Article Type: Research Paper

WHISTLEBLOWING DETERMINANTS: THE INTERACTION BETWEEN MICROSOCIAL ETHICAL ENVIRONMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL ETHICAL LEADERSHIP

Alfa Laili[1], Tito IM. Rahman Hakim[2*], Prasetyono[3]

Affiliation:

[1,2,3]Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Trunojoyo Madura, Bangkalan, Indonesia

ABSTRACT
This paper examines the influence of organizational commitment and microsocial ethical environment on internal whistleblowing intentions. This paper also investigates the moderating effect of organizational ethical leadership on organizational commitment and microsocial ethical environment. A total of 197 students at universities in Madura became respondents to this study. The sample is filtered from students in Madura Universities who join student organizations with snowball sampling. The hypotheses are tested using the partial least square (PLS) technique. The findings indicate that support from an ethical environment is associated with students' whistleblowing intentions, while organizational commitment is not significantly associated with whistleblowing intentions. Organizational ethical leadership is revealed to strengthen the effect of organizational commitment and to weaken the impact of microsocial ethical environment on internal whistleblowing intentions. The findings of this study lead researchers to conclude that "safety" is the driving factor to report fraud, not "responsibility" or "bravery". The rectorate in higher education institutions in Madura also prompted the implementation of an official whistleblowing system and ethics training so students who join student organizations feel safe and keep sensible of wrongdoing around them.

ABSTRAK
Artikel ini menguji pengaruh komitmen organisasional dan lingkungan etika mikrososial terhadap niat *whistleblowing* internal. Artikel ini juga menyelidiki efek moderasi kepemimpinan etis organisasi terhadap komitmen organisasi dan lingkungan etis mikrososial. Sebanyak 197 mahasiswa perguruan tinggi di Madura menjadi responden penelitian ini. Sampel disaring dari mahasiswa di Universitas Madura yang mengikuti organisasi kemahasiswaan dengan *snowball* sampling. Hipotesis diuji dengan menggunakan teknik partial least square (PLS). Temuan menunjukkan bahwa dukungan dari lingkungan etis berhubungan dengan niat *whistleblowing* mahasiswa, sedangkan komitmen organisasi tidak berhubungan signifikan dengan niat *whistleblowing*. Kepemimpinan etis organisasi terungkap untuk memperkuat efek komitmen organisasi dan untuk melemahkan dampak lingkungan etis mikrososial terhadap niat *whistleblowing* internal. Temuan penelitian ini mengarahkan peneliti untuk menyimpulkan bahwa "keselamatan" adalah faktor pendorong untuk melaporkan penipuan, bukan "tanggung jawab" atau "keberanian". Rektorat perguruan tinggi di Madura juga mendorong penerapan sistem *whistleblowing* resmi dan pelatihan etika sehingga mahasiswa yang bergabung dengan organisasi mahasiswa merasa aman dan menjaga kesadaran terhadap kesalahan di sekitarnya.

KATA KUNCI : Kepemimpinan Etis Organisasi; Lingkungan Etis Mikrososial; Niat *Whistleblowing*; Organisasi Mahasiswa.

INTRODUCTION

Prospective whistleblowers are faced with whether to report fraud or remain silent, which is why Dhamija & Rai (2018) state that a prospective whistleblower will observe their workplace environment before deciding what to do. This action is triggered by the possibility of retaliation received by the whistleblower (Tudu, 2021). Negative consequences from whistleblowing are common (Karatuna & Basol, 2018) and extreme, so it will instill fear among whistleblower (Alleyne *et al.*, 2017). These negative consequences will be further exacerbated if individuals do peer reporting. Whistleblowing has become a prominence topic for the last two decade (Niazi *et al.*, 2020) for its ability to deter fraud (Nurhidayat & Kusumasari, 2018; Peltier-Rivest, 2018).

Regardless of how good this system is, if no whistleblowers are willing to report fraud, then this system will not function properly. This is because whistleblowing is a complex

interpersonal behavior, and this complexity is triggered by cognitive and emotional elements (Mansor *et al.* 2022; Mason & Simmons, 2019). Nayir & Herzig (2012) illustrate that individual courage to report individual or organizational mistakes is a complex phenomenon that may be triggered by several factors, such as organizational, situational, and personal factor. This research attempts to examine the variables of the three factors stated by Nayir & Herzig (2012), namely the microsocial ethical environment (organization), organizational commitment (personal), and organizational ethical leadership (situational).

This study examines the influence of organizational commitment and microsocial ethical environment on internal whistleblowing intentions at universities in Madura moderated by organizational ethical leadership. Violetta & Kristianti (2021) explains that there is misappropriation of assets and finances by student organization administrators. Puspita *et al.* (2015) also support the previous fact by providing evidence of asset and reimbursement system abuse, namely increasing the reporting of costs that Black and White student organizations do not per the realization carried out in universities in Madura. Based on the findings from Puspita *et al.* (2015) and Violetta & Kristianti (2021), it is imperative to investigate governance mechanism, such as whistleblowing on student organization in Madura higher education institutions.

