



Exploring the Influence of the Whistleblowing Triangle on Whistleblowing Intentions: An Investigation of Middle-Segment Businesses in Indonesia

Antonius Grivaldi Sondakh^{1*}

Faculty of Economics and Business, Lambung Mangkurat University, Indonesia.
antonius.g.s@mail.ugm.ac.id

Ainun Na'im²

Doctoral Accounting Program
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Bulaksumur, Caturtunggal, Kec. Depok, Kabupaten Sleman,
Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta, INDONESIA

Ertambang Nahartyo³

Doctoral Accounting Program
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Bulaksumur, Caturtunggal, Kec. Depok, Kabupaten Sleman,
Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta, INDONESIA

Supriyadi⁴

Doctoral Accounting Program
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Bulaksumur, Caturtunggal, Kec. Depok, Kabupaten Sleman,
Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta, INDONESIA

ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the influence of the whistleblowing triangle on employees' intentions to report fraudulent activities within medium-sized businesses in Indonesia. The whistleblowing triangle is the theoretical framework integrating factors from the Theory of Planned Behavior and the Fraud Triangle Theory. With a focus on Indonesian businesses' accounting and finance staff, this research engages 120 participants. The study examines how elements of the whistleblowing triangle affect whistleblowing intentions, employing multiple linear regression analysis. Results indicate a significant impact, with pressure

© The Author(s) 2024

L. Warlina and S. Luckyardi (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Business, Economics, Social Sciences, and Humanities - Economics, Business and Management Track (ICOBEST-EBM 2024)*, Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research 291,

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-465-5_21

exerting a negative effect, while opportunity and rationale positively influence the propensity to disclose fraudulent activities. Organizations can bolster fraud prevention measures by understanding these dynamics through robust reporting procedures. This study contributes to the existing literature by offering an integrated approach, contrasting with previous research that analyzed whistleblowing intentions separately using the Theory of Planned Behavior and the Fraud Triangle.

Keywords: Whistleblowing Intention; Whistleblowing Triangle; Fraud Triangle; Theory of Planned Behavior

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the dawn of civilization, humans have always been prone to errors, making the concepts of ethics and morality exceedingly crucial (Schwartz, 2016). Ethics refers to the principles and norms determining what is considered right or wrong, good or bad, in one's behavior and actions. Meanwhile, morality pertains to an individual's or group's awareness of the distinction between right and wrong and a commitment to following these moral values and principles. In whistleblowing, ethics and morality emphasize the importance of adhering to standards of good and proper conduct when making decisions, particularly regarding reporting unethical or illegal actions within the workplace.

Strengthening ethics and morality through whistleblowing, especially within organizations susceptible to unethical and immoral behavior, is paramount. This research investigates the influence of the whistleblowing triangle on employees' intentions to report fraudulent activities in medium-sized businesses in Indonesia. Latan (2019) developed the whistleblowing triangle concept, integrating factors from the Theory of Planned Behavior and Fraud Triangle Theory. Latan et al. (2019) introduced the "reporting triangle" construct, comprising pressure, opportunity, and rationalization, to explain the factors influencing individuals' intentions to report. This construct builds upon the widely recognized "fraud triangle" theory, a primary motivator behind fraudulent behaviors (Latan et al., 2019).

Previous research has utilized one or more of the main components of the fraud triangle—opportunity, rationalization, and pressure—in their studies but has not conclusively explained employees' intentions to become whistleblowers (Andon et al., 2016; Avortri & Agbanyo, 2021; Ayu Suryandari et al., 2023; Rustiarini, Sutrisno, et al., 2019; Rustiarini, T et al., 2019). Recent studies by Saitri et al. (2023) and Saud and Febriana (2022) have emphasized the interactions between these factors, highlighting the role of pressure, opportunity, and rationalization in shaping individuals' decisions related to reporting fraud. Unlike them, this study also aims to delve deeper into the dynamics of reporting intentions within the context of medium-sized companies in Indonesia. This research contributes to expanding previous studies by utilizing the whistleblowing triangle concept, believed to explain better employees' intentions to become whistleblowers.

