

Whistle blowing: Fraud and Friendship in Organization

Mediaty¹, Abdul Hamid Habbe², Kartini³, Henni Mande⁴

^{1,2,3}(Accounting, Hasanuddin University, Indonesia)

⁴(Accounting, STIE Panca Bhakti Palu, Indonesia)

*Corresponding Author, Henni Mande⁴

ABSTRACT:- This study aims to determine the effect of the level of fraud and the level of friendship of student interest into whistleblower and perception of organizational support as a moderating variable. This study used experimental method with the number of respondents 78 students. The results showed that the level of fraud influenced the interest of the students into whistleblower while the level of friendship did not affect and the perception of organizational support did not moderate the relationship of both.

Keywords:- Whistleblowing, fraud, friendship, Prosocial Organizational Behavior, perceived organizational support.

I. INTRODUCTION

The news about the occurrence of fraud both in the private sector and in the public sector never subsided even more echoed and disrupt the life of our nation and state in Indonesia. Cheating in the form of corruption is quite familiar in the order of various crucial problems faced by this Nation. Based on the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2015, published by *Transparency International*, Indonesia scored 36 or is ranked 88 of 168 countries surveyed. This shows that the perception of corruption in Indonesia is still high and apprehensive. Indonesia's GPA in 2014 and 2013 scored no less than 34 and 32, which means that the eradication of corruption in Indonesia has not been effective and has not been significant.

Corruption is a danger that can hamper the development of a country so that efforts are needed to prevent and eradicate it. One effective tool used to detect corruption is to empower *Whistleblower*. Several cases of corruption in Indonesia is revealed through the *whistleblower*, one of whom is a case of asking papa shares.

Being a *whistle-blower* is not an easy task. A person who comes from an internal organization will generally face an ethical dilemma in deciding whether to "blow the whistle" or keep it hidden. Some people see *the whistle-blower* as a traitor who violate the norms of organizational loyalty, others looked *whistle-blower* as heroic protector of the values that are considered more important than loyalty to the organization (Rothschild and Miethe, 1999). The conflicting views often make prospective *whistle-blower* in a dilemma indecision determine the attitudes that can ultimately distort the interest of *whistle-blowing*.

Understanding the factors that can affect a person's interest to commit acts of *whistle-blowing* is important so that organizations can design policies and *whistle-blowing* system is most effective. A person's interest (including internal auditors) to become a *whistleblower* or *prosocial* behavior can be explained by both the antecedent variables of *prosocial behavior theory*. According to the Brief and Motowidlo (1986), there are two variables that can affect a person's antecedents *prosocial* behavior. The first variable is individual antecedents, such as feelings of empathy, social responsibility, education level, and motivation. The individual variables of the antecedents are an inherent variable to a person including the level of one's ability to internalize rules and moral reasoning models (Rushton, 1981) in Brief and Motowidlo (1986). The second variable is contextual antecedents, such as prevailing norms, group cohesiveness, scope of work, role clarity, leadership style, and participation in decision making.

Previous research related to interest *whistle-blowing* has revealed some of the determinants of interest *whistle-blowing*. Several studies link situational factors such as the seriousness of the fraud and the degree of closeness (Kaplan and Whitecotton, 2001; Sabang, 2013; Winardi, 2013) and the *personal cost* (Kaplan and Whitecotton, 2001; Winardi, 2013) as factors influencing interest *whistleblowing*.

Personal costs in the form of sanctions or retaliation that may be experienced by the reporting fraud. The sanctions are derived from the relationship between the complainant and the perpetrator. The relationship between fraudsters and fraud reporters can also be seen from the side of position and side of friendship. Research King (1997) concluded that interest in reporting mistakes made by his own friends is smaller than reporting fraud committed by non-friends to supervisors. Miller and Thomas (2005) conclude differently from the research of King (1997), Miller and Thomas (2005) say fraud reporting by actors who have close relationship (cohesiveness) between fraudsters and reporters interact with the seriousness of fraud. Differences in perceptions of cheating (cheating) and *personal costs* are some of the factors that affect a person's interest *menajdi whistleblower*.