Based on ICW's records, the education sector was also one of the ten most corrupt sectors from 2015 to 2019, with state losses reaching Rp 41.09 billion. The previous phenomenon exhibit that corruption is also leached out the higher education institutions (Chaudhary *et al.,* 2019; Sofyani *et al.,* 2021). This study tries to provide enlightenment regarding the whistleblowing topic by examining the types of respondents that were rarely researched before, namely students who join student organizations. The results inconsistency from prior research prompted researchers to re-examine the organizational commitment (Alleyne *et al.,* 2013; Kanojia *et al.,* 2020; Mansor *et al.* 2020; Sofyanty, 2019; Su'un *et al.,* 2020) and microsocial ethical environment (Ahyaruddin & Asnawi, 2017; Hanif & Odiatma, 2017; Lee & Fargher, 2013; Mayer *et al.,* 2013). The prosocial behavior theory (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Dozier & Miceli, 1985) is a pervasive theory in whistleblowing literature (Nawawi & Salin, 2018) that explains theoretically how these two variables (organizational commitment and microsocial ethical environment) able to affect internal whistleblowing intentions.

The novelty of this study is moderating variable in an effort to address an area that has not received ample attention in whistleblowing literature and to reduce the inconsistent results of previous studies (Baron & Kenny, 1986), namely organizational ethical leadership. Prior studies mostly employ leadership as independent variable (Akhtar *et al.,* 2021; Alpkan *et al.,* 2020; Anita *et al.,* 2021; Anugerah *et al.,* 2019; Gupta & Bhal, 2021), except Hechanova & Manaois (2020) who use leadership as mediating variable. Leadership style is proven to significantly affect whistleblowing intention but our study try to extend this empirical findings by making organizational ethical leadership as moderating variable. The addition of organizational ethical leadership is based on the social information processing theory by Salancik & Pfeffer (1978). By examining the moderating effect, we can provide empirical evidence not only the significant direct effect of this variable on whistleblowing intentions but also whether leadership can strengthen the direct effect of organizational commitment and microsocial ethical environment on individual intentions to blow the whistle.

Social information processing theory explains that there is learning and adjustment of the actions of an individual after observing his social environment (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). The implication is that the individual can consider whether the whistleblowing action to be taken will be welcomed or not. The research findings show that students participating in

student organizations are more comfortable blowing the whistle in an ethical environment. Students' organizational commitment are not predictors of whistleblowing, but if they have high organizational commitment and ethical leaders, they will report the fraud they encounter. The interaction between organizations' ethical environments, deans, or rectors who hold moral values encourages students to remain silent.

From the result, the contribution of this study is threefold. First, this study provides insight regarding whistleblowing on subjects that are rarely researched, namely students who join student organizations. This will contribute immensely to the whistleblowing literature by elucidating how the reasoning process, blowing the whistle or remaining silent, of student who join student organizations. Second, the inconsistency of prior research is mitigated by adding organizational ethical leadership as moderating variable. Organizational ethical leadership is evident to significantly moderate the association of organizational commitment and microsocial ethical environment on internal whistleblowing intentions. Last but not least, the interaction between microsocial ethical environment and organizational ethical leadership encourage students to remain silent. This suggest that universities in Madura need to establish a mechanism where student could report fraudulent act officially and ethics training to remain vigilant. Although environment around whistlebower seems ethical and clean due to ethical peer in student organizations and dean/rector, fraud is still exist.

Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran (2005) and Caillier (2013a,b) argue that individuals who are more committed to their organizations are more comfortable blowing the whistle and taking action to mitigate fraud than individuals with lower commitment. Students who join student organizations and have an outstanding commitment to their organizations will be encouraged to blow the whistle on the fraud they find. As stated by prosocial behavior theory, this urge will be stronger if the student tries to behave prosocially. Kanojia *et al.* (2020) and Mansor *et al.* (2020) support the previous statement. They state that individual with commitment whether for organization or for profession tend to blow the whistle if they ken about wrongdoing. Their findings show evidence that commitment is an individual predictor of whistleblowing. Sofyanty (2019) and Su'un *et al.* (2020) clarify that whistleblowers are an individuals with high commitment to sacrifice their wellbeing for the betterment of organizations. Based on the previous description, the researcher formulated the following hypothesis:

H1: Organizational commitment is positively associated with internal whistleblowing intentions.

Microsocial ethical environment is defined as a small part of ethics in the environment that can influence someone in making decisions in certain situations (Husser *et al.*, 2017). Whistleblowers need support to take ethical actions, such as whistleblowing which can be in the form of support from colleagues and organization (Chang *et al.*, 2017). Clark *et al.* (2020) perform cross-cultural study in China, Taiwan, Russia, and The United States. The findings show that American have greater chance to blow the whistle. It is triggered by the cultural apsect, where in smaller content we can call it environment. When the environment or people around the organization are supportive, someone will act ethically (Sims & Keenan, 1998), in line with prosocial behavior theory. In ethical and conducive environmental conditions, students will feel safer whistleblowing for the fraud they observe. Their motivation to perform good deeds will be greater in supportive environment. The existence of support and acceptance from the social environment indicates that the personal costs perceived to occur to whistleblowers will be minimal or even nil. Lee & Fargher (2013) and Hanif & Odiatma (2017), which showed that the ethical climate influences whistleblowing actions. Based on theory and previous research, the researchers formulated the hypothesis as follows:

H2: Microsocial ethical environment is positively associated with internal whistleblowing intentions.

