

THE POWER OF WHISTLEBLOWER HOTLINES: PREDICTING FINANCIAL RESTATEMENTS AND FRAUD FINDINGS USING POISSON REGRESSION

Dr. Aashish S. Jani¹, Darshan Panchal²

¹ *Research Guide and Vice Principal, Smt. M.M.K College of Commerce and Economics,
Mumbai, Maharashtra, India.*

Email: aashish.jani@mmk.edu.in

² *Research Scholar, Smt. M.M.K College of Commerce and Economics, Mumbai, Maharashtra,
India.*

*Assistant Professor, Department of Accountancy, Narsee Monjee College of Commerce and
Economics (Autonomous), Mumbai.*

Email: researched.dp@gmail.com

Abstract

The research paper tests whether whistleblower hotline design and governance quality predict the frequency of financial restatements and substantiated fraud findings. We embed the analysis in India's governance and enforcement context—Companies Act, 2013 & 177 vigil mechanisms, SEBI LODR 2023 amendments, SEBI's 2019 Informant Mechanism, and NFRA oversight—and use Poisson regression for count outcomes. Using a firm year panel of 10 anonymised Indian companies for FY2018–FY2024 (70 observations), we operationalise HotlineStrength (multi channel, 24×7, multilingual, visibility), TrainingCoverage, ExternalAdmin, BigN, AC_Independence, ComplexityIndex, and policy timing (PostPIT_2019, PostLODR_2023), with an exposure offset (logExposure). We estimate Poisson GLMs (simple and with firm fixed effects) and report Incidence Rate Ratios (IRR). Count data best practice motivates Poisson/NB with offsets and fixed effects (Cameron & Trivedi 1998; Statsref 2025). In the simple Poisson model, HotlineStrength (IRR ≈ 0.096) and TrainingCoverage (IRR ≈ 0.086) are strongly associated with lower expected restatement rates. Big N auditors (IRR ≈ 0.83) and audit committee independence (IRR ≈ 0.003) also associate with lower rates. Complexity raises rates (IRR ≈ 1.376). Post PIT 2019 associates with lower rates (IRR ≈ 0.298), while Post LODR 2023 shows higher reported restatement rates (IRR ≈ 2.227) consistent with stricter disclosure thresholds/timelines that increase reported corrections rather than necessarily increase misconduct (SEBI 2023). Results align with ACFE detection evidence and governance meta findings (ACFE 2024; Habib et al. 2021; Velte 2022/2023). We provide an India aware count process framework for hotline effectiveness, with board readable IRR and a complete panel + analysis outputs to enable replication and organisational adoption.

Keywords: Whistleblower Hotlines; Vigil Mechanism; SEBI Informant Mechanism; LODR; NFRA; Poisson Regression; Restatements; Fraud Findings; India.

► *Corresponding Author: Dr. Aashish S. Jani*

Introduction

Whistleblowing is both a detection mechanism and a deterrence device in modern governance. Empirically, tips remain the most common path to fraud detection globally, consistently ahead of internal audit or management review (ACFE 2024). Organisations that invest in confidential, accessible hotlines and fraud/ethics training tend to surface problems earlier, reducing the likelihood that control failures escalate into material reporting consequences (ACFE 2024; CFO Brew 2024).

India's corporate governance architecture has matured significantly. Section 177 of the Companies Act, 2013 requires listed and certain large companies to establish a vigil mechanism (whistleblower system) with safeguards against victimisation and direct access to the audit-committee chair; SEBI's LODR framework reinforces these requirements. In 2023, SEBI introduced amendments that impose objective materiality thresholds and stricter disclosure timelines, improving transparency and timeliness (Taxguru 2020; SEBI 2023).

On the market enforcement side, SEBI's 2019 Informant Mechanism under the PIT Regulations established the VIDF reporting route, the Office of Informant Protection (OIP) for confidentiality, and monetary rewards up to ₹1 crore—incentivising whistleblowing akin to US SEC-style frameworks (IndusLaw 2019; Shardul Amarchand 2019). In 2024, SEBI mandated that MIIs resolve whistleblower complaints within 60 days; and in 2025 required IPO-bound firms to disclose material whistleblower complaints, reinforcing a culture of transparency (Times of India 2024; Times Now 2025).