The most important thing in the implementation of the whistle-blowing system is whether employees who know the occurrence of cheating want to report (whistleblower) or not. Rothschild and Miethe (1999) state that most whistleblowers are considered disloyal to the organization, and they may be rejected by other employees within the organization (Elliston, 1982). The condition becomes an ethical dilemma for whistleblowers when it comes from internal organization, so it is important for whistleblowers to gain support and protection from the organization. Alleyne et al. (2013) explains the importance of perception of organizational support for individuals to report unethical acts. It is based on the theory of social exchange, an organization that treats employees well to create a sense of duty in the employee, so to meet the feelings of its obligations, employees respond in a way that benefits the organization.

The purpose of this study was to examine and analyze whether the degree of cheating and friendship levels affected the interest of being a whistleblower and whether the perception of organizational support moderated the relationship of the influence of the fraud rate and the level of friendship to interest into a whistleblower. This research is important because, firstly, previous research by Sabang (2013) has not used organizational support perception variables. Secondly, using different respondents (accounting students) and different contexts (the cases raised), this study is expected to make an important contribution to the ideals and behavior of students prosocial as the next generation.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

2.1 Prosocial Organizational Behavior Theory

Brief and Motowidlo (1986) defines *organizational prosocial behavior* as behavior / actions carried out by members of an organization against any individual, group, or organization devoted to improving the welfare of the individual, group, or organization. Prosocial behavior is not altruistic behavior. According to Staub (1978) cited by Dozier and Miceli (1985) that prosocial behavior is a positive social behavior that is intended to provide benefits to others. But unlike altruism, prosocial actors can also have the intent to gain benefits for themselves as well.

Prosocial behavior into the theory that encourage *whistle-blowing*. Brief and Motowidlo (1986) mentions *the whistleblowing* as one of the 13 forms of *prosocial organizational behavior*. This is consistent with the opinion of Dozier and Miceli (1985) which states that the act of *whistle-blowing* can be seen as a general prosocial behavior because such behavior will benefit the other person (or organization) in addition is also beneficial for *whistle-blower* itself.

Prosocial behavior theory has some antecedent variables were grouped into two major groups. First, Individual antecedents, an aspect derived from the individual perpetrators of prosocial actions such as the ability of individuals to internalize the standards of justice, individual responsibility to the social environment, the way of moral reasoning and feelings of empathy towards others. Second, Contextual antecedents, is an aspect of organizational context and work environment such as norm factor, group cohesiveness, role models, leadership style, organizational climate, pressure, organizational commitment, and other matters that can affect mood, sense of satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Brief And Motowidlo, 1986).

2.2 Whistleblowing

Miceli and Near (1985) define whistleblowing as a disclosure by members of an organization about illegal, immoral or illegitimate practices under the control of their superiors to persons or organizations that may influence the action. Whistleblowing may also be defined as the efforts of current or past members of an organization to alert the organization's top management or to the public of a serious error created or concealed by the organization (Ahern and McDonald, 2002; Princess, 2016).

Individuals who do whistleblowing are called whistleblowers, Miceli and Near (1985) explain that what can be called a whistle-blower has four characteristics, namely (1) employees or former employees of organizations whose organizations are cheated; (2) has no authorization to alter or stop the fraud under his control; (3) permitted or not allowed to make reports; (4) does not occupy positions whose duties require to conduct corporate fraud reporting.

2.3 Seriousness of Fraud and Whistleblowing

One *behavior prosocial* behavior is working to make improvements to the organization (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986). One form of improvement is to keep the information presented credible by users of financial statements. Another person who *prosocial* behavior is to provide the best service to those in need (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986), provide the correct information to users of financial statements is an implementation of *prosocial* behavior. Correct information relates to the materiality of the information presented.