Unethical behavior in an organization causes individuals to question the moral integrity of a leader. Therefore, when someone perceives their leader as ethical, they tend to reciprocate by putting more effort into helping the organization report fraud (Brown *et al*, 2005). Based on the organizational dissent model theory put forward by Graham, (1983), an individual's decision to report a dubious action is influenced by one of which is perceived personal cost. Salancik & Pfeffer (1978) asserted that one could learn a lot about the behavior of each existing individual by studying the information and social environment in which the action occurs and in which he adapts. Positive perceptions about ethical leadership are essential for the comfort and safety of employees so that personal costs are felt lower when carrying out whistleblowing. Based on the organizational dissent model theory and social information processing perspective theory, students with ethical deans, rectors, and organizational commitment will be more motivated to do whistleblowing. Akhtar *et al.* (2021), Alpkan *et al.* (2020), Anita *et al.* (2021), Anugerah *et al.* (2019), Hechanova & Manaois (2020), and Gupta & Bhal (2021) reveal that ethical leaders will strengthen individual intentions to carry out whistleblowing. From the explanation above, the hypothesis in this study is:

H3: Organizational ethical leadership moderates positive association of organizational commitment on internal whistleblowing intentions.

Whistleblowers will see the surrounding environment before carrying out whistleblowing (Mayer *et al.*, 2013). This shows that the reaction from the leadership and the work environment are factors that the whistleblower considers. When leaders or heads of organizations do not practice ethical behavior, members of the organization will tend to care less about their organizations because they see that their leaders do not handle fraudulent behavior properly (Said *et al.*, 2018). Conversely, when leaders treat their employees fairly and ethically, they build higher-quality social relations (Brown & Treviño, 2006). Students will tend to act ethically when the environment or people around an organization support it. Salancik & Pfeffer (1978) added that individuals concerning environmental and social information could observe how others in the organization assess a behavior. When leaders uphold ethics and colleagues see whistleblowing as something good, this will further trigger students to report fraud in their organization. Mayer *et al.* (2013) provide empirical evidence that the interaction between ethical leaders and perceptions of ethical co-worker behavior strengthens individual intentions to report fraud. Based on the explanation above, the hypothesis in this study is:

H4: Organizational ethical leadership moderates positive association of microsocial ethical environment on internal whistleblowing intentions.

METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach whose data is obtained directly from the respondents. This study uses a web-based survey to collect the necessary data due to the Covid-19 pandemic, which made it impossible to distribute questionnaires directly. Online questionnaires created via google form were distributed to the research sample, students who have been/are currently managing student organizations at universities in Madura. The selection of respondents was based on the findings of Violetta & Kristianti (2021) regarding fraud in student organizations, especially in Madura (Puspita *et al.*, 2015). The questionnaires were distributed sequentially using snowball sampling because the researcher did not have contact with every student who was active in organizations at universities in Madura and the absence of data related to population size. From the distribution of the online questionnaire,

the researchers obtained 199 responses. Still, two responses were deleted because it turned out that the responses came from students who had never participated in student organizations. This research finally has 197 responses that can be used and processed to test the research hypothesis. This response is methodologically sufficient, according to Hair *et*

No	Description	Category	Number of Respondents	Percentage
1	**Gender**	Male	85	43%
		Female	112	57%
2	**Age**	18 Years	11	6%
		19 Years	30	15%
		20 Years	53	27%
		21 Years	65	33%
		22 Years	29	15%
		23 Years	4	2%
		24 Years	5	3%
3	**Student Organization Name**	Student Executive Board	22	11%
		Student Representative Council	7	4%
		Study Program Student Association	27	14%
		Student Activity Unit and others	141	72%
4	**College Name**	Trunojoyo Madura University	103	52%
		POLTERA	10	5%
		IAIN Madura	14	7%
		Wiraraja University	36	18%
		Others	34	17%
5	**College Area**	Bangkalan	107	54%
		Sampang	15	8%
		Pamekasan	25	13%
		Sumenep	50	25%

Table 1. Characteristics of Respondents

Source: Processed Data (2022)

al. (2014), where the minimum number of samples in the study was 150 (15x10), ten times the largest number of formative indicators used to measure one construct. Table 1 describes the demographics of the research respondents. Based on Table 1, the frequency of respondents' gender was dominated by women at 57% and the rest by men at 43%. The majority of respondents in this study were 21 years old, with 33% equivalent to the 7th semester, while the second rank was 20 years old, with 27%.

The organization followed by the most respondents in this study was the Student Activity Unit, with 72%. The second place was followed by the Study Program Student Association as much as 14%, the Student Executive Board at 11%, and the Student Representative Council by 4%. The research respondents were mainly students of Trunojoyo Madura

University, with as many as 103 respondents, or equivalent to 52% of the total respondents. The rest are students of Wiraraja University, with as many as 36 respondents or 18%, IAIN Madura 14 respondents or 7%, POLTERA, as many as ten respondents or 5%; and the remaining 34 respondents from other universities. The majority of respondents came from Bangkalan, namely 107 respondents with a percentage of 54%, Sumenep 50 people or 25%, Pamekasan 25 people or 13%, and the rest Sampang 15 people or 8%.

