



RESEARCH PAPER

Effect of Individual Differences, Situational Factors, and Symbolic Interpretative Influence on the University Teachers' Whistle-Blowing Perceived Attitude

¹Ghulam Muhammad Malik ² Dr. Nargis Abbas*

1. Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan

2. Assistant Professor, Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan

*Corresponding Author: gmmalik.mba@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The paper aimed to determine the effect of individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence on Pakistani university teachers' whistle-blowing perceived attitude. A quantitative research design was used to collect data with the help of a multistage sampling technique. The target population of the study consisted of all male and female teachers at public sector universities and HEIs of the Pakistani Punjab province. Nine out of 35 universities were selected randomly. However, at least 150 university teachers in each selected institution were selected conveniently to constitute a sample of 1350 teachers. It is pertinent to mention that the study was derived from the doctorate thesis of the first author of this research paper and most data regarding all four variables was taken from his dissertation (Malik, 2023). In his doctorate research, he developed a whistle-blowing questionnaire and administered it to 1350 university teachers. Descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were used to analyze the data. The analysis results and findings revealed that respondents considerably agreed with most statements of the whistle-blowing questionnaire and their views were substantially higher regarding all four variables of whistle-blowing. Moreover, a significant positive relationship was observed among these variables indicating strong coefficient values, mostly high followed by some moderate values. Similarly, the predictors of whistle-blowing, including individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic-interpretative influence, successfully predicted the outcome variable, the whistle-blowing perceived attitude. Therefore, it was concluded that university teachers gave high importance to whistle-blowing and its four indicators. All four indicators were closely associated with each other. The predictor variables played a key role in increasing and inculcating the whistle-blowing attitude among university teachers. Hence, some recommendations were made regarding the need, scope, and effect of whistle-blowing in academic institutions regarding its policy and practices. Finally, the researchers also suggested that further research may be needed to increase whistle-blowing practices in academic institutions.

KEYWORDS Individual Differences, Situational Factors, Symbolic Interpretative Influence, Whistle-Blowing Perceived Attitude

Introduction

The present study aimed to determine the effect of individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence on university teachers' whistle-blowing perceived attitude. The literature revealed that various authors (Caillier, 2017; Gao & Brink, 2017; Nayir et al., 2018; Near & Miceli, 2016; Taylor, 2018) adopted a standard definition of whistle-blowing which states that whistle-blowing is "the disclosure by organization members (former or current) of illegal, immoral and illegitimate practices under the control of their employers to persons and organizations that may be able to effect action" (Near and Miceli, 1985). In general, fraud, bribery, corruption, kickbacks, sexual harassment, receiving and giving gifts, extortion, favoritism, nepotism, cronyism, insider trading, improper use of insider information, money laundering, workplace safety, product safety, aggressive

accounting, environmental pollution, discrimination, and conflicts of interest are just a few of the actions that may constitute the corporate wrongdoing (Near & Miceli, 1985). However, at least four components are vital for a whistle-blowing act to occur, including the whistle-blower, the complaint or wrongdoing that is being reported, the organization as a whole, or a specific person or a group of people working there who is committing the wrongdoing, and the party who is receiving the whistle-blower's complaint of wrongdoing (Dworkin & Near, 1997; Near & Miceli, 1985; Rocha & Kleiner, 2005).

Whistle-blowers might be internal or external depending on who receives the complaint (Chiyangwa et al., 2020). If the complaint alerts higher-ups within the organization about malfeasance, they are referred to as internal whistle-blowers (Miceli & Near, 1985, 1988; Near & Miceli, 1985, 1995). The complainant is referred to as an external whistle-blower if, on the other hand, the complaint is made to an external authority outside of an organization, such as the government or any law enforcement body (Bouville, 2008; Dasgupta & Kesharwani, 2011; Near & Miceli, 1996).