Jones (1991) states that the extent of fraud is measured on the basis of the consequences of moral issues caused by events. Research using the concept of materiality in assessing the extent of fraud done by Robinson et al. (2012). The concept of materiality used in research conducted by Robinson et al. (2012) is a

misstatement at the expense of the company. 0.5% error of the total company cost is considered immaterial and misstatement of 6% of the total cost of the company is considered material. Research results showed that the respondents were composed of members of *the Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA)* less inclined to report that no material misstatements in the financial statements compared to material misstatement. Material misstatement can reduce the level of confidence in financial information. In addition, material misstatement in the financial statements will be detrimental to the users of the financial statements.

This study uses the campus organization context Student Executive Board (BEM) Faculty of Economics and Business Unhas and respondents are students. Based on the theory of prosocial behavior and some of the above research, the first hypothesis proposed is:

H1: Interest accounting students to become whistleblower are larger if the levels of fraud is higher than the level of fraud is low.

2.4 Friendship and Whistleblowing

Indonesian society is a society that has a high level of kolektivitas, high collectivity describes the level of closeness. Patel (2003) considered that *whistleblowing* as part of the control mechanism will be more effective in individualistic countries. Miller and Thomas (2005) argues that the desire to report fraud *close* influenced *relational* (relations in the context of cohesion). The higher the cohesion relationship between the perpetrator of fraud to *the observer* (who look cheating), the lower the interest to report fraud perpetrators. However, the assumption is not proven, cohesiveness only affects when interacting with the offices of the perpetrators of fraud.

Tharp and Mattingly (1991) in Miller and Thomas (2005) stated that the reduced interest in reporting unsafe practices in hospitals occurs because of interpersonal loyalty. According to King (1997), fraud reporting by friends themselves to supervisors is less than fraudulent reporting by non-friends. Greenberger et al. (1987) states that the group of friends is able to create an integrated force that forces the individual to be silent when viewing unethical behavior packaged in norms.

Cohesiveness is one antecedent *prosocial* behavior (Brief and Motowildo, 1986). Clark (1981), Clark and Mills (1979) states that the nature of the relationship between two individuals affect a person's chances against the other *prosocial* behavior. Hornstein (1976, 1978) in Brief and Motowildo (1986) argue that people will engage emotionally when in a group and will be motivated to help each other when in trouble. This study produces cohesiveness in the form of friendship.

Based on the above explanation, the next hypothesis proposed to be tested is:

H2: Interest accounting students to become whistleblower are larger if the perpetrators of fraud have friendships height than friendship lower with a student (whistleblower).

2.5 Perceptions of Organizational Support and Whistleblowing

Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) explain that the basis of the theory of social exchange is a relationship that increases over time into relationships of mutual trust, loyalty, and mutual commitment as long as both parties abide by the rules of exchange. The social exchange approach integrates employees' beliefs about how they are treated by their organizations and how organizations are committed to them (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Adopting the social exchange theory framework, Eisenberger et al. (1986) argues that such beliefs underlie employee conclusions about their organizational commitment to perceptions of perceived organizational support, thereby contributing to employee commitment to the organization. Employees are comfortable with their decision-making related to reporting unethical acts when the organization supports employee action (Alleyne et al., 2013).

Wayne et al. (1997) explains that the magnitude of perceived organizational support perceived by employees creates a sense of duty, employees not only feel that they should commit to their bosses but also feel obligated by engaging in behaviors that support organizational goals. Alleyne et al. (2013) states that perceived perceived organizational support is one of the factors supporting an individual to report unethical acts within his organization. Individuals should assess the expected level of support when they decide to report any errors, given the various negative damages that arise if the lack of support from the organization.