Whistleblowing intention is an individual's subjective probability of engaging in whistleblowing activities. The greater an individual's intention to provide information, the higher the likelihood of actual whistleblowing. Understanding the key factors influencing intentions to engage in whistleblowing within a company has been a critical concern for

policymakers aiming to increase whistleblowing rates among employees. Miceli and Near (1994) attempted to construct a model explaining reporting determinants, emphasizing the inherent complexity of reporting motivations. The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) is believed to elucidate internal factors influencing intentions to engage in whistleblowing. Therefore, the TPB and Fraud Triangle Theory can predict employees' willingness to whistleblow (Brown et al., 2016). Literature reviews by Gao and Brink (2017) underscore the importance of ongoing research efforts in this domain, indicating promising directions for future investigations.

In Indonesia, corruption has become a significant issue. Research findings indicate that corruption has the highest percentage (64%), accompanied by a decline in the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) (IDN Times, 2023). Despite legislative measures such as Law Number 31 of 2014 concerning Witness and Victim Protection (Republic of Indonesia Law, 2014) aiming to protect informants, challenges remain in implementing reporting practices in Indonesia (Latan et al., 2019). The corporate sector, particularly within the context of medium-sized enterprises in this research, also plays a crucial role in the country's economy. Anvari et al. (2019) noted that most fraud cases occur in workplaces primarily involving managers and employees. This research is essential due to relatively limited empirical evidence in Indonesia. Latan (2016) mentioned that the high number of fraud cases identified by the ACFE in Indonesia could be interpreted as auditors' or public accountants' reluctance to become informants. Therefore, factors contributing to increased whistleblowing intentions remain worthy of exploration.

This study aims to identify how the reporting triangle initiates accounting and finance staff members' intentions to become informants in medium-sized companies in Indonesia. The study employs a quantitative research design, surveying accounting and finance staff from medium-sized companies in Indonesia. Structured questionnaires based on the reporting triangle construct are used to gather data on participants' perceptions and intentions related to whistleblowing. Multiple linear regression analysis will be used to analyze data and evaluate the influence of various factors on whistleblowing intentions. Through such efforts, this study aims to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of whistleblowing phenomena and their implications for organizational governance and accountability. The results of this research can serve as a reference for companies and stakeholders to develop policies that promote transparency and integrity in their respective work environments.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Whistleblowing originates from a sporting occurrence in which a referee stops a game and breaks the rules by blowing his whistle (Qusqas & Kleiner, 2001). Whistleblowing is defined variously by researchers in different domains (Lokanan & Sharma, 2023). However, Brennan and Kelly (2007) point out that the reporting summarizes Near and Miceli (1985) most widely accepted definition of whistleblowing in accounting research. They define whistleblowing as the "disclosure of illegal, immoral, or unauthorized practices by members of an organization to other individuals or organizations that may be able to take action under the control of their employer (Near & Miceli, 1985). In reality,

organizations employ whistleblowing as a critical tactic to uphold integrity, compliance, and openness.

Global regulators have emphasized the importance of implementing whistleblowing to disclose and prevent fraudulent acts in various organizations. The Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE), an international institution that plays a role in fraud checking, said whistleblowing has proven effective in detecting and preventing various acts of fraud, including corruption (ACFE, 2022). The fraud here includes multiple practices such as fraud, deception, or unfair ways of obtaining property or money intentionally. The importance of whistleblowing is further evidenced by the fact that whistleblowing methods accounted for reporting as many as 42% of fraud cases in 2022 (ACFE, 2022).

According to the National Committee on Governance Policy (KNKG), whistleblowing activities cannot escape the role of whistleblowers who can come from internal and external organizations in disclosing fraud. Whistleblowers provide information or evidence related to violations as employees (internal parties) and the wider community such as customers, suppliers, etc. (external parties) (KNKG, 2008). They play a crucial role in exposing fraudulent acts. One can categorize fraud as a "fraud tree" when addressing the fraud issue. Among the main categories in such "fraud trees" are corruption, misappropriation of assets, and fraud in financial statements (ACFE, 2019).