The questionnaire used in this study used a Likert scale measurement to measure respondents' responses. Each response was answered 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). Budiaji (2013) revealed that the number of response points 7 also has good reliability, validity, discrimination power, and stability. The questionnaire in this study measures four different variables: organizational commitment, microsocial ethical environment, organizational ethical leadership & internal whistleblowing intention. Instrument from Angle & Perry (1981) and Husser *et al.* (2017) is employed to measure organizational commitment (15 indicators) and microsocial ethical environment (eight indicators) respectively. The instrument from Said *et al.* (2018) includes ten indicator items used to measure organizational ethical leadership. The endogenous variable in this study, namely internal whistleblowing intention, was measured using an instrument from Park *et al.* (2008), which consists of three indicator items. The data analysis tool uses the SmartPLS version 3.0 software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Construct	Indicator	AVE	Loading Factor
Organizational Commitment	OC1		0.733
	OC2		0.687
	OC5		0.668
	OC8	0.504	0.769
	OC10		0.729
	OC13		0.739
	OC14		0.639
Microsocial Ethical Environment	MEE1		0.725
	MEE4		0.699
	MEE5	0.51	0.766
	MEE7		0.637
	MEE8		0.737
Internal Whistleblowing Intentions	IWI1		0.788
	IWI2	0.652	0.794
	IWI3		0.84
Organizational Ethical Leadership	OEL1		0.721
	OEL2		0.834
	OEL3		0.823
	OEL4		0.832
	OEL5	0.597	0.815
	OEL6		0.732
	OEL7		0.823
	OEL9		0.656
	OEL10		0.691

Table 2.
Convergent Validity Test Result

Source: Processed Data (2022)

Two stages test must be done before testing the hypothesis because the research uses PLS statistical analysis tools. The researcher first tested the outer model and then the inner model. After that, the researcher could interpret the hypothesis test. In this study, because all

variables use reflective indicators, the research model needs to pass three tests to pass the outer model, namely the convergent validity test, discriminant validity test, and reliability test. Table 2 presents the results of the convergent validity test.

Two aspects are observed to see whether the variable indicators have met the convergent validity test. The first aspect we can see is the loading factor value which must be greater than 0.7. The second we can see from the AVE value which must be greater than 0.5 (Sholihin & Ratmono, 2013:66). From Table 2, we can conclude that all indicators have passed the convergent validity test because the loading factor value is > 0.7 and the AVE value is > 0.5. This is because all indicators with a loading factor value of less than 0.7 have been removed from the model. Then the outer model testing process can be continued to the discriminant validity test, the results of which are exhibited in Table 3.

Construct	Indicator	AVE Root	Latent Variable Correlation (Highest Value)	Loading Factor	Cross Loading (Highest Value)
Organizational Commitment	OC1	0.71	0.667	0.733	0.535
	OC2			0.687	0.431
	OC5			0.667	0.465
	OC8			0.769	0.533
	OC10			0.729	0.436
	OC13			0.739	0.543
	OC14			0.639	0.473
Microsocial Ethical Environment	MEE1	0.714	0.667	0.725	0.611
	MEE4			0.699	0.505
	MEE5			0.766	0.504
	MEE7			0.637	0.391
	MEE8			0.737	0.452
Internal Whistleblowing Intentions	IWI1	0.807	0.562	0.788	0.299
	IWI2			0.794	0.343
	IWI3			0.84	0.636
Organizational Ethical Leadership	OEL1	0.773	0.653	0.721	0.52
	OEL2			0.834	0.6
	OEL3			0.823	0.544
	OEL4			0.832	0.583
	OEL5			0.815	0.535
	OEL6			0.732	0.468
	OEL7			0.823	0.606
	OEL9			0.656	0.464
	OEL10			0.691	0.413

Table 3. Discriminant Validity Test Result

Source: Processed Data (2022)

Table 3 shows that all the remaining variables and indicators have met the discriminant validity test. This can be seen from all variables and indicators whose root value is AVE > correlation of latent variables and cross loading value < loading factor value. Furthermore, a reliability test was conducted to determine whether the research instruments and indicators had measured the variables consistently.

The reliability test is tested by looking at the composite reliability value greater than 0.7. Table 4 explains that all variables have values above 0.7, meaning that the research instruments and indicators have met the reliability test and all the outer model tests. The hypothesis testing could proceed as the measurement model result met every requirements. From table 5, there are two effect that tested, direct effect and moderating effect. Testing for the effect of organizational commitment on the internal whistleblowing intentions produces a significance value of 0.434, above 0.05, and a path coefficient value of 0.015, which means Hypothesis **H1 is not supported**. The test results for Hypothesis 2 provide information that the significance value of 0.000 is less than 0.05 with a path coefficient value of 0.330. It can be concluded that **H2 is supported**, which means that microsocial ethical environment significantly affects the intention to blow the whistle internally.