In line with the theory of social exchange and reciprocal norms, the perception of organizational support creates a feeling of employee rewards toward the organization and can be reduced by mutual effort (Gouldner, 1960). This suggests that a high perception of organizational support results in a positive impact on employee attitudes and behavior for a benefit that is beneficial to the organization, such as reporting on fraud within the organization.

Thus, perceived organizational support is expected to strengthen the relationship of attitude factors and perceptions of behavioral control over one's intent to report fraud. Based on the above explanation, the third hypothesis of this study are:

H3: The perception of perceived organizational support moderates the relationship level of fraud and friendship on the interest accounting students to become a whistleblower.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

The research used experimental method with the model between subject design.

3.1 Experimental Design

Between subject design an experimental model used to determine differences in the interest of internal auditors at every level of fraud and the degree of friendship between the perpetrator of fraud by whistleblower (students).

Participants or subjects will be divided into 2 groups with different treatment based on the questionnaire. The first group was given a high fraud case treatment and low friendship. The second group was given low fraud case treatment and high friendship.

3.2 Research subject

The subjects of this study are S1 students, STIE Tri Dharma, Accounting Department. The division of participants/subjects is done randomly. Students are chosen to be the subject of this study because the students of Accounting Department are candidates of auditors who are very likely to become whistleblowers. In addition, students are also the next generation of nation that is expected to prevent the occurrence of cheating when they are in the community.

Habbe (2006) states that there is no standard firmly how the number of participants in an experiment, but it applies the basic law that the larger the sample, the better because the *power of the test* increases. Based on some research that became the reference of this research, the number of subjects in a group or group is about 40 people, the number of subjects or respondents of this study about 80 people.

3.3 Case Design

Number of cases prepared as many as four. The first and second cases show high and low fraud rates. The concept of materiality used in research conducted by Robinson et al. (2012) is a misstatement at the expense of the company. A 0.5% error of the total company cost is considered immaterial and misstatement of 6% of the total cost of the company is considered material. The third and fourth cases are cases of fraudsters with high and low friendship relationships between fraudsters and the subject of students (whistleblowers). Subjects or samples will be divided into 2 groups, high-cheating fraud groups and low-friendship low-fraud groups.

Randal and Gibson (1990) suggest that developing scenarios should pay more attention to realistic conditions to reduce ambiguity and ambiguity issues. A realistic scenario allows respondents to place themselves in the position of characters depicted in the scenario (Patel, 2003). The case used in this experiment was the findings of a student as the supervisory board of BEM STIE Tri Dharma.

These cases were adopted from Sabang (2013) and modified in the context of the BEM organization. Here's the case:

1. Every case as if it occurred at BEM STIE Tri Dharma. That matter Adjusted because the subject or research respondents are students.
2. Other things that are modified are the level of cheating and friendship relationships between fraudsters and students (whistleblower).
3. Performed framing by means of bolding of certain information with the purpose of making assertion. In the first and second cases, the information in bold is the level of fraud. In case 3 in bold is the information of friendship, while case 4 there is no thickening of the mold because there is no information of close friendship (not close friends)

3.4 DATA ANALYSIS METHOD

The first step before hypothesis testing is to conduct a descriptive analysis by comparing demographic characteristics ie gender. It aims to know the composition of both groups. In testing the hypothesis 1 and 2, the parametric analysis tool is used to compare independent samples t test (*independent sample t-test*) and to test the hypothesis 3, an analysis tool used is a Two Way ANOVA.

Independent samples t test was used to test whether there is a difference between (1) the level of fraud against the interests *whistleblower* and (2) the degree of friendship towards interest *whistleblower*. Two Way ANOVA was used to test whether the perception of perceived organizational support moderates the relationship level and the level of fraud against the interests friendship became a *whistleblower*.

IV. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Research Respondents

The collected questionnaires were 78.