Several factors, such as individual differences (Toolami et al., 2019), situational factors (Nuswantara, 2023), and symbolic interpretive influence (Lee et al., 2022), can affect the whistle-blowing perceived attitude and the decision to blow the whistle (Rose et al., 2018). It was observed that personal traits, values, beliefs, and attitudes that vary between people are referred to as individual differences (Keenan & McLain, 1992). However, preventing wrongdoing, moral judgment, locus of control, decision-making, and civic values were chosen as the sub-themes of individual differences in the current study. Besides, situational factors are the contextual components that affect whistle-blowing decisions, such as organizational culture, perceived risk, and social standards (Cho & Song, 2015; Keenan & McLain, 1992). Though, organizational environment, leadership style, prosocial behavior, and organizational commitment were taken as sub-themes of situational factors. Moreover, the influence of external cues, such as the behavior and attitude of coworkers or supervisors and the general climate of the institution on a person's perception of whistle-blowing, is known as the symbolic interpretative influence (Keenan & McLain, 1992). Yet, moral beliefs, conflict resolution, and employee loyalty were considered as the sub-themes for the symbolic interpretative influences. Understanding these factors and their effect on university teachers' perceived attitude toward whistle-blowing is crucial for enhancing the effectiveness of whistle-blowing practices (Mansor et al., 2020) and creating a culture of integrity within academic institutions (Dorasamy, 2012). The dependent variable was referred to as the whistle-blowing perceived attitude, including awareness of wrongdoing, assessment of the seriousness of the wrongdoing, motivation to correct the wrongdoing, assessment of personal influence over the situation, search for others who can correct the wrongdoing, and assessment of consequences for self, others, and the wrongful behavior sub-themes.

The study aimed to determine the effect of individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence on university teachers' whistle-blowing perceived attitude. There were insufficient safeguards and support for whistle-blowing (Abbas & Ashiq, 2020). Thus, the researchers intended to explore the factors that may influence the whistle-blowing perceived attitude and the decision of university teachers to blow the whistle. However, by examining the current literature and conducting research on this topic, the researchers hoped to provide insights into how universities can better encourage whistle-blowing among their faculty members.

Hypotheses of the Study

The following were the hypotheses of the study:

H₀₁: "There is no significant relationship between individual differences, situational factors, symbolic-interpretative influence, and the university teachers' whistle-blowing perceived attitude."

H₀₂: "There is no significant effect of individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence on the university teachers' whistle-blowing perceived attitude."

Material and Methods

A quantitative study approach was used to determine the effect of individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence on the university teachers' perceived attitude toward whistle-blowing. A cross-sectional survey research design was utilized to accomplish this study, allowing for the collection of demographic data. However, this design was descriptive and correlational in nature. Furthermore, it was suitable for the study because it tried to gather information from a variety of individuals in one particular period.

Sample and Population

A convenience sample of at least 150 university teachers from nine randomly chosen Pakistani HEIs was contacted. However, the target population comprised thirty-five public sector universities and DAIs of Pakistan's Punjab Province. Hence, the multistage sampling technique was used to select the sample for the study.

Data Collection

A self-developed structured questionnaire was administered to collect data for the study. The researchers appointed associates to gather data from 1350 male and female participants of the selected universities of the public sector in Punjab Province. However, 1043 responses were shortlisted for the final study. The study abided by moral standards including informed consent, privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity. Moreover, ethical considerations were guaranteed during the data collection process. Participants were made aware of the study's objectives and their freedom to discontinue participation at any time. They were also given the assurance that no identifying information would be gathered and that their responses would be kept private.

Instrumentation

Demographics, individual differences, situational factors, symbolic interpretative influence, and whistle-blowing perceived attitude were the four subheadings of the questionnaire. In the demographic section, details on the participants' age, gender, number of years of teaching experience, and academic qualification were mentioned. The individual differences' part included preventing wrongdoings, moral reasoning, locus of control, decision-making, and civic values. Questions about the organizational environment, leadership style, prosocial behavior, and organizational commitment made up the situational factors section. Questions about the moral beliefs, conflict resolution, and employee loyalty of university teachers constituted the symbolic interpretative influence section. However, the whistle-blowing perceived attitude section consisted of questions regarding the awareness of wrongdoing, assessment of the seriousness of the wrongdoing, motivation to correct the wrongdoing, search for other persons who can correct the wrongdoing, search for other agencies which can correct the wrongdoing, assessment of consequences for self, others, and the wrongful behavior, assessment of management complicity or support for wrongdoing, and assessment of personal influence over the situation.