Companies adopt whistleblowing to maintain transparency, compliance, and fair behavior (Brown et al., 2016). The whistleblowing triangle is a concept influenced by the fraud triangle that pays attention to whistleblowing's Intention using the Theory of planned behavior (TPB) (Latan et al., 2019). The fraud triangle, introduced by Donald Ray Cressey in 1953, states that three factors influence a person to commit fraud: pressure, Opportunity, and Rationalization (Latan et al., 2019). Pressure refers to a person's motivation to achieve cheating, whereas Opportunity provides an opportunity for the individual to commit fraud. Rationalization is an individual's attempt to justify or legitimize the act of fraud committed.

The Fraud Triangle Theory posits that an individual's choice to blow the whistle depends on rationalizing the fraud perpetrator's motives and options. Both personal and environmental factors have a role in the decision to become a whistleblower, and the Fraud Triangle Theory can assist organizational accountants in recognizing situations when whistleblowing is possible (Brown et al., 2016). Whistleblowers evaluate the adverse pressures experienced while making disclosures, the accessible resources for reporting fraudulent activities, and their capacity to justify their disclosures. The Fraud Triangle Theory highlights external factors that create chances and pressures for whistleblowing. In contrast, the Theory of Planned Behavior focuses on internal factors that motivate individuals to blow the whistle.

Meanwhile, TPB explains that internal and external factors influence a person's Intention to carry out a behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Individuals consider their actions carefully before deciding to act (Triantoro et al., 2020). Whistleblowing Intention is the deep desire of individuals to report fraudulent or unethical acts within an organization (Veetikazhi et al., 2022). Integrating the fraud triangle and TPB allows for a more in-depth analysis of the factors influencing an individual's intent to commit whistleblowing actions (Brown et al., 2016).

The whistleblowing triangle components help understand why someone intends to reveal cheating or unethical acts (Latan et al., 2019). According to the whistleblowing triangle,

opportunities are the type and amount of resources you have to disclose violations or fraudulent acts. Pressure is the motivation for whistleblowers to reveal cheating or misconduct. At the same time, Rationalization is an attempt to reduce conflicts between attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that are contrary to the way of rationalizing actions (Smaili & Arroyo, 2019). At the same time, the Theory of planned behavior (TPB) is a psychological theory that explains the relationship between the attitudes of individuals and their behavior (Ajzen, 1991). The TPB predicts individual behavior based on their evaluation of attitudes toward behavior, subjective norms, and understanding of behavioral control. Researchers have used this Theory to indicate different types of behavior, including whistleblowing behavior. (Ajzen, 1991).

Initial research (Brown et al., 2016) was conducted on professional accountants using a fraud triangle approach integrated with the Theory of planned behavior (TPB). The results of this study show that control behavior and perception positively affect whistleblowing intentions (Brown et al., 2016). Latan et al. (2016) later expanded the study, examining a sample of auditors working in Indonesia's Big 4 and non-Big Four accounting and finance department staff offices. They found a significant relationship between the integration component of the fraud triangle and the TPB, intending to whistleblowing. These findings became the basis for the development of a construct that came to be known as the "whistleblowing triangle" (Latan et al., 2019).

2.1. The Effect of Pressure on Whistleblowing Intentions

There are two types of pressure individuals face: internal and external (Saitri et al., 2023). Internal pressure involves values, morals, loyalty to the organization, and individual satisfaction in the workplace. At the same time, external pressure comes from risks that individuals may face, such as job loss, reputational damage, and experiences of unfair treatment (Latan et al., 2019). Pressure is a factor that influences whistleblowing Intention according to the whistleblowing triangle concept (Smaili & Arroyo, 2019). Research shows findings in different directions (Saitri et al., 2023; Saud & Febriana, 2022). (Latan et al., 2019) mentioned that pressure has a negative influence on the Intention to whistleblower. The higher the pressure an employee faces, the less likely they are to whistleblowing. Based on the relationship between these variables, we proposed:

H1: Pressure has a negative influence on whistleblowing intentions.

2.2. The Effect of Opportunity on Whistleblowing Intentions

Individuals form ethical awareness when they become aware of opportunities to disclose cheating, which affects their Intention to whistleblow (Latan et al., 2019). Implementing whistleblowing must be supported by guarantees that the whistleblower can provide information correctly. Opportunities are a crucial element in the whistleblowing triangle, which involves supporting systems within the organization and prevailing norms (Veetikazhi et al., 2022). Saud & Febriana (2022) show that the more excellent the Opportunity an individual has, the higher their intensity of whistleblowing. The protection and support provided to whistleblowers also affect the opportunities for whistleblowing. Based on the relationship between these variables, we proposed:

H2: Opportunities have a positive influence on whistleblowing intentions.