Table 1 Demographics

Group	Gender	Total
KTPR	Man	15
	Woman	25
KRPT	Man	19
	Woman	19
Total		78

KTPR: High Fraud Low Friendship

KRPT: Low Fraud High Friendship

4.2 Analysis

4.2.1 Hypothesis Testing 1

Hypothesis 1 testing is performed to prove that the student's interest to be a whistleblower is greater if the fraud rate is high compared to low fraud rate. The analytical tool used for hypothesis testing 1 is the independent sample t test and the comparable data is student interest to be whistleblower when the fraud rate is high and when the fraud rate is low.

Table 2 The Average Difference of Student Interest Being a Whistleblower by Level of Fraud

Keterangan		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Minat mahasiswa (Whistleblower)	Kecurangan Tinggi	40	6,23	,800	,127
	Kecurangan Rendah	38	4,68	1,741	,283

Table 3 Different Test of Effect of Fraud Rate on Student Interest Being a Whistleblower

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Differences	Std. Error Differences	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Minat Mahasiswa Menjadi Whistleblower	Equal Variances assumed	23,755	,000	5,063	76	,000	1,541	,304	,935	2,147
	Equal Variances Not assumed			4,978	51,372	,000	1,451	,310	,919	2,162

Based on table 2 above, the average student interest to be whistleblower at high fraud rate is greater than at low fraud rate. The average student interest in the high fraud rate is 6.23 while the low fraud rate is 4.68.

Based on the test result of independent sample t test in table 3, the value of t is 4.978 with a probability value (p-value) of 0.000. Since the probability is less than 0.05, this means that the average between student interest at high fraud rate and low fraud rate is significantly different. In other words, the student's interest in becoming a whistleblower is greater when the fraud rate is higher than when the fraud rate is low. The results of this statistical test support hypothesis 1.

4.2.2 Hypothesis Testing 2

Table 4 Average Student Interest Difference Being a Whistleblower by Friendship Level

Keterangan		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Minat mahasiswa (Whistleblower)	Pertemanan Tinggi	38	5,50	1,409	,229
	Pertemanan Rendah	40	5,50	1,219	,193

Table 5 Different Test The Effect of Friendship Level on Student Interest Being a Whistleblower

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Differences	Std. Error Differences	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Minat Mahasiswa Menjadi Whistleblower	Equal Variances assumed	4,81	,490	,000	76	1,000	,000	,298	-,593	,593
	Equal Variances Not assumed			,000	73,212	1,000	,000	,299	-,596	,596

Hypothesis 2 testing is done to prove that the student interest to be a whistleblower is greater if the level of friendship is lower than the high level of friendship. The analytical tool used for hypothesis testing 1 is the independent sample t test and the comparable data is the internal auditor's interest to be a whistleblower at a low level of friendship and a high level of friendship.

Based on table 4 above, the average student interest becomes a whistleblower at a low level of friendship and at a high level of friendship is the same. The average student interest at the high level of friendship is 5.50 and at the low friendship level is also 5.50. Based on the result of independent sample t test in table 5, the value of t equal to 0,000 with the probability value (p-value) equal to 1,000. Since the probability is greater than 0.05, this means that the average of student interest at high levels of friendship and low level of friendship does not differ significantly. In other words, the student's interest to be a whistleblower when the level of friendship is high and when the level of friendship is low is the same. The results of this statistical test do not support hypothesis 2.

4.2.3 Hypothesis Testing 3

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

Dependent Variable: WHISTLEBLOWING

F	df1	df2	Sig.
5,164	25	52	,000

Levene's test result shows that F count is 5,164 and Sig value is 0.000. Since $p < 0,05$ means the null hypothesis is rejected. The results of this test indicate that the population has significantly different variance.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: WHISTLEBLOWING

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	92,600 ^a	25	3,704	2,120	,011
Intercept	1539,713	1	1539,713	881,300	,000
KECURANGAN	45,740	1	45,740	26,180	,000
PDO	36,120	14	2,580	1,477	,153
KECURANGAN * PDO	18,341	10	1,834	1,050	,417
Error	90,849	52	1,747		
Total	2521,000	78			
Corrected Total	183,449	77			

a. R Squared = ,505 (Adjusted R Squared = ,267)

The result of the anova test above shows that cheating gives F value of 26,180 and significant at 0,05 ($p < 0,05$). This means that there is a significant difference in the average interest of students into whistleblowers based on cheating. The perception of organizational support (PDO) gives a F value of 1.477 and is insignificant at 0.05 ($p > 0,05$). This means that there is no significant difference between the average Perception of Organizational Support based on the degree of fraud.