There were numerous phases involved in developing an instrument to assess how individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence affect the perceived attitude of university teachers toward whistle-blowing. These procedures were essential for guaranteeing the instrument's validity, dependability, and applicability. These phases were substantially elaborated in the whistle-blowing project of the first author (Malik, 2023) along with some general steps in the instrument development process, including the extensive review of the current research regarding whistle-blowing, its constructs, variable identification, item generation, expert review, pilot testing, establishing validity and reliability, and finalizing the instrument. Moreover, the tool validation process entailed many steps to guarantee the validity, reliability, and suitability of the measurement tool. Consequently, the final instrument had several distinct, reliable, and valid items that accurately captured the important structures and variables.

Data Analysis

Utilizing both descriptive and inferential statistics, the acquired data was examined. Means, standard deviations, and frequencies were used for descriptive statistical analysis that gave a general overview of the features of the sample and the distribution of responses. However, to compare the demographic effect of whistle-blowing, t-test, and ANOVA techniques were applied. Finally, correlation and regression analysis techniques were used to test the hypotheses related to the effect of individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence on the university teachers' perceived attitude toward whistle-blowing. These statistical techniques were used in data analysis to find trends, correlations, and important relationships between the relevant variables. The results of this study added to the body of knowledge regarding whistle-blowing in Pakistani HEIs by shedding light on the variables that could shape university teachers' perceptions of whistle-blowing. Based on the results of the data analysis, conclusions were made by critically evaluating them to consider the study's constraints and compare them to the body of previous research on whistle-blowing and its related concepts.

Delimitations of the Study

The study was delimited in two phases. In the first phase, it was delimited to 111 public-sector universities and DAIs of Pakistan in the year 2017-18. In the second phase, the study was delimited to 35 public-sector universities in Punjab province. Moreover, the use of self-reported data, the restricted generalizability of the results due to the sample size and the region analyzed, and the possibility of social desirability bias were some of the study's shortcomings and limitations. Additionally, this survey only looked at views toward whistle-blowing rather than actual behavior.

Results and Discussion

The following were the results and findings of the study:

Demographic Profile

The following was the demographic profile of the study:

The data were collected from 1043 participants regarding their gender (Male 600, Female 443), academic qualification (Master 120, M.Phil. 442, Ph.D. 481), and service experience (Less than six 325, six to ten 341, eleven to fifteen 199, sixteen to twenty 112, twenty one to twenty five 42, above twenty five 24).

Table 1
Relationship Between Whistle-Blowing Variables

Whistle-Blowing Variables	Correlation and Level of Significance	Individual Differences	Situational Factors	Symbolic Interpretative Influence	Whistle-Blowing Perceived Attitude
Individual Differences	Pearson Correlation	1	0.716**	0.645**	0.601**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000	0.000	0.000
Situational Factors	Pearson Correlation	0.716**	1	0.666**	0.617**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000		0.000	0.000
Symbolic Interpretative Influence	Pearson Correlation	0.645**	0.666**	1	0.601**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000		.000
Whistle-Blowing Perceived Attitude	Pearson Correlation	0.601**	0.617**	0.601**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	

Note. **. The Pearson correlation coefficient is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table displayed the relationships between four variables, including individual differences, situational factors, symbolic interpretative influence, and the university teachers' perceived attitude toward whistle-blowing. The Pearson correlation coefficient ranges from -1 to 1, where 0 denotes no correlation and 1 represents a perfect positive correlation (Akoglu, 2018). The strength of the correlation was interpreted by the three most used interpretations of the correlation coefficient, including strong, moderate, and low (Dancey & Reidy, 2007). However, the positive correlation indicates that as one variable increases, the others also tend to increase, while the negative correlation indicates that as one variable increases, the others tend to decrease (Schober et. al., 2018). The table showed that, with correlation values of 0.601, 0.617, and 0.601, respectively, substantial moderate correlations were found between individual differences, situational factors, symbolic interpretative influence, and the whistle-blowing perceived attitude. This indicated significant positive relationships among all four variables. However, the correlation between situational factors and whistle-blowing perceived attitude variables was greater than the remaining sets of variables. Apart from this, all predictor variables, including individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence were also found significantly correlated with each other. However, the correlation was strong between individual differences and situational factors variables with a coefficient value of 0.716. In contrast, it was moderate between individual differences and symbolic interpretative influence variables with a correlation value of 0.645. Similarly, the correlation was also moderate between situational factors and symbolic interpretative influence variables, with a correlation value of 0.666, respectively. This implied significant positive relationships among all three predictor variables. Hence, it was observed that the correlation between individual differences and situational factors variables was greater than the remaining sets of variables. Therefore, the findings suggested a significant positive relationship among all four variables of whistle-blowing. This implied that these variables may play an integral role in shaping the whistle-blowing perceived attitude among Pakistani university teachers.