2.3. The Effect of Rationalization on Whistleblowing Intentions

In making decisions, a whistleblower must convince himself that cheating is unauthorized. Therefore, Rationalization is essential and requires understanding high moral standards (Saitri et al., 2023). Rationalization is the ethical standard used by whistleblowers in determining whether they should report violations (Veetikazhi et al., 2022). Saud & Febriana (2022) show that Rationalization positively influences whistleblowing intentions. The higher the level of Rationalization of individuals, the more likely they are to engage in whistleblowing. Rationalization assists individuals in determining the good and bad of a decision or behavior, including in the context of whistleblowing. Based on the relationship between these variables, we proposed:

H3: Rationalization has a positive influence on whistleblowing intentions.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study employed a survey method to collect data, specifically targeting accounting and finance staff from medium-sized enterprise companies in Indonesia indebted to the National Bank. The choice of survey method was deemed appropriate for several reasons. Firstly, it allowed for efficient data collection from a dispersed population. Secondly, it facilitated the collection of self-reported data regarding participants' perceptions and intentions, aligning with the research focus on whistleblowing intentions. Simple random sampling was utilized to select sample data from the population of debtor customers in the middle segment of businesses served by the National Bank. This method ensured that each member of the population had an equal chance of being included in the sample, enhancing the representativeness of the findings.

Profile of respondents' characteristics in this study, comprising 120 participants who completed the questionnaires. Among them, 55% were male, while 45% were female. Regarding age demographics, a majority (66.7%) fell within the 30-40 age bracket, with 13.3% below 30 years, 13.3% below 50 years, and 6.7% over 50 years old. Regarding tenure, a significant portion of respondents (46.7%) reported work experience ranging from 11 to 15 years, 40% with 5-10 years, 8.3% with over 20 years, and 5% with 16-20 years. Additionally, 90% of respondents held Bachelor's degrees, 5% held Master's degrees, 3.3% held high school/vocational diplomas or equivalents, and 1.7% held Associate degrees.

A structured questionnaire, administered through a Google Form, was designed to capture relevant data. The questionnaire consisted of descriptive sections to gather demographic information about the respondents and Likert scale questions to assess their perceptions and intentions regarding whistleblowing. The Likert scale ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), providing a standardized measure for data analysis.

Operationalization of Variables. This study's dependent variable is Whistleblowing Intention (Y), while the independent variables consist of three components of the whistleblowing triangle: Pressure (X1), Opportunity (X2), and Rationalization (X3). Whistleblowing Intention (Y) represents individuals' plans and intentions to engage in fraud reporting or whistleblowing actions. This variable was assessed using a questionnaire adapted from previous studies (Latan et al., 2019; Saud & Febriana, 2022). Indicators for

the rationalization variable include: 1. Intention to perform whistleblowing actions. 2. The desire to try to commit whistleblowing actions. 3. Plan to carry out whistleblowing actions. 4. Vigorous efforts to conduct internal whistleblowing. 5. Effort to conduct external whistleblowing.

Pressure (X1), based on the whistleblowing triangle theory, represents the motivation for individuals to disclose violations. This variable was measured using questionnaires adopted from previous studies (Latan et al., 2019; Saud & Febriana, 2022). Pressure encompasses external pressures from potential risks such as job loss, reputation damage, and unfair treatment. Indicators for the pressure variable include: 1. Compliance with shareholders' expectations. 2. Compliance with supervisors' expectations. 3. Compliance with financial managers' expectations. 4. Compliance with company culture. 5. Compliance with professional standards. 6. Compliance with regulatory requirements.

Opportunity (X2), according to the whistleblowing triangle theory, refers to the type and amount of resources available to individuals to disclose violations or fraud. This variable was measured using questionnaires adopted from previous studies (Latan et al., 2019; Saud & Febriana, 2022). Indicators for the opportunity variable include: 1. Encouragement or discouragement to report fraud. 2. Difficulty navigating the fraud reporting process. 3. Reporting incentives. 4. Risk of retaliation from other parties.