Table 4.
Reliability
Test Result

No	Construct	Cronbach Alpha	Composite Reliability
1	Organizational Commitment	0.837	0.877
2	Microsocial Ethical Environment	0.758	0.838
3	Internal Whistleblowing Intentions	0.761	0.849
4	Organizational Ethical Leadership	0.915	0.930

Source: Processed Data (2022)

Table 5.
Hypothesis
Test Result

Direct Effect	Code	Path Coefficient	P Value	Conclusions
Organizational Commitment → Internal Whistleblowing Intentions	H1+	0.015	0.434	**Rejected**
Microsocial Ethical Environment → Internal Whistleblowing Intentions	H2+	0.330	0.000	**Accepted**
Moderating Effect				
Organizational Commitment*Organizational Ethical Leadership → Internal Whistleblowing Intentions	H3+	0.203	0.007	**Accepted**
Microsocial Ethical Environment*Organizational Ethical Leadership → Internal Whistleblowing Intentions	H4+	-0.155	0.028	**Rejected**

Source: Processed Data (2022)

The results of statistical testing also provide information regarding the moderating hypothesis, shown in Table 5. Two moderating hypotheses were tested: organizational commitment and microsocial ethical environment. The two variables were tested for their moderating effect by interacting it with organizational ethical leadership. Of the two moderating hypotheses, H3 and H4, both significantly moderated by the organizational ethical leadership. The interaction of organizational commitment and organizational ethical leadership significantly affect students' intention to blow the whistle via internal channel, with p value 0.007 and positive path coefficient 0.203. It can be concluded that **H3 is supported**, and organizational ethical leadership enhance the effect of organizational commitment on internal whistleblowing intentions. Organizational ethical leadership moderates the effect of microsocial ethical environment on internal whistleblowing intentions with p value 0.028 but the path coefficient value shows a negative value of -0.155. This means that organizational ethical leadership weakens the influence of microsocial ethical environment on internal whistleblowing intentions, so **H4 is not supported**.

Organizational Commitment and Microsocial Ethical Environment on Internal Whistleblowing Intentions

Organizational commitment does not significantly affect the intention to carry out internal whistleblowing (H1). The results of this study contradict the prosocial behavior theory. Member of students organizations who have high motivation to behave prosocially are try to evade blowing the whistle. The findings of this study are inconsistent with the findings of Kanojia *et al.* (2020), Mansor *et al.* (2020), Sofyanty (2019), and Su'un *et al.* (2020) but in line with the findings of Ahmad (2011) and Septianti (2013) who obtained empirical evidence that organizational commitment has no significant effect on the intention to carry out internal whistleblowing. Student with high organizational commitment in Madura tend to protect their organizations from bad reputations by remaining silent. Reluctance and emotional closeness among organization members also prevent them from blowing the whistle. This group cohesion become obstacle for student to blow the whistle as suggested by Alleyne *et al.* (2019). Their study provide insight that the stronger the bond between group in an organizations, the stronger their refusal to report wrongdoing in their organizations. Palumbo & Manna (2020) add that the emotional closeness among member will form a homogeneity in their organizations so ethical behavior will be more challenging to do because of the fear of alienation. Thus, high commitment could become double edge sword for whistleblowing practices. Microsocial ethical environment has empirically proven to influence individual intentions to take internal whistleblowing actions (H2). Personal preferences will be increasingly moved to whistleblowing if the organizational environment supports it, giving rise to a sense of security. In conclusion, the better the organization's ethical climate, the higher the intention of students who join student organizations in Madura to take internal whistleblowing actions. This finding is in line with Lee & Fargher (2013) and Hanif & Odiatma (2017) but contradicts the finding of Ahyaruddin & Asnawi (2017). The results of this study provide evidence of prosocial behavior theory application, which states that individuals will take actions that will benefit other individuals, groups, or organizations, such as whistleblowing.

The Moderating Effect of Organizational Ethical Leadership

Organizational ethical leadership can significantly moderate the influence of organizational commitment on internal whistleblowing intentions (H3). These findings support Brown & Treviño (2006) and Graham (1983), who state that an individual's decision to report fraud is caused by low perceived personal cost due to the support from an ethical dean or rector to conduct whistleblowing. When superiors support whistleblowing, this will positively influence someone to report fraud. Social information processing theory by Salancik & Pfeffer (1978) also emphasizes that students need to understand the behavior, and mindset of other individuals, support from leaders, and social conditions before blowing the whistle. The existence of role models and ethical leadership from the head of the organization, dean, or rector can strengthen the intention of students who join student organizations in Madura universities to carry out internal whistleblowing. Organizational ethical leadership moderates the influence of the microsocial ethical environment on the intention to carry out internal whistleblowing significantly but has a negative/weakening effect (H4). This study contradicts the results of Mayer *et al.* (2013), who revealed that the interaction between ethical leadership and the microsocial ethical environment could strengthen whistleblowing intentions. These different results are likely to occur because, from the point of view of organizational administrators, when the organizational environment and the leaders are ethical, they will consider it impossible for fraud to occur. Dalton & Radtke (2013) added that individuals with high responsibility to the organization would be significantly urged to do

whistleblowing. The implication is that even though students are in an ethical environment and have the support of the dean or rector, this factor is not significant in increasing their intention to do whistleblowing. This is because they already have a high intention to carry out whistleblowing if they find fraud in their organization.

CONCLUSION

This study examines the students' intentions to blow the whistle internally whom join student organizations in Madura universities that affected by organizational commitment, microsocial ethical environment and moderated by organizational ethical leadership. The statistical result implied that microsocial ethical environment had a direct positive relationship with students' internal whistleblowing intentions. Organizational ethical leadership significantly moderates the relationship of organizational commitment and microsocial ethical environment with internal whistleblowing intentions. However, the interaction between organizational ethical leadership and microsocial ethical environment weakens students' intention to report fraud internally. The findings of this study can be explained by prosocial behavior theory, social influence theory, social information processing theory.