Table 2
Effect of Whistle-Blowing by Checking the Model Fit through R-Square

Model	R	R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Predictors	0.685	0.469	0.468	0.56331

Dependent Variable: Whistle-Blowing Perceived Attitude

Predictors: (Constant), Individual Differences, Situational Factors, Symbolic Interpretative Influence

The table showed that the effects of individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence on the perceived attitude toward whistle-blowing were examined using the multiple regression analysis approach to ascertain the combined effect of the predictors on the resultant variable. As illustrated by the R-squared value of 0.469,

this showed an acceptable fit of the model to the data. This means that the combined effect of the three predictors accounted for about 46.9% of the variability in the whistle-blowing perceived attitude. Additionally, it presented that the interaction of the predictors had a significant effect of 46.8% on the outcome variable with the adjusted R-square value of 0.468. As a result, the findings demonstrated the importance of these factors in determining the perceived attitude of university teachers toward whistle-blowing. Hence, it was noted that the relationship was significant and substantially positive among all four variables, therefore none of them needed to be taken out of the model.

Table 3
Effect of Whistle-Blowing by Checking the Model Fit through ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	291.493	3	97.164	306.210	0.000
Residual	329.689	1039	0.317		
Total	621.182	1042			

Dependent Variable: Whistle-Blowing Perceived Attitude

Predictors: (Constant), Individual Differences, Situational Factors, Symbolic Interpretative Influence

The table evaluated the model fit using an ANOVA to show the effect of whistle-blowing. It presented that the model had a good fit for the data due to the reason that the F-statistics of 306.210 was significant at a 0.05 level of significance. It showed that the investigated model accurately depicted the correlation between these variables which indicated that individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence asserted a statistically significant effect on the whistle-blowing perceived attitude. Hence, it was proved that these factors had a significant effect on the university teachers' whistle-blowing attitude. However, the results also showed a sizable percentage of the variance in the dependent variable was satisfactorily explained by the current model. This suggested that the predictors, including individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence had a significant predictive value for the outcome variable and they were crucial in determining university teachers' perceived attitude toward whistle-blowing.

Table 4
Effect of Whistle-Blowing by Checking the Model Fit through Coefficients

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	1.292	0.097						
Individual Differences	0.220	0.032	0.233	0.601	0.207	0.154	0.437	2.290
Situational Factors	0.246	0.032	0.270	0.617	0.233	0.174	0.417	2.399
Symbolic Interpretative Influence	0.226	0.027	0.270	0.601	0.253	0.191	0.498	2.007

Dependent Variable: Whistle-Blowing Perceived Attitude

Predictors: (Constant), Individual Differences, Situational Factors, Symbolic Interpretative Influence

The table presented the coefficients for the multiple regression analysis results, including the estimates for the intercept and coefficients, correlations, and collinearity

statistics based on a 0.05 level of significance. The model's intercept and coefficients for the predictor variables were both shown in the table to be very significant. This established that no variable needed to be eliminated because all three predictors contributed significantly to the model. As a result, it was clear that the intercept estimates and coefficients for individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence were crucial in predicting the perceived attitude toward whistle-blowing. The dependent variable was, however, more strongly influenced by situational factors and symbolic interpretative influence than by individual differences among the predictors. The unstandardized beta coefficients showed that there was an additional rise in situational factors and symbolic interpretative influence of 0.246 and 0.226, respectively, for every 1-unit increase in these factors. However, every unit rise in individual differences caused a 0.220-unit increase in the dependent variable. The standardized beta coefficients also showed that situational factors and symbolic-interpretative influence had a greater effect on the dependent variable than individual differences. Hence, it was noted that situational factors and symbolic interpretative influence had a greater effect on the Pakistani university teachers' attitude toward whistle-blowing than did individual differences. This emphasized the significance of these factors among Pakistani university teachers to increase their perceived attitude toward whistle-blowing. However, the effect of individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence on the whistle-blowing perceived attitude was examined by the following multiple regression equation.

$$\text{Whistle-blowing Perceived Attitude} = 1.292 + 0.220 (\text{Individual Differences}) + 0.246 (\text{Situational Factors}) + 0.226 (\text{Symbolic Interpretative Influence}) + \text{error},$$

Discussion and Conclusions

Participants had a positive outlook on coming forward for whistle-blowing which was also reflected in the research work of Asyary et al. (2021) and Kanojia et al. (2020). This suggested that whistle-blowing is considered a crucial strategy for holding companies accountable and safeguarding the public. Similarly, the results also suggested that the participants had a favorable propensity to engage in a whistle-blowing attitude. In addition, few researchers have mentioned this positive attitude regarding whistle-blowing in their work (Arkorful, 2022; Lee et al., 2021; Mansor et al., 2020).