Rationalization (X3) in the whistleblowing triangle theory involves individuals' attempts to reconcile conflicting attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors related to their actions. This variable was measured using questionnaires adopted from previous studies (Latan et al., 2019; Saud & Febriana, 2022). Indicators for the rationalization variable include: 1. Assisting companies in addressing fraud situations. 2. Supporting colleagues in reporting fraud. 3. Disregarding moral considerations in the situation. 4. Ignoring potential consequences.

Validity And Reliability of Questionnaire Instruments and Classical Assumption Tests Conducted on The Data. Validity testing revealed that all questionnaire items for Pressure (X1), Opportunity (X2), Rationalization (X3), and Whistleblowing Intention (Y) surpassed the threshold R-value of 0.2542, signifying their validity. Reliability testing indicated Cronbach's alpha values exceeding 0.60 for all variables (X1, X2, X3, Y), implying satisfactory reliability. Using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov method, the normality test suggested a normal data distribution with an Asymp—Sig (2-tailed) value of 0.270. Multicollinearity testing showed Tolerance values (>0.1) and VIF values (<10) for all independent variables, indicating the absence of multicollinearity. Heteroscedasticity testing revealed significance values (>0.05) for all independent variables, suggesting the absence of heteroscedasticity. Overall, validity and reliability tests affirmed the robustness of the questionnaire instruments, while classical assumption tests ensured the suitability of the data for further analysis.

Multiple linear regression analysis will be employed to analyze the data and assess the influence of the whistleblowing triangle components on whistleblowing intentions. This analytical approach allows for examining the relationship between the independent variables (Pressure, Opportunity, Rationalization) and the dependent variable (Whistleblowing Intention), controlling for potential confounding variables.

The table below shows the results of statistical tests to address the research hypotheses.

Table 1: Table of Statistical Test Results

R² (Adj)	0.728		
Test F	0		
Variable	Regression Coefficients	P-Value (Sig)	Conclusion
(Constant)	-0.1		
Pressure (X1)	-0.225	0.009	H1 Supported
Opportunity (X2)	0.32	0.000	H2 Supported
Rationalization (X3)	0.477	0.000	H3 Supported
Note: P-value less than 0.05 indicates statistical significance.			

Note: P-value less than 0.05 indicates statistical significance

The table above presents the outcomes derived from multiple linear regression analysis and hypothesis testing, investigating the impact of independent variables (Pressure, Opportunity, and Rationalization) on the dependent variable (Whistleblowing Intention). This tabulated data includes regression coefficients for each variable, significance values (P-values) indicating the statistical significance of these variables influence, and metrics assessing model fit with the data (R^2 (Adj)) and overall model significance (Test F).

Analytical findings reveal that the Pressure variable demonstrates a regression coefficient of -0.225 with a P-value of 0.009, suggesting a significant influence of experienced pressure on the intention to disclose violations. Similarly, the Opportunity variable exhibits a regression coefficient of 0.320 with an extremely low P-value (0.000), signifying the crucial role of available opportunities in enhancing the intention to disclose violations. Furthermore, the rationalization variable displays a regression coefficient of 0.477 with a very low P-value (0.000), indicating the impact of individuals' rationalization levels on the intention to disclose violations.

Hypothesis testing outcomes indicate that the regression model effectively fits the data (R^2 (Adj) = 0.728, Test F Sig. = 0.000), with each independent variable significantly influencing the dependent variable (Pressure: Sig. = 0.009, Opportunity: Sig. = 0.000, Rationalization: Sig. = 0.000). Overall, the regression model demonstrates a strong fit with the data, underscored by the adjusted R-squared value of 0.728 and the significant Test F result (Sig. = 0.000). These results imply that the model explains a substantial portion of the variation in Whistleblowing Intention, supporting the notion that Pressure, Opportunity, and Rationalization are significant determinants of individuals' intentions to blow the whistle within organizational settings. In conclusion, the empirical support provided by the statistical tests bolsters the hypotheses. It emphasizes the necessity of considering diverse factors, such as organizational pressures, available opportunities, and individual rationalization processes, to comprehend whistleblowing intentions thoroughly. These findings hold implications for organizational governance, emphasizing that companies must cultivate transparent and supportive environments conducive to ethical reporting practices.