The interaction result between cheating and perception of organizational support gives F value of 1.050 and is not significant at 0.05 ($p > 0,05$). This means that there is no mutual influence or *joint effect* between the fraud and the perception of organizational support to the average student interest whistleblower. The perception of organizational support does not moderate the influence of cheating on student interest into a whistleblower. Hypothesis 3 is not supported. Adjust R Square of 0.267 means that the variability of student interest into whistleblower which can be explained by fraud variable, perception of organizational support, and interaction between fraud and perception of organizational support is 26,7%.

V. DISCUSSION

Hypothesis 1 states that student interest becomes whistleblower greater if the fraud rate is high compared to low fraud rate. Results of statistical hypothesis testing proved that H1 is supported. The results of this study are consistent with research conducted by Robinson et al. (2012), Curtis (2006), Taylor and Curtis (2010), Schultz et al. 1993), and Ahmad (2011).

Research Robinson et al. (2012) used the materiality level as a distinguishing levels of fraud, and was adopted in this study. Considered material misstatement may degrade the reliability of the financial information and would be detrimental to users of financial statements. Perspective *prosocial behavior theory* assume that someone who behaves *prosocial* will keep the information presented correctly in the financial statements so that users of financial statements are not harmed and while keeping the trust of the organization. Materiality level of fraud is one measure of the level of fraud and cheating was part of moral issues (Jones, 1991), the higher the level of materiality considered cheating increasingly unethical. One of the scenarios used by Ahmad (2011) in his research also use metarialitas level as a form of cheating. The results of his research to the same conclusion that the more serious fraud, the higher the interest to become a *whistleblower*.

Hypothesis 2 states that student interest in accounting to become a whistleblower is greater if the perpetrators of fraud have friendships height lower than friendship with a student (whistleblower). However, the test results Hypothesis 2 was not supported. The results of this study are inconsistent with the presumption Tharp and Mattingly (1991) in Miller and Thomas (2005), and King (1997). Their results are consistent with research Miller and Thomas (2005), which concluded that the cohesiveness of interacting with the level of fraud. This can be caused by differences in study subjects with research conducted by Tharp and Mattingly (1991) in Miller and Thomas (2005), and King (1997).

Before discussing the subject of the differences between this study and previous research, it will first be discussed theory perspective *prosocial behavior*. In *prosocial behavior theory*, friendship (cohesiveness) has become one of the causes the person to reveal or not reveal fraud (*whistleblower*). On the other hand, the main purpose of people behave *prosocial* is because of the desire to improve the life of an individual, group, or organization. This study becomes empirical evidence that is not always the cohesiveness of a barrier for someone to become a *whistleblower*, especially on college campuses.

Prosocial behavior theory assumes that the friendship (cohesiveness) can inhibit a person to behave in *prosocial*, but does not indicate how much cohesiveness and how the shape of the cohesion that can hinder a person becomes a reporting (*whistleblower*). Cohesiveness can be influenced by demographic factors such as age (O'Reilly et al., 1989), the size of the group (Carron and Spink, 1995), as well as communication and comfort level (Lott and Lott, 1961). This study uses students as a whistleblower that the average age of the

young so that they are eager to show their identity, wanted to show his idealism, often considered emotional, as well as in the context of student organizations were not great.