The findings showed a significant positive correlation between individual differences, situational factors, symbolic interpretative influence, and the university teachers' perceived attitude toward whistle-blowing. The study found a significant relationship between individual differences and the perceived attitude toward whistle-blowing. According to this, people's attitude toward reporting wrongdoing may be influenced by personality qualities including preventing wrongdoing, moral reasoning, and locus of control. The decision-making methods and civic values of a person might also have an effect on whistle-blowing. People with strong moral convictions are more inclined to believe that it is important to denounce wrongdoing, even if it goes against their interests. People with a strong locus of control are more prone to speak up when they see something wrong because they believe they can make a difference. When weighing the advantages and hazards of sharing information, those who are strong at making decisions are more likely to decide that it is the best course of action. Furthermore, despite the difficulties, those who have strong civic values are more likely to believe that upholding the law and ethical standards is necessary. Also, significant relationships may be reflected between the related variables in some prior studies as well (Lee et al., 2021; Mansor et al., 2022a, 2022b; Nuswantara, 2023; Toolami et al., 2019). The analysis showed a significant correlation between situational factors and the whistle-blowing perceived attitude that was strongly positive. This suggested that factors related to organizations, such as organizational environment, leadership style, prosocial behavior, and organizational commitment, have a big effect on the employees' attitude toward blowing the whistle. Whistle-blowing is more likely to be supported by organizations with strong ethics and compliance culture. It is also

more likely to occur under the direction of leaders who encourage it and provide a secure environment in which to report wrongdoing. Last but not least, people who are prosocial and eager to assist others are more likely to blow the whistle. Similarly, significant relationships may be observed between the related variables in some prior studies as well (Güven & Şahin, 2023; Jannah et al., 2023; Khan et al., 2022; Nuswantara, 2023;). According to the study, symbolic interpretative influence and whistle-blowing perceived attitude have a moderately positive relationship. This suggested that people's attitudes toward whistle-blowing are moderately influenced by factors like moral beliefs, ability to resolve conflicts, and loyalty to one's employer. Strong moral beliefs increase the likelihood that a person will think it is crucial to report wrongdoing. Conflict-savvy people are more likely to be able to handle the difficulties of whistle-blowing positively. Finally, people who are devoted to their company are more likely to consider the advantages and disadvantages of whistle-blowing before making a choice. Likewise, significant relationships may be seen between the related variables in some prior studies as well (Assmann, 2022; Gupta & Bhal, 2021; Svenkerud et al., 2021).

Hence, individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence all play a significant role in influencing university teachers' perceptions of their obligations to report misconduct. Fostering a supportive attitude toward whistle-blowing in academic settings may depend on acknowledging and addressing these factors. When implementing policies and practices relating to whistle-blowing, organizations and institutions should take into account the relationship between these factors.

According to the study's findings, individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence are all significant contributors to the development of Pakistani university teachers' attitudes toward whistle-blowing. This implied that these factors all work together to influence how people feel about coming forward with information. The analysis showed that the whistle-blowing perceived attitude among Pakistani university teachers was significantly influenced by all three predictor variables. This suggested that each of these factors influences how people perceive whistle-blowing generally. Although individual differences contributed significantly to the model, their influence on the whistle-blowing perceived attitude lagged in situational factors and symbolic interpretive influence. This suggested that individual differences along with their sub-variables, in comparison to situational and symbolic interpretative influence factors, had a relatively smaller effect on whistle-blowing attitude. Moreover, significant effects may be detected between the related variables in some prior studies as well (Lee et al., 2021; Mansor et al., 2022a, 2022b; Nuswantara, 2023; Winnanda & Ahmar, 2023). The analysis showed that the whistle-blowing perceived attitude was significantly influenced by situational factors. This suggested that situational factors had a big effect on how Pakistani university teachers felt about blowing the whistle. The findings revealed that these factors along with their sub-indicators, more so than individual ones, had significant effects on the perceived attitude of university teachers in Pakistan toward whistle-blowing. In addition, significant effects may be found between the related variables in some prior studies as well (Khan et al., 2022; Naufal et al., 2020a, 2020b; Nuswantara, 2023;). The whistle-blowing perceived attitude was also significantly influenced by symbolic interpretative influence. This suggested that the attitude toward whistle-blowing in the context of Pakistani universities was significantly influenced by these factors along with its sub-variables. Besides, significant effects may be uncovered between the related variables in some prior studies as well (Gupta & Bhal, 2021; Svenkerud et al., 2021).

