

Perceptions of Justice as a Catalyst for Whistleblowing amongst Trainee Auditors

Faeenza Soni

Student number: 364056

Ethics number: CACCN/1053

A research report submitted to the faculty of
Commerce, Law and Management at the University
of the Witwatersrand in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of a Masters in
Commerce (Accountancy).

Supervisors:

Warren Maroun and Nirupa Padia

May 2014

ABSTRACT

This thesis presents empirical evidence of the factors that motivate trainee auditors to blow the whistle on wrongdoing in an audit firm. It investigates whether organisational justice (comprised of procedural, interactional and distributive justice) is positively correlated with the willingness to blow the whistle. It also investigates whether the type of justice (procedural, interactional and distributive justice) affects the decision to blow the whistle. Finally, it investigates whether professional performance, morality-proxied by a sense of religion-, seniority, age and gender affect this decision to blow the whistle.

The results indicate that most trainee auditors' sense of organisational justice is positively correlated to their likelihood to blow the whistle. All three justice dimensions (procedural, interactional and distributive justice) are found to increase trainee auditors' propensity to blow the whistle. High interactional justice is found to be a greater motivation to blow the whistle than procedural and distributive justice. Low distributive justice is found to be least effective as an impediment to whistleblowing, whilst low procedural and interactional justice are more effective than low distributive justice in deterring whistleblowing.

This research finds that age, gender, seniority and religion do not affect the trainee auditor's propensity to blow the whistle. Most recent performance ratings do not affect trainee auditors' decision to blow the whistle, except in the case of trainees who received a low performance rating when there was low interactional justice.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this research report is my own unaided work. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of Master of Commerce by Coursework and Research Report at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted elsewhere for the purpose of being awarded another degree or for examination purposes at any other university.

Signature:

Faeza Soni

25 May 2014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my parents, Salima and Abdul Samad Soni, for always prioritising my education, as well as for their constant support and encouragement throughout my studies.

To my first supervisor, Warren Maroun, for his advice, availability, enthusiasm and encouragement.

To my second supervisor, Nirupa Padia, for her guidance, availability and positive attitude

To Dina Venter, who assisted with the statistical analyses for this report.

To Lelys Madock, for editing this report.

To my friends and siblings, for their support and understanding.

To all the trainee auditors who gave the time to participate in this study.

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	7
1.1	Purpose of this study.....	7
1.2	Definitions.....	7
1.3	Background and contribution of the research	8
1.4	Limitations and delimitations	10
1.5	Assumptions.....	10
2	LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11
2.1	What is whistleblowing?	11
2.2	Whistleblowing in an external auditing context	12
2.3	Motivations for blowing the whistle	14
2.3.1	The structural model and organisational justice theory.....	15
2.3.2	Components of organisational justice	16
2.4	Other motivational factors	18
2.4.1	Good performance	18
2.4.2	Religion	18
2.4.3	Level of seniority (Length of service)	18
2.4.4	Age	19
2.4.5	Gender	19
2.4.6	Audit firm size	19
2.4.7	Seriousness of the wrongdoing.....	19
2.4.8	Legislative protection and training in statutory duties to blow the whistle.....	20
3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	20
3.1	Research design, data collection and data analysis.....	21
3.2	Population and sample.....	24
3.2.1	Population	24
3.2.2	Sample and sampling method	24
4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	25
4.1	Cursory analysis: Univariate descriptive statistics	26
4.2	Primary analyses.....	29
4.2.1	Low justice conditions	32
4.2.2	High justice conditions.....	35
4.3	Extraneous variables: Bivariate descriptive statistics	37
5	CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	50
6	REFERENCES.....	52
7	APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE	57
8	APPENDIX 2: MOTIVATIONS FOR, AND IMPEDIMENTS TO, WHISTELBLOWING IDENTIFIED IN PRIOR LITERATURE.....	63

9 APPENDIX 3: TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS 66

10 APPENDIX 4: ETHICS CLEARANCE..... 67

##

2 L