The chosen methodological approach is highly relevant to the research objectives, as it enables the systematic examination of factors influencing whistleblowing intentions among accounting and finance staff in Indonesian businesses indebted to the National Bank. Utilizing the whistleblowing triangle construct and a quantitative survey method, this research aims to provide nuanced insights into the underlying motivations driving individuals' decisions to blow the whistle.

4. DISCUSSION

This study empirically investigates how the elements of the whistleblowing triangle idea affect the employees' intent to report fraud in middle-class Indonesian companies' finance and accounting departments. The primary driving force behind this research is the empirical data and lack of understanding surrounding the whistleblower triangle, which researchers have not adequately investigated. On the other hand, noteworthy advancements in reporting infractions should be noted (e.g., Smaili & Arroyo, 2019). Based on the statistical test results presented in the table, it can be observed that all three independent variables—Pressure, Opportunity, and Rationalization—have a significant influence on Whistleblowing Intention, supporting the respective hypotheses.

Firstly, Pressure (X1) exhibits a negative regression coefficient of -0.225 with a P-value of 0.009, indicating that increased pressure experienced by respondents is associated with decreased intention to disclose violations. This finding aligns with previous research, including studies by Latan et al. (2019) and Saitri et al. (2023). Contrary to the direction of the relationship suggested by Saud and Febriana (2022), our research provides empirical evidence of a negative relationship between pressure and whistleblowing intentions. The stronger the pressure an employee faces internally and externally, the more reluctant they may be to blow the whistle. Additionally, creating a work environment that supports the importance of whistleblowing, as suggested by Smaili and Arroyo (2019), can empower accounting and finance staff to overcome pressure and gain trust in their actions, highlighting the significance of organizational culture and policies in promoting ethical reporting practices (Brown et al., 2016).

Secondly, Opportunity (X2) demonstrates a positive regression coefficient of 0.320 with a highly significant P-value of 0.000, implying that greater opportunities available to individuals positively influence their intention to blow the whistle. This result is consistent with existing literature, including studies by Latan et al. (2019), Saitri et al. (2023), Saud & Febriana (2022), and Smaili & Arroyo (2019), which highlight the importance of organizational support and conducive reporting mechanisms in fostering whistleblowing intentions among employees. An opportunity is a circumstance or state that permits staff members to report infractions without facing any obstacles, often tied to the availability of organizational support systems, writing avenues, norms, and ethical standards within the organization. As indicated by earlier research, employees in workplaces with such options are more inclined to report breaches through anonymous internal reporting channels (Brown et al., 2016; Latan et al., 2016, 2019; Saitri et al., 2023).

Lastly, Rationalization (X3) exhibits a positive regression coefficient of 0.477 with a highly significant P-value of 0.000, indicating that individuals' rationalization processes are crucial in shaping their intentions to disclose violations. It underscores the significance of

addressing cognitive biases and ethical considerations in understanding whistleblowing behavior. This research provides empirical evidence that Rationalization can influence whistleblowing intentions among accounting and finance staff in medium-sized companies in Indonesia. The greater the Rationalization that accounting and finance staff exhibit, the greater their intensity in reporting fraud. The results of this study align with previous research by Latan et al. (2016, 2019), Saitri et al. (2023), Saud & Febriana (2022), and Smaili & Arroyo (2019). According to the research, an accounting and finance department staff member's choice to uncover violations is heavily influenced by the rationalization process, which has implications for the accounting profession. Justification involves reasoning oneself to believe one's actions do not contradict accepted ethical norms. Professional accountants must adhere to a code of professional ethics, which includes disclosing any severe fraud or errors discovered during financial statement audits. Therefore, accounting and finance employees often face moral dilemmas when reporting infractions without organizational support. The justification process plays a critical role in an accountant's decision to disclose violations, as it involves assessing whether the behavior aligns with current ethical norms and facts.