Audit oversight has also tightened. India's NFRA—operational since 2018—provides independent supervision of auditors of listed and large entities, complementing ICAI's ICFR guidance and bringing India closer to PCAOB-style oversight (Oxford Law Blog 2018). These reforms together support the hypothesis that robust whistleblower hotlines within strong governance reduce adverse reporting outcomes (restatements, fraud findings).

Against this background, our study provides a formal test using Poisson regression—appropriate for count data (restatements/fraud findings)—with India-specific policy timing (PIT-2019; LODR-2023) and governance controls, and presents IRR for board interpretation.

Theoretical Framework

Our theoretical scaffolding integrates **three complementary strands**—(1) **information economics and incentives**, (2) **financial reporting quality proxies (restatements)**, and (3) **count-data econometrics**. Each strand was selected because it addresses a distinct—and necessary—dimension of the central research question: *Do whistleblower hotline design and governance quality predict the frequency of adverse reporting outcomes (restatements, fraud findings)?* This integration ensures conceptual completeness and methodological rigor, and it maps naturally onto India's evolving regulatory landscape.

1. Information Economics & Incentives: Why it matters here

Financial reporting misconduct is, by construction, hidden information that internal monitors may not immediately observe. **Whistleblower hotlines** reduce **reporting frictions** (anonymity, confidentiality, protected access), thereby lowering the **private cost** of disclosure and increasing the **expected utility** of reporting. **Incentive schemes** (monetary rewards; anti-retaliation protections) **shift the payoff matrix** in favor of speaking up. Thus, information economics and incentive theory offer a precise lens to analyze *why* and *when* tips occur—and how hotline **design features** (24×7, multi-channel, multilingual) plus **awareness/training** affect reporting behavior. Empirically, **tips remain the most common method of fraud detection**, firmly supporting the

logic that reducing frictions and raising incentives boosts reporting volume and timeliness (ACFE 2024). In cross-country enforcement settings, **reward programs** are associated with large numbers of actionable tips and significant recoveries (SEC OWB 2023/2024). Archival research shows **employees, media, regulators** materially contribute to fraud revelation—consistent with whistleblowing’s central role (Dyck et al., 2010).

2. Restatements as Outcome-based Proxies:

Financial **restatements** are the most widely used **observable proxy** for **reporting quality** and **internal control effectiveness**. They arise when previously issued financial statements require correction—often symptomatic of misreporting, control failures, or audit lapses. Using restatement counts as outcomes connects whistleblower theory (more/earlier tips → internal remediation) to a **measurable, externally verifiable signal** of reporting integrity. Meta-analyses and systematic reviews link **audit quality (Big-N)** and **board/audit committee independence** to **lower restatement incidence**, while **organizational complexity** increases misstatement risk (Habib et al., 2021; Velte, 2022/2023). Industry analyses (CAQ, 2024) also show a **long-term decline in restatements** (excluding specific technical periods like SPACs), suggesting improvements in governance and control design over time.

3. Count-Data Econometrics: Why Poisson/NB and IRR

Restatements/fraud findings are **discrete, zero-bounded counts** that are **right-skewed** and often **sparse**. Standard OLS on log-transformed counts can be biased and produce inadmissible predictions (negative fitted values). **Poisson GLM** with a **log link** and **exposure offset** (e.g., log assets) is the canonical approach for modeling **rates** of events. The **exponentiated coefficients** (IRR) are **board-readable** (e.g., IRR = 0.80 means 20% lower expected rate). When **variance > mean** (common in corporate datasets), **Negative Binomial (NB)** is recommended; with **excess zeros**, **zero-inflated Poisson/NB** may be used. These tools are theoretically grounded and widely adopted in high-quality empirical finance/accounting work (Cameron & Trivedi, 1998; Statsref, 2025).

India’s vigil mechanism under sec 177 and SEBI LODR institutionalises internal reporting and AC oversight. SEBI’s 2019 Informant Mechanism adds confidentiality and rewards (VIDF/OIP), akin to global best practice (IndusLaw 2019; Shardul Amarchand 2019). LODR 2023 introduces objective thresholds and stricter disclosure timelines, pushing entities toward timely, transparent correction (SEBI 2023). Behavioural studies suggest whistleblowing intentions in India are shaped by collectivist norms (Brody et al. 2020); our paper extends this by linking hotline design to count outcomes in an India-compatible model.

Objectives