Research conducted by Tharp and Mattingly (1991) in Miller and Thomas (2005) and King (1997) has the same concept of thought. Each based on the idea of Hornstein (1976 and 1978) in his Brief and Motowild (1986) which states that people will be involved emotionally when you are in one group and will be motivated to help each other when in trouble and thought. In connection with it, Greenberger et al. (1987) states that the group of friends was able to create a unified force that is forcing people to be quiet when he saw unethical behavior are packed in norms. Participants used in the study Tharp and Mattingly (1991) in Miller and Thomas (2005) and King (1997) is a nurse. Both these studies participants are nurses who have a strong enough bond profession, whereas this study used students as a whistleblower where student status bounded only a few years in the lecture.

The results are consistent with the findings of Sabang (2013) that the cohesiveness or friendship does not affect the interest to become a whistleblower. Sabang (2013) indicates that internal auditors have the same interest to be *whistleblowers*, both in the condition of having cohesiveness or friendship high or low between the perpetrator of fraud by internal auditors. The common interest can be interpreted equally not interested or are equally interested.

Hypothesis 3 states that the perception of perceived organizational support moderates the relationship cheating and friendship on the interest level accounting students to become a whistleblower. This study only tested the moderating relationship cheating because the level of friendship has no effect. Results of testing the hypothesis 3 is not supported. Perception of perceived organizational support did not moderate the influence of fraud against the interests of students accounting for the whistleblower.

These results are not in line with the research Adebayo (2005), Hooks et al. (1994), as well as Kaplan and Whitecotton (2001) which shows the relationship between the perceived level of support organizations with access to reveal the fraud. This may be due to differences in the respondent being used. This study uses students as respondents and in the context of the organization is not large so that students feel the support organization is not important and campus organizations do not have enough power to protect them.

VI. CONCLUSION

Tests on the research found that student interest in becoming a *whistleblower* is greater if the conditions of high-level fraud and friendship between the perpetrators of fraud by students are not the cause of the difference in interest nahasiswa to become a *whistleblower*. Perception of perceived organizational support did not moderate the relationship cheating and level of friendship to the interest of students to become a whistleblower.

The results support the *prosocial behavior theory*. A person becomes a *whistleblower* because they want to maintain the confidence of the organization and do not want to disadvantage users of financial statements. This study becomes empirical evidence that the value of material fraud becomes important so indispensable transparency in the financial management of an organization.

VII. LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This study has some limitations that may affect the study results. These limitations include, first, the instrument or questionnaire that was used to separate and emphasize the factors to be studied in each case. The impact of these instruments is the researcher cannot analyze further in order to prove the possibility of interaction between the level of fraud and the degree of friendship. Subsequent researchers can incorporate all the factors studied in a single case are four combinations of instruments with the consequence that the number of participants more.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to the University of Hasanuddin and LPDP DIKTI that has funded this research, therefore this research have broad impact on the economy and welfare of the people of Indonesia?

REFERENCES

- [1]. Ahern, KM and S. McDonald. 2002. The Beliefs of Nurses Who Were Involved in A Whistleblowing Event, *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 38 (3), 303-309.
- [2]. Ahmad Syahrul Ahmar. 2011. Internal Auditor and Internal whistleblowing Intentions: A Study of Organizational, Individual, Situational and Demographic Factor . Wertern Australia: Dissertation School of Accounting, Finance and Economics. Edith Cowan University.
- [3]. Alleyne, P., M. Hudaib, and R. Pike. 2013. Towards a Conceptual Model of Whislte-blowing Intention Among External Auditors. *The British Accounting Review*, 45: 10-23.