Consequently, our study offers valuable insights into the whistleblowing literature concerning theoretical implications (Brown et al., 2016; Gao & Brink, 2017; Latan et al., 2019; Smaili & Arroyo, 2019). Moreover, it provides empirical substantiation for the hypothesis, positing a connection between the factors of the whistleblowing triangle and whistleblowing intent. Besides extending previous research on the whistleblowing triangle (Brown et al., 2016; Latan et al., 2019; Smaili & Arroyo, 2019), the practical implications of this study may aid professional accountants in understanding the significance of disclosing fraudulent activities without apprehension of reprisal.

Professional accountants must maintain neutrality despite the protection afforded to informants, emphasizing the need for mid-segment organizations to prioritize establishing multiple reporting channels, internal incentives, top-level management support, and ethical standards in the workplace. Despite challenges to ethical behavior, accountants' obligations have far-reaching implications for stakeholders and society.

This study has certain limitations. Firstly, it did not consider additional elements that could augment the whistleblower triangle model. Future research should explore various variables, including risk and capability (Andon et al., 2016). Secondly, it exclusively evaluated the negative impact of pressure, neglecting the positive aspects of stress, such as social motivation and a sense of obligation (Smaili & Arroyo, 2019). Future studies may consider integrating these aspects. Additionally, this study solely examined the justification factor within a singular framework, overlooking its cognitive and psychological dimensions (Murphy & Dacin, 2011). Subsequent research can delve into these dimensions to assess justification factors comprehensively.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The study's findings highlight the significant influence of Pressure, Opportunity, and Rationalization on whistleblowing intentions among accounting and finance staff in medium-sized Indonesian companies. Firstly, Pressure negatively impacts whistleblowing intentions, indicating that higher pressure levels may deter individuals from disclosing

violations, consistent with previous research findings. Conversely, Opportunity positively correlates with whistleblowing intentions, emphasizing the importance of providing conducive reporting mechanisms and organizational support. Additionally, Rationalization plays a crucial role in shaping whistleblowing intentions, with individuals' ethical reasoning influencing their likelihood to report violations. These insights underscore the importance of fostering transparent and supportive organizational cultures to promote ethical reporting practices.

Moreover, the study contributes to the whistleblowing literature by empirically investigating the whistleblowing triangle's elements and their effects on whistleblowing intentions. The findings offer theoretical implications by validating the connection between the whistleblowing triangle factors and whistleblowing intent, thus expanding upon earlier research in this area. The study underscores the significance of disclosing fraudulent activities without fear of reprisal. It suggests that mid-segment organizations prioritize providing various reporting channels, internal incentives, and ethical standards to facilitate ethical reporting practices among accounting and finance professionals.

However, the study has certain limitations. Future research should consider additional variables and alternative models of whistleblowing, such as risk and capability, to provide a comprehensive understanding of whistleblowing behavior. Additionally, exploring social and moral motivations alongside financial incentives could offer a more nuanced perspective on whistleblowing intentions. Furthermore, investigating the cognitive and psychological aspects of justification factors within a broader framework could enhance our understanding of the decision-making processes underlying whistleblowing behavior.

In summary, this study contributes to both theoretical and practical understandings of whistleblowing behavior. It underscores the importance of organizational support and ethical considerations in promoting transparent and integrity-driven workplaces. Further research addressing the identified limitations could provide valuable insights into enhancing ethical reporting practices and organizational governance.

REFERENCES

- ACFE. (2019). SURVEI FRAUD INDONESIA 2019. Retrieved from <https://acfe-indonesia.or.id/survei-fraud-indonesia/>
- ACFE. (2022). A Report to the Nation on Occupational Fraud and Abuse. Retrieved from <https://www.acfe.com/>
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Andon, P., Free, C., Jidin, R., Monroe, G. S., & Turner, M. J. (2016). The Impact of Financial Incentives and Perceptions of Seriousness on Whistleblowing Intention. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1985, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3215-6>