This paper contributes to the concept of whistleblowing in three ways. Firstly, the reasoning process of students who join student organizations in Madura universities is quite intricate. They feel safe when there is a support from either their peer in student organizations or dean/rector, but the joint support from both is detrimental for their intention to blow the whistle. Secondly, by adding organizational ethical leadership as moderating variable, this study can lessen inconsistency from previous research. The interaction of organizational ethical leadership and organizational commitment strengthens students' intentions to report fraud, but the joint effect of organizational ethical leadership and microsocial ethical environment impairs their intention to reort fraudulent act. Lastly, the weakening relationship from the interaction of ethical leader and support from peer in student organizations promote for ethical training and official whistleblowing channel to report fraud. It is inevitable for universities in Madura to protect whistleblowers because it is not bravery or responsibility that becomes the driving force for the student to report fraud but safety.

This study should be interpreted with caution due to several limitations. First, this study could not obtain complete data regarding students participating in student organizations at universities in Madura. These data were not available when the researcher conducted the study. This makes the researcher unable to do probability sampling, which causes the generalizability of the findings of this study to be not optimal. Future research is expected to try to find data on students who actively participate in student organizations to generalize research findings to the population better. Another limitation in this study is conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic, so researchers were unable to distribute questionnaires directly to respondents. Future researchers are expected to be able to use two channels for distributing questionnaires, namely through the Google form and being able to come directly to the relevant institution. This is intended so that the respondents are more diverse and that the findings of subsequent research can better represent all student organizations in Madura Island Higher Education.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, S.A. (2011). Internal Auditors And Internal Whistleblowing Intentions: A Study Of Organisational, Individual, Situational And Demographic Factors. Thesis of Faculty of Business and Law. Edith Cowan University.

Ahyaruddin, M. and M. Asnawi. (2017). Pengaruh Moral Reasoning Dan Ethical Environment Terhadap Pengaruh Moral Reasoning Dan Ethical Environment Terhadap Kecenderungan Untuk Melakukan Whistleblowing. Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Ekonomika. Vol. 7 No. 1. pp. 1–20.

Akhtar, M. W., M. Javed, F. Syed, M.K. Aslam, and K. Hussain. (2021). Say No To Wrongdoing: The Serial Mediation Model Of Responsible Leadership And Whistleblowing Intentions. International Journal of Manpower. Vol. 42 No. 5. pp. 889–903. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-02-2020-0070.

Alleyne, P., R. Haniffa, and M. Hudaib. (2019). Does Group Cohesion Moderate Auditors' Whistleblowing Intentions?. Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation. Vol. 34. pp. 69-90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intaccaudtax.2019.02.004.

Alleyne, P., W. Charles-Soverall, T. Broome, and A. Pierce. (2017). Perceptions, Predictors And Consequences Of Whistleblowing Among Accounting Employees In Barbados. Meditari Accountancy Research. Vol. 25 No. 2. pp. 241-267. https://doi.org/10.1108/MEDAR-09-2016-0080.

Alpkan, L., M. Karabay, İ. Şener, M. Elçi, and B. Yıldız. (2020). The Mediating Role Of Trust In Leader In The Relations Of Ethical Leadership And Distributive Justice On Internal Whistleblowing: A Study On Turkish Banking Sector. Kybernetes. Vol. 50 No. 7. pp. 2073–2092. https://doi.org/10.1108/K-05-2020-0268.

Anita, R., M.R. Abdillah, and N.B. Zakaria. (2021). Authentic Leader And Internal Whistleblowers: Testing A Dual Mediation Mechanism. International Journal of Ethics and Systems. Vol. 37 No. 1. pp. 35-52. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOES-03-2020-0036.

Angle, H.L. and J.L. Perry. (1981). An Empirical Assessment Of Organizational Commitment And Organizational Effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly. Vol. 26 No.1. pp. 1-14. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392596.

Anugerah, R., M.R. Abdillah, and R. Anita. (2019). Authentic Leadership And Internal Whistleblowing Intention: The Mediating Role Of Psychological Safety. Journal of Financial Crime. Vol. 26 No. 2. pp. 556-567. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-04-2018-0045.

Baron, R.M. and D.A. Kenny. (1986). The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction In Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, And Statistical Considerations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. Vol. 51 No. 6. pp. 1173-1182. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173.

Brief, A.P. and, S.J. Motowidlo. (1986). Prosocial Organizational Behaviors. The Academy of Management Review. Vol. 11 No. 4. pp. 710-725. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1986.4283909.

Brown, M.E. and L.K. Treviño. (2006). Ethical Leadership: A Review And Future Directions. Leadership Quarterly. Vol. 17 No. 6. pp. 595–616. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004.

Brown, M.E., L.K. Treviño, and D.A. Harrison. (2005). Ethical Leadership: A Social Learning Perspective For Construct Development And Testing. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes. Vol. 97 No. 2. pp. 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002.

Budiadji, W. (2013). Skala Pengukuran Dan Jumlah Respon Skala Likert (The Measurement Scale And The Number Of Responses In Likert Scale). Jurnal Ilmu Pertanian dan Perikanan. Vol. 2 No. 2. pp. 125-131.