Hence, the study's conclusions emphasize the importance of individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence in determining the perceived attitude of whistle-blowing among Pakistani university teachers. Individual differences do affect the whistle-blowing attitude, but situational factors and symbolic interpretative influence had a stronger effect. These findings highlighted the significance of these factors

to take them into account when developing policies meant to encourage whistle-blowing in academic settings.

Recommendations of the Study

The overall perception of whistle-blowing among university teachers is shaped by these factors taken together. A variety of factors can have an effect on whistle-blowing. Hence, individual, situational, or symbolic-interpretative influence factors can all be considered. Organizations can develop a culture that supports and protects whistle-blowers by being aware of these factors. The overall implications of these findings highlighted the importance of all factors while also offering insightful information about the interaction between them.

When developing strategies to encourage a pro-whistle-blowing perceived attitude, organizations may adopt an integrated approach that considers individual differences, situational factors, and symbolic interpretative influence all at once. Organizations may create a comprehensive and effective environment for promoting whistle-blowing by addressing all these factors holistically. Institutions may concentrate on offering courses in ethics that help people develop traits like moral judgment and ethical decision-making abilities. People may be more likely to recognize and address wrongdoing if a solid ethical foundation is encouraged. Giving them training and development opportunities that improve these traits may have a big effect on how willing they are to raise the alarm. Organizations may promote a good and moral work environment to improve situational factors. This may be accomplished by fostering supportive leadership styles, encouraging open communication, and fostering employee engagement and commitment to the organization's values. Creating a culture that values moral behavior may motivate people to come forward to blow the whistle when necessary. Organizations may concentrate on strengthening symbolic interpretative influence factors like moral values and ethical principles through organizational policies, codes of conduct, and training programs. Additionally, efforts may be made to increase employee engagement and loyalty because these factors may have a positive effect on an employee's propensity to raise the alarm when necessary. Organizations may offer information and tools that encourage people to have faith in their ability to affect change and fight injustice. In addition to creating channels for people to voice their concerns without fear of retaliation, this may involve providing training in effective communication, conflict resolution, and assertiveness techniques to increase the whistle-blowing perceived attitude among employees.

Additionally, businesses may continuously assess the performance of their whistle-blower policies and programs. Organizations need to be explicit about their policy on protecting whistle-blowers from reprisals. The procedure for reporting wrongdoings may be outlined in the policy, along with a clear definition of what whistle-blowing entails. Also included in the policy may be a guarantee that whistle-blowers won't face reprisals. The whistle-blowing policy may be explained to employees, and they may be given the chance to ask any questions they may have so that they may feel free to report wrongdoing without worrying about consequences. Organizations may set up transparent and easily accessible reporting mechanisms to encourage a positive whistle-blowing culture. This entails putting in place systems for anonymous reporting, offering assistance, and protection to those who come forward with information, and regularly evaluating the reporting procedure to find and fix any barriers or flaws. People may feel more at ease sharing their concerns if the environment is one that values and protects whistle-blowers. In addition to the abovesaid recommendations, organizations may take into account the suggestions like evaluating the success of their initiatives and programs for encouraging whistle-blowing, allowing whistle-blowers to remain anonymous, creating a procedure for looking into accusations of wrongdoing, taking the proper action if wrongdoing is discovered, establishing a culture of accountability and transparency, encouraging employees to report wrongdoing, educating people on whistle-blowing, and establishing an atmosphere of fearlessness and openness.

Hence, by putting these suggestions into practice, organizations may foster an ethical climate that motivates people to identify wrongdoing and report it, ultimately fostering institutional transparency, integrity, and accountability.