- [4]. Brief, AP and SJ Motowidlo. 1986. Prosocial Organizational Behaviors. *Academy of Management Review* 11 (4): 710-725.
- [5]. Dozier, J. B and MP Miceli. 1985. Potential Predictors of Whistle-Blowing: A Prosocial Behavior Perspective. *Academy of Management Review* 10 (4): 823-836.
- [6]. Elliston, FA 1982. Anonymity and Whistleblowing. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 1 (3), 167-177.
- [7]. Gouldner, AW 1960. The norm of reciprocity: a preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25 (2).
- [8]. Habbe, Abdul Hamid. 2006. Tests and Anchoring Adjustment Representativeness Heuristic for behavior Over / Underreaction investors to gain information, and consequently the profit forecast and stock valuation . Dissertation. UGM central library.
- [9]. Ilham Maulana Saud. 2016. Effect of Attitudes and Perceptions of Control Attitudes toward Whistleblowing Internal-External Intention with Perception Support Organization For Variabel moderating. *Journal of Accounting and Investment* Vol 17 No. 2, Pg: 209-219.
- [10]. Jones, TM 1991. Individuals By Ethical Decision Making in Organizations: An Issue-Contingent Model. *Academy of Management Review* 16 (2): 366-395.
- [11]. Kaplan, SE and SM Whitecotton. 2001. An examination of the auditors' reporting intentions when another client auditors is offered employment. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory*, 20 (1), 45-63.
- [12]. King, Granville. 1997. The Effects of Interpersonal closeness and Issue Seriousness on Blowing The Whistle. *The Journal of Business Communication* . Vol. 34. No. 4. Pp. 419-436.
- [13]. Miceli, MP and JP Near. 1985. Characteristics of Climate and Perceived Organizational Wrongdoing Associated with Whisde-Blowing Decisions, *Personnel Psychology*, 38, 525-544.
- [14]. Miceli, MP and JP Near. 1992. Situation variables affecting the whistle-blowing decision: a review of the literature. *Advances In Management Accounting*, 1, 109-139.
- [15]. Miller, Daine L. and Stuart Thomas. 2005. The Impact of Relative Position and Relational closeness on Reporting of Unethical Acts. *Journal of Business Ethics* . Vol. 61. Pp. 315-328.
- [16]. Patel, C. 2003. Some Cross-cultural Ovidence on Whistle-blowing as an Internal Control Mechanism. *Journal of International Accounting Research*, 2, 69-96.
- [17]. Daughter, CM 2016. Effect Reporting Line and level of religiosity of the intention Someone Doing Whistleblowing. *Journal of Accounting and Investment*, 17 (1), 42-52.
- [18]. Rizki Bagustianto, Nurkholis. 2012. Factors Affecting the Interests of Civil Servants (PNS) To Take Action Whistleblowing (Study on the PNS BPK). *Journal of Economics and Finance*. ISSN 1411-0393.
- [19]. Robinson, Shani N; Jesse C. Robertson; and Mary B. Curtis. 2012. The Effect of Contextual and Organizational Wrongdoing Attributes on Employees' Whistleblowing Intentions Following Fraud. *Journal of Business Ethics* . Vol. 106. Pp. 213-227.
- [20]. Rothschild, J. and D. Mieth. Whistle-Blower 1999. *Disclosures and Management Retaliation*. *Work and Occupations*. 26, 107-128.
- [21]. Sabang, MI 2013. Cheating, Cheating Performer Status, Individu- Interaction Group, and Interest Being a Whistleblower (Experiments in Government Internal Auditors. Thesis , Graduate Program in the Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Brawijaya, Malang.
- [22]. Transparency International. 2015 Corruption Perceptions Index 2015. <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2015#resultstable> . Accessed February 2, 2016.
- [23]. Wayne, SJ, LM Shore and RC Liden. 1997. Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: a social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40 (1), 82-111.
- [24]. Winardi, RD 2013. The Influence of Individual and Situational Factors on Lower-Level Civil Servants' Whistle-Blowing Intention in Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business*. 28 (3); 361-376.

***Corresponding Author, Henni Mande⁴**
⁴(Accounting, STIE Panca Bhakti Palu, Indonesia)