Caillier, J.G. (2013a). Transformational Leadership And Whistle-Blowing Attitudes: Is This Relationship Mediated By Organizational Commitment And Public Service Motivation. The American Review of Public Administration. Vol. 45 No. 4. pp. 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074013515299.

Caillier, J.G. (2013b). Do Employees Feel Comfortable Blowing The Whistle When Their Supervisors Practice Transformational Leadership?. International Journal of Public Administration. Vol. 36 No. 14. pp. 1020-1028. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2013.798812.

Chang, Y., M. Wilding, and M.C. Shin. (2017). Determinants Of Whistleblowing Intention: Evidence From The South Korean Government. Public Performance & Management Review. Vol. 40 No. 4. pp. 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2017.1318761.

Chaudhary, N.S., K.P. Gupta, and S. Phoolka. (2019). A Study Of Whistle-Blowing Intentions Of Teachers Working In Higher Education Sector. International Journal of Law and Management. Vol. 61 No. 1. pp. 106-132. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-10-2017-0253.

Clark, D., T.-S. Wang, M. Shapeero, A.B. Staley, N. Ermasova, and M. Usry. (2020). A Comparative Study Of The Whistleblowing Activities: Empirical Evidence From China, Taiwan, Russia, And The United States. In Research on professional responsibility and Ethics in accounting (Vol. 23, pp. 141-159). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1574-076520200000023008.

Dalton, D. and R.R. Radtke. (2013). The Joint Effects Of Machiavellianism And Ethical Environment On Whistle-Blowing. Journal of Business Ethics. Vol. 117 No. 1. pp. 153-172. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1517-x.

Dhamija, S. and S. Rai. (2018). Role Of Retaliation And Value Orientation In Whistleblowing Intentions. Asian Journal of Business Ethics. Vol. 7. pp. 37-52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13520-017-0078-6.

Dozier, J.B. and M.P. Miceli. (1985). Potential Predictors Of Whistle-Blowing: A Prosocial Behavior Perspective. Academy of Management Review. Vol. 10 No. 4. pp. 823-836. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4279105.

Graham, J. W. (1983). Principled Organizational Dissent. Dissertation of Doctoral of Philosophy. Northwestern University.

Gupta, S. and K.T. Bhal. (2021). Leadership Styles, Justice And Whistle-Blowing Intention: Testing A Mediation Model. European Business Review. Vol. 33 No. 4. pp. 622–641. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-03-2020-0068.

Hair, J.F., M. Sarstedt, L. Hopkins, and V.G. Kuppelwieser. Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM): An Emerging Tool For Business Research. European Business Review. Vol 26 No. 2. pp. 106-121. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128.

Hanif, R.A. and F. Odiatma. (2017). Pengaruh Lingkungan Etika Terhadap Niat Melakukan Whistleblowing Dengan Locus Of Control Sebagai Variabel Moderasi. Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Keuangan Bisnis. Vol. 10 No. 2. pp. 61–69.

Hechanova, M.R.M. and J.O. Manaois. (2020). Blowing The Whistle On Workplace Corruption: The Role Of Ethical Leadership. *International Journal of Law and Management*. Vol. 62 No. 3. pp. 277–294. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-02-2019-0038.

Husser, J., J.M. Andre, and V. Lespinet-Najib. (2017). The Impact Of Locus Of Control, Moral Intensity, And The Microsocial Ethical Environment On Purchasing-Related Ethical

Reasoning. Journal of Business Ethics. Vol. 154 No. 1. pp. 243–261. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3446-1.

639

Kanojia, S., S. Sachdeva, and J.P. Sharma. (2020). Retaliatory Effect On Whistle Blowing Intentions: A Study Of Indian Employees. Journal of Financial Crime. Vol. 27 No. 4. pp. 1221-1237. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-12-2019-0170.

Karatuna, I. and O. Başol. (2018). To Blow The Whistle Or Not: The Roles Of Perceived Organizational Retaliation And Upward Communication Satisfaction In Employee Responses To Observed Wrongdoing. Redefining Corporate Social Responsibility (Developments in Corporate Governance and Responsibility, Vol. 13). Emerald Publishing Limited: Bingley. pp. 217-233. https://doi.org/10.1108/S2043-052320180000013015.

Lee, G. and N. Fargher. (2013). Companies' Use Of Whistle-Blowing To Detect Fraud: An Examination Of Corporate Whistle-Blowing Policies. Journal of Business Ethics. Vol. 114 No. 2. pp. 283–295. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1348-9.

Mansor, T.M.T., A.M. Ariff, and H.A. Hashim. (2020). Whistleblowing By Auditors: The Role Of Professional Commitment And Independence Commitment. Managerial Auditing Journal. Vol. 35 No. 8. pp. 1033-1055. https://doi.org/10.1108/MAJ-11-2019-2484.

Mason, C. and J. Simmons. (2019). Rage Against The Machine: Moral Anger In Whistleblowing. Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management. Vol. 14 No. 3. pp. 337-355. https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-10-2017-1572.

Mayer, D.M., S. Nurmohamed, L.K. Trevino, D.L. Shapiro, and M. Schminke. (2013). Encouraging Employees To Report Unethical Conduct Internally: It Takes A Village. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes. Vol. 121 No. 5. pp. 89-103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2013.01.002.