Suggestions for Future Research

It is unclear if the study's conclusions apply to other populations because it only included a sample of Pakistani university teachers belonging to the Punjab province. The variables that affect the whistle-blowing perceived attitude in other contexts require further study.

Future researchers may be able to explore participants' attitudinal disparities regarding whistle-blowing with various demographic information other than this study. They may include residential status, age, income, and marital status to investigate the differential effects of whistle-blowing. Moreover, several other personality factors may be considered to find the effect of whistle-blowing on their attitude and behavior. Similarly, the effect of whistle-blowing may be examined on various organizational variables other than those taken in this study. A comparative analysis may be performed among different faculties and departments to determine the significant differences in participants' views in this regard. In addition, some other studies may be conducted on the diversified sample of Pakistan's other provinces as the present study took the study's sample from the Punjab province only. Besides, interventional studies may be performed to analyze the whistle-blowing effect of different groups of employees. However, non-teaching staff or students may be taken as the study's sample to identify their opinions on whistle-blowing. Anyway, researchers may conduct longitudinal studies to determine its effect over a certain period.

References

- Abbas, N., & Ashiq, U. (2020). Why I don't Blow the Whistle? Perceived Barriers by the University Teachers to Report Wrong Doings. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal (LASSIJ)*, 4(2), 84–97
- Akoglu, H. (2018). User's guide to correlation coefficients. *Turkish Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 18(3), 91–93
- Arkorful, V. E. (2022). *Unravelling electricity theft whistleblowing antecedents using the theory of planned behavior and norm activation model*. *Energy Policy*, 160, 112680.
- Assmann, K. (2022). *Whistleblowers and their Faith in Journalism*. *Journalism Practice*, 1–20
- Asyary, A., Veruswati, M., Sagala, L. O. H. S., Saktiansyah, L. O. A., Susanna, D., & Moshammer, H. (2021). Support of the Implementation of a Whistleblowing System for Smoke-Free Environments: A Mixed Methods Approach. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(23), 12401
- Bouville, M. (2008). Whistle-blowing and morality. *Journal of business ethics*, 81, 579-585.
- Caillier, J. G. (2017). An examination of the role whistle-blowing education plays in the whistle-blowing process. *The Social Science Journal*, 54(1), 4–12
- Chiyangwa, S., Mutongi, C., Nyoni, T., & Nyoni, S. P. (2020). Barriers to Successful Implementation of Whistle Blowers' Protection Frameworks. *European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements*, 1(2), 1-6
- Cho, Y. J., & Song, H. J. (2015). Determinants of Whistleblowing Within Government Agencies. *Public Personnel Management*, 44(4), 450–472
- Dasgupta, S., & Kesharwani, A. (2011). *Whistleblowing: A survey of literature* (pp. 57-70). SSRN
- Dorasamy, N. (2012). Institutionalising a whistle blowing culture within higher education institutions: policy and procedure underpinning good governance at the Durban University of Technology. *Journal of economics and behavioral studies*. 4(9), 505-514.
- Dworkin, T. M., & Near, J. P. (1997). A better statutory approach to whistle-blowing. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 7(1), 1-16
- 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), 1-13
- Gupta, S., & Bhal, K. T. (2021). Reporting misdemeanors in the workplace: analysing enablers using modified TISM approach. *The TQM Journal*, 33(7), 57-75.
- Güven, S., & Şahin, B. (2023). A Study into the Relationship between Whistleblowing, Personal Ethical Values and Organizational Commitment: Hirschman's Exit, Voice and Loyalty in Tourism. *Journal of Travel & Hospitality Management/Seyahat ve Otel İşletmeciliği Dergisi*, 20(1). 24-40
- Jannah, K., Rohma, F. F., & Faisol, I. A. (2023). The Moderating Effect of Abusive Supervision on Religiosity and Whistleblowing Relationship: An Experimental Investigation. *Accounting Analysis Journal*, 12(1), 21-30.