- Anvari, F., Wenzel, M., Woodyatt, L., & Haslam, S. A. (2019). The social psychology of whistleblowing: An integrated model. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 9(June 2018), 41–67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386619849085>
- Avortri, C., & Agbanyo, R. (2021). Determinants of management fraud in the banking sector of Ghana: the perspective of the diamond fraud theory. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 28(1), 142–155. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-06-2020-0102>
- Ayu Suryandari, N. N., Yadnyana, I. K., Ariyanto, D., & Adi Erawati, N. M. (2023). Implementation of Fraud Triangle Theory: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Governance and Regulation*, 12(3), 90–102. <https://doi.org/10.22495/jgrv12i3art10>
- Brennan, N., & Kelly, J. (2007). A study of whistleblowing among trainee auditors. *The British Accounting Review*, 39, 61–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2006.12.002>
- Brown, J. O., Hays, J., & Stuebs, M. T. (2016). Modeling accountant whistleblowing intentions: Applying the Theory of planned behavior and the fraud triangle. *Accounting and the Public Interest*, 16(1), 28–56. <https://doi.org/10.2308/apin-51675>
- Gao, L., & Brink, A. G. (2017). Whistleblowing studies in accounting research: A review of experimental studies on the determinants of whistleblowing. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 38, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acclit.2017.05.001>
- IDN Times. (2023). Indeks Persepsi Korupsi RI Tahun 2022 Anjlok 4 Poin di Angka 34. Retrieved from <https://www.idntimes.com/news/indonesia/santi-dewi/indeks-persepsi-korupsi-ri-tahun-2022-anjlok-4-poin-di-angka?page=all>
- KNKG. (2008). Pedoman Sistem Pelaporan Pelanggaran atau Whistleblowing System. Retrieved from www.governance-indonesia.com
- Latan, H., Chiappetta Jabbour, C. J., & Lopes de Sousa Jabbour, A. B. (2019). 'Whistleblowing Triangle': Framework and Empirical Evidence. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 160(1), 189–204. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3862-x>
- Latan, H., Ringle, C. M., Jose, C., & Jabbour, C. (2016). Whistleblowing Intentions Among Public Accountants in Indonesia: Testing for the Moderation Effects. *Journal of Business Ethics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3318-0>
- Lokanan, M. E., & Sharma, P. (2023). Two Decades of Accounting Fraud Research: The Missing Meso-Level Analysis. *SAGE Open*, 13(3), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231197305>
- Miceli, M. P., & Near, J. P. (1994). Whistleblowing: Reaping the benefits. *Academy of Management Executive*, 8(3), 65–72.
- Murphy, P. R., & Dacin, M. T. (2011). Psychological Pathways to Fraud: Understanding and Preventing Fraud in Organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 101(4), 601–618. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0741-0>
- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1985). Organizational Dissidence: The Case of Whistleblowing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 4(1), 1–16.

- Qusqas, F., & Kleiner, B. H. (2001). "The difficulties of whistleblowers finding employment. *Management Research News*, 24(3/4), 97–100. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170110782702>
- Rustiarini, N. W., Sutrisno, S., Nurkholis, N., & Andayani, W. (2019). Fraud triangle in public procurement: evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 26(4), 951–968. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-11-2018-0121>
- Rustiarini, N. W., T, S., Nurkholis, N., & Andayani, W. (2019). Why people commit public procurement fraud? The fraud diamond view. *Journal of Public Procurement*, 19(4), 345–362. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOPP-02-2019-0012>
- Saitri, P. W., Suartana, I. W., Sisdyani, E. A., & Sujana, I. K. (2023). Predicting whistleblowing Intention using the whistleblowing triangle. *Journal of Accounting and Investment*, 24(3), 683–696. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jai.v24i3.17030>
- Saud, I. M., & Febriana, P. (2022). Pengaruh Whistleblowing Triangle terhadap Intensi dalam Melakukan Whistleblowing. *Jurnal Kajian Akuntansi*, 6(1), 25. <https://doi.org/10.33603/jka.v6i1.5512>
- Schwartz, M. S. (2016). Ethical Decision-Making Theory: An Integrated Approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139(4), 755–776. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2886-8>
- Smaili, N., & Arroyo, P. (2019). Categorization of Whistleblowers Using the Whistleblowing Triangle. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 157(1), 95–117. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3663-7>
- Triantoro, H. D., Utami, I., & Joseph, C. (2020). Whistleblowing system, Machiavellian personality, fraud intention: An experimental study. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 27(1), 202–216. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-01-2019-0003>
- Veetikazhi, R., Kamalanabhan, T. J., Malhotra, P., Arora, R., & Mueller, A. (2022). Unethical employee behavior: a review and typology. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(10), 1976–2018. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1810738>

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