Mesmer-Magnus, J.R. and C. Viswesvaran. (2005). Whistleblowing In Organizations: An Examination Of Correlates Of Whistleblowing Intentions, Actions, And Retaliation. Journal of Business Ethics. Vol. 62 No. 3. pp. 277–297. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-005-0849-1.

Nawawi, A. and A.S.A.P. Salin. (2018). Whistle Blowing Intentions – Evidence From Malaysian PLC. International Journal of Law and Management. Vol. 60 No. 5. pp. 1111-1125. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-04-2017-0096.

Nayir, D. Z., and C. Herzig. (2012). Value Orientations As Determinants Of Preference For External And Anonymous Whistleblowing. Journal of Business Ethics. Vol. 107. pp. 197-213. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1033-4.

Niazi, A.A.K., T.F. Qazi, I. Ali, and R. Ahmad. (2020). Prioritizing Determinants Of Effective Whistle Blowing (WB): Interpretative Structural Modeling Approach. International Journal of Law and Management. Vol. 62 No. 3. pp. 213-230. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-10-2017-0244.

Nurhidayat, I. and B. Kusumasari. (2018). Strengthening The Effectiveness Of Whistleblowing System: A Study For The Implementation Of Anti-Corruption Policy In Indonesia. Journal of Financial Crime. Vol. 25 No. 1. pp. 140-15. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-11-2016-0069.

Palumbo, R., & Manna, R. (2020). Uncovering The Relationship Between Whistleblowing And Organizational Identity: Some Preliminary Evidence From Italian Publicly Owned Universities. International Journal of Public Sector Management. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-02-2019-0030.

Park, H., J. Blenkinsopp, M.K. Oktem, and U. Omurgonulsen. (2008). Cultural Orientation And Attitudes Toward Different Forms Of Whistleblowing: A Comparison Of South Korea, Turkey, And The U.K.. Journal of Business Ethics. Vol. 82 No. 4. pp. 929-939. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9603-1.

Peltier-Rivest, D. (2018). The Battle Against Fraud: Do Reporting Mechanisms Work?. Journal of Financial Crime. Vol. 25 No. 3. pp. 784-794. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-05-2017-0048.

Puspita, Y.R., B. Haryadi, and A.R. Setiawan. (2015). Sisi Remang Pengelolaan Keuangan Organisasi Mahasiswa. Jurnal Akuntansi Multiparadigma. Vol. 6 No. 1. pp. 133–144. http://dx.doi.org/10.18202/jamal.2015.04.6011.

Said, J., N. Omar, M. Rafidi, and S.N. Syed Yusof. (2018). Are Organizational Factors More Prevailing Than Individual Factors In Mitigating Employee Fraud? Findings From Royal Custom Officers. Journal of Financial Crime. Vol. 25 No. 3. pp. 907-922. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-09-2017-0087.

Salancik, G.R. and J. Pfeffer. (1978). A Social Information Processing Approach To Job Attitudes And Task Design. Administrative Science Quarterly. Vol. 23 No. 2. pp. 224–253. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392563.

Septianti, W. (2013). Pengaruh Faktor Organisasional, Individual, Situasional, Dan Demografis Terhadap Niat Melakukan Whistleblowing Internal. Paper presented at Simposium Nasional Akuntansi XVI. Manado.

Sholihin, M. and D. Ratmono. (2013). Analisis SEM-PLS Dengan WarpPLS 3.0. ANDI. Yogyakarta.

Sims, R.L. and J.P. Keenan. (1998). Predictors Of External Whistleblowing: Organizational And Intrapersonal Variables. Journal of Business Ethics. Vol. 17 No. 4. pp. 411–421. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005763807868.

Sofyani, H., Z. Saleh, and H.A. Hasan. (2021). Investigation On Key Factors Promoting Internal Control Implementation Effectiveness In Higher Education Institution: The Case Of Indonesia. Jurnal Reviu Akuntansi Dan Keuangan. Vol. 11 No. 3. pp. 483-495. https://doi.org/10.22219/jrak.v11i3.18637.

Sofyanty, D. (2019). Pengaruh Komitmen Organisasi Dan Iklim Organisasi Terhadap Tindakan Whistleblowing. Widya Cipta: Jurnal Sekretari Dan Manajemen. Vol. 3 No. 1. pp. 43–50. https://doi.org/10.31294/widyacipta.v3i1.5023.

Su'un, M., H. Hajering, and M. Muslim. (2020). Professional Commitment And Locus Of Control Toward Intensity In Whistleblowing Through Ethical Sensitivity. Jurnal Akuntansi. Vol. 24 No. 1. pp. 100–118. https://doi.org/10.24912/ja.v24i1.659.

Tudu, P.N. (2021). Blow Whistle, Should I Or Shouldn't I: A Study On Moderating Effect Of Perceived Organizational Support On Intention To Blow The Whistle Among Indian Government Employees. Society and Business Review. Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 218-237. https://doi.org/10.1108/SBR-03-2020-0028.

Violetta, G. P. and I. Kristianti. (2021). Pengungkapan Kecurangan Di Lembaga Kemahasiswaan. Reviu Akuntansi Dan Bisnis Indonesia. Vol. 5 No. 1. pp. 26–37. https://doi.org/10.18196/rabin.v5i1.11300.