- Kanojia, S., Sachdeva, S., & Sharma, J. P. (2020). Retaliatory effect on whistle blowing intentions: a study of Indian employees. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 27(4), 1221-1237.
- Keenan, J. P., & McLain, D. L. (1992, August). *Whistleblowing: A conceptualization and model*. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 1992, No. 1, pp. 348-352). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
- Khan, J., Saeed, I., Zada, M., Ali, A., Contreras-Barraza, N., Salazar-Sepúlveda, G., & Vega-Muñoz, A. (2022). Examining whistleblowing intention: The influence of rationalization on wrongdoing and threat of retaliation. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 19(3), 1752
- Lee, H., Kang, M. M., & Kim, S. Y. (2021). A psychological process of bureaucratic whistleblowing: Applying the theory of planned behavior. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 51(5), 374-392
- Lee, H., Zhang, X. A., Sung, Y. H., Lee, S., & Kim, J. N. (2022). Symmetry, inclusion and workplace conflicts: conflict management effects of two leadership strategies on employee advocacy and departure. *Journal of Communication Management*, 26(3), 349-370
- Malik, G. M. (2023). *Analyzing whistle-blowing practices and predictors in higher education: validation/implementation of interactionist model in the context of Pakistan* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Sargodha, Pakistan.
- Mansor, T. M. T., Ariff, A. M., Hashim, H. A., & Ngah, A. H. (2022a). Whistleblowing intentions among external auditors: an application of the moderated multicomponent model of the theory of planned behaviour. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 30(5), 1309-1333.
- Mansor, T. M. T., Mohamad Ariff, A., & Hashim, H. A. (2020). Whistleblowing by auditors: the role of professional commitment and independence commitment. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 35(8), 1033-1055
- Mansor, T. M. T., Mohamad Ariff, A., Hashim, H. A., & Ngah, A. H. (2022b). External whistleblowing intentions of auditors: a perspective based on stimulus–organism–response theory. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 22(4), 871-897
- Miceli, M. P., & Near, J. P. (1985). Characteristics of organizational climate and perceived wrongdoing associated with whistle-blowing decisions. *Personnel psychology*, 38(3), 525-544
- Miceli, M. P., & Near, J. P. (1988). Individual and situational correlates of whistle-blowing. *Personnel psychology*, 41(2), 267-281
- Naufal, M., Sofia, A., Prawira, I. F. A., & Apandi, R. N. N. (2020a). Exploring the whistleblowing intention. *Asia Proceedings of Social Sciences*, 5(1), 75-80.
- Naufal, M., Sofia, A., Prawira, I. F. A., & Apandi, R. N. N. (2020b). Whistleblower dilemma: Individual and situational factors in whistleblowing intention. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 11(12), 43-60
- Nayir, D. Z., Rehg, M. T., & Asa, Y. (2018). Influence of ethical position on whistleblowing behaviour: do preferred channels in private and public sectors differ? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 149, 147-167

- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1985). Organizational dissidence: The case of whistle-blowing. *Journal of business ethics, 4*, 1-16
- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1996). Whistle-blowing: Myth and reality. *Journal of management, 22*(3), 507-526
- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (2016). After the wrongdoing: What managers should know about whistleblowing. *Business Horizons, 59*(1), 105-114.
- Nuswantara, D. A. (2023). Reframing whistleblowing intention: An analysis of individual and situational factors. *Journal of Financial Crime, 30*(1), 266-284.
- Rocha, E., & Kleiner, B. H. (2005). To blow or not to blow the whistle? *That is the question. Management Research News, 28*(11/12), 80-87.
- Rose, J. M., Brink, A. G., & Norman, C. S. (2018). The effects of compensation structures and monetary rewards on managers' decisions to blow the whistle. *Journal of Business Ethics, 150*, 853-862
- Schober, P., Boer, C., & Schwarte, L. A. (2018). Correlation coefficients: appropriate use and interpretation. *Anesthesia & analgesia, 126*(5), 1763-1768.
- Svenkerud, P. J., Sørnes, J. O., & Browning, L. (2021). Whistleblowing, Communication and Consequences. In *Whistleblowing, Communication and Consequences*. Routledge
- Taylor, J. (2018). Internal whistle-blowing in the public service: A matter of trust. *Public Administration Review, 78*(5), 717-726
- Toolami, B. N., Roodposhti, F. R., Nikoomaram, H., Banimahd, B., & Vakilifard, H. (2019). The survey of whistleblowing intentions for accounting frauds based on demographic individual differences among accounting staff. *International Journal of Finance & Managerial Accounting, 4*(14), 1-13
- Winnanda, J. D., Harnovinsah, & Nurmala Ahmar. (2023). Determinant of Whistleblowing Intention with Remuneration as Moderation in Indonesian Open University. *JFBA: Journal of Financial and Behavioural Accounting, 3*(1), 23-40