational safety leadership behaviours impacts followers in such a way that effective safety culture becomes more consistent and robust.

An obvious question is how do we actually measure this stuff? After all you have probably heard the adage “what’s measured gets done”. Now I need to stress here I am not speaking about traditional metrics, such as LTIFR (which is highly problematic in itself). We already spend a lot of energy measuring/ checking/policing. We do this all the time in all sorts of ways.

What we are talking about, is putting processes in place to assess or measure those things that exist below the surface.

There is a very famous See Captain who said

"When anyone asks how I can best describe my experience in nearly 40 years at sea, I merely say, uneventful. Of course there have been winter gales, and storms and fog the like, but in all my experience, I have never been in any accident of any sort worth speaking about. ...... I never saw a wreck and never have been wrecked, nor was I ever in any predicament that threatened to end in disaster of any sort. You see, I am not very good material for a story"
He was also quoted as stating:
"We do not care anything for the heaviest storms in these big ships. It is fog that we fear...."

You may well have already concluded we are talking, of course, about Captain Edward J. Smith, Master of the Titanic.

There is frequently far more below the surface than can be seen from above. It is only when we deliberately delve below the surface that we are able to recognise those risks that exist within the “fog” that Captain Smith talks about.

What is scary here is that ominously Captain Smith predicted precisely the fate of Titanic.

“It is fog that we fear....... The big icebergs that drift into warmer water melt much more rapidly under water than on the surface, and sometimes a sharp, low reef extending two or three hundred feet beneath the sea is formed. If a vessel should run on one of these reefs half her bottom might be torn away.”

Another way of looking at the power that these transformational safety leadership behaviours have upon a workplace cultural framework is to look at the flotation scale. As we continue to focus more and more on traditional outcome metrics, and often using traditional management methods, we find downward pressure being placed on the “iceberg”. Some of the normally visible outcomes (often near the water line) sink just under the surface. In time we also see (actually we don’t see) the formation of “reefs”, not unlike those described by Captain Smith.

Here are just a few. Most of us know of situations where injuries have been “hidden”; in all sorts of ways. I became aware of a situation where a young man was asked to wait 2-3 hours till end of shift before being transported to the medical centre. As it turned out his leg was...
broken in two (2) places. Another where there was a high level argument as to whether a worker had received stitches or sutures (I am still scratching the head over that one). It seemed that only stitches needed to be “reported” to the host employer. Or there is the time I visit a certain crib hut “out the back”. It just happened to be the “dead man zone” where the “selected duties” employees were housed; playing cards. They were not contributing to LTIFR. We have to ask ourselves what were they doing? Other than sending a very powerful visible and behavioural message rippling throughout the business.

I put it to you these situations are not as unique as we might prefer to think; all the above occurred in large national and multi-national organisations. There is an important point here. The senior management are often unaware of the micro methods used by frontline supervisors and middle management to achieve the objectives that have been described to them. They actually think they are doing the “right thing”. We need to get away from the inclusion of “outcome” results, as regards safety, from within performance contracts etc. Again we certainly do need to “reward” and “recognise”. Therefore if we engineer our reward systems more toward the implementation and support of safety process measures, the more traditional metrics should look after themselves.

I would like to draw us back to the world of “emotion”. Take a peek at many of the “feeders” under the surface of the iceberg. They tend to have a “personal” or “emotional” meaning for people. Yet this is where we don’t go too often. It IS the most powerful driver for most of us.

Now I would ask you to look again at the floatation scale. As we systematically implement transformational safety leadership behaviours within and throughout the business, this actually places upward pressure on the iceberg and we begin to see more “stuff” above the surface. I know there are always some people who would prefer not to see some of this “stuff”. It has to be said though, that the more of the iceberg which is visible the more likely the business shall avoid the hazard. After all the bigger the “burg”, the more likely you shall see it from further away. Of course you also have to be looking!

So we come back to the question how do we appropriately measure our safety culture and map it against transformational competencies. The first thing we need to recognise is: If we just “ask”, then dependant upon the leadership structure in place, we may well just hear what we think we want to. Self reinforcing, yes, we feel good that things are going in the “right” direction, and all that. It just happens to be based on false data.
Another approach is the ubiquitous safety survey. All 700 employees receive a safety survey with their pay docket (or whatever system is in place). You then get 526 back. This is a significant problem in itself.

More recently technology has allowed surveys to be administered via the Internet. This provides great advantage in administration and data analysis. Again though data may well be skewed due to IT comfort, literacy etc. There are also still large numbers of people in operational roles who do not require internal IT system access. So whilst Internet surveys promise so much, they are only truly effective within a small subset of our safety world.

The most successful safety survey processes use wireless data collection technologies. Using these methods we can successfully survey 697 of the 700. Since we are emulating, to some degree, TV shows like “Who wants to be a Millionaire” etc, participants are highly engaged in the experience. This also has an impact upon honesty and integrity of responses. The literacy issue goes out the window as well. So this is definitely the way to go. At the end of the day we may be making business critical decisions based upon information received, so we absolutely have to ensure that those decisions are based upon valid positions.

So let us look at how we can map our safety culture. If we do not have an understanding of the road ahead it is very difficult to navigate a successful journey. If we are exploring traditional cultural constructs then there are a number of tools available. Many of them you could adapt to take advantage of wireless delivery.

What we are doing here is going below the water line, away from observed or measured behaviours, toward the underlying beliefs and belief systems of the individual which, when taken together make up our safety cultures.

What we are also doing is putting a definable shape to those cultural constructs that often exist within the “fog”. In the case of my own work we have taken that one step
further. We have defined, based upon experience and anecdotal research, areas of effective practice, as well as “danger zones” or “red zones”.

Allow me to now move toward the somewhat newer realm of safety leadership. You will recall I hope the discussion around the traditional work of Zohar, Flin and Barling. Well, following all the requests asking that I develop a focused safety leadership tool grounded within this world of “transformational”; the Transformational Safety Leadership Improvement Model was created. What we have here are a number of unique yet intuitive behavioural safety leadership competencies.

What we have learnt is that there are clearly best practice zones when it comes to transformational safety leadership; and these are different from traditional leadership environments. The most evident is within the realm of “policing”. What we know is that the impact on productivity, of having a policing and firefighting culture within a traditional business environment is negligible. In the safety environment though we know that we require a certain amount of “policing”; indeed the regulatory frameworks in which we operate demand it. Thus the best practice zone within a transformational safety leadership framework shall be different to traditional areas of business performance. In short we now have a way of seeing through the “fog” and giving shape to very real world safety leadership behaviours, whilst gaining the synergies associated with all of the outcomes research around transformational leadership.

The other priceless outcome associated with the application of transformational safety leadership behaviours is that they feed directly into the belief systems of the workforce itself. What we have is a developing safety culture which “believes” in the positive safety messaging as a direct result of the consistently applied emotional basis of the safety leadership being demonstrated at multiple levels within the structure. That is priceless.
So here we are nearing the end of our journey together this evening. When we put this all together we can see how the application of these transformational safety leadership behaviours can actually impact the safety culture within which they exist.

If your safety leaders are primarily demonstrating passive-avoidant behaviours consistent with “invisibility” and “fire fighting” this leads directly to an “at risk” safety culture. I would go so far as to suggest that some of these types of organisations are actually “toxic” to those who have to function within them. You will notice that there are no visible “green” behaviours being experienced. Now here’s the “rub”! It may well be that there is the “odd” leader who is practicing a fair bit of “green”. They shall probably be well regarded by those around them. Experience is they don’t last. If the culture itself is primarily “red” they move on, or they become increasingly frustrated, and it impacts performance. They experience serious levels of cognitive dissonance between their “beliefs” and the “expected” behaviours. Never a good place to be!
The next stage toward an effective transformational safety culture is to leave much of the “red” behind. What we are trying to achieve is more transformational safety leadership, i.e. “to be seen in the green”. This amber zone is the place where the majority of organisations sit; it is indicative of a traditional safety culture. They are heavily grounded in transactional safety leadership behaviours. There are visits toward the “green”; and under strain they may be seen to fall back toward the “red”. Essentially they hang around the middle.

The goal of any transformational safety culture is to “live in the green”. As you can see it is fine to visit the “amber zone” when circumstances require, and we know there are times when that may well be the case. They are strategic visits though. What you will notice is that there are no visits to the red. Once again we think of this Model as wanting to be “seen in green”. We do not have any desire to be “dead in red”.

Visual depiction of the impacts of Transformational Safety Leadership Behavioural Competencies upon Safety Culture
If we take this even a further step forward we are now also able to look inside the beliefs of our work environments to gain a far more focussed understanding of how the business sees itself in regard to engineering itself toward a transformational safety culture. This way of looking at “transformational safety” provides a very simple way of appreciating a very powerful set of beliefs about safety leadership functioning within the business. And remember our exploration of the early work of the “dominos” of Walter Heinrich and the later “cheese” of James Reason. It is this “stuff” around transformational safety culture and leadership which adds richness to these positions.

Now I promised at the outset to mention the “ripple effect”. In all of our work in safety leadership we see it in operation. You might start trying to be more of a “motivator” as regards safe behaviours with your people. You might only start doing the “little” things. It does not take all that long and your followers begin to take notice. Of course I assume you are consistently doing this “stuff”. What is happening is the changes in safety leadership behaviour begin to ripple out throughout your organisation. Your “ripples” impact the safety behaviours of those around you. What you are doing is impacting the belief systems of those around you. They actually start to believe that the way you are approaching safety comes from the inside of yourself. Your own “beliefs” about the way the world should be. So when you take back to your businesses the results of the safety awards tonight, may I suggest you do more than that. Take the time tonight to speak with the “winners”; get a “feeling” for “why” they won. Promote these outcomes throughout your “world” and keep the “ripples” rippling.
In summing up:
Our journey tonight has taken us to the watershed work of Walter Heinrich, through to the enormous contributions of James Reason, and into the world of accident causation and workplace safety. We have seen how some of the more recent understandings regarding safety culture and safety leadership can make a valued contribution to these frameworks. There has also been some exploration regarding how we can “know” where we are, in terms of measuring our positions on these dimensions, and clearing the “fog” away from our safety culture and focusing attention below the surface.

In short I hope tonight I have assisted you widen your own horizons and appreciate the value you can gain from transforming safety. Moving beyond the traditions of behaviour and embracing belief.

THANK YOU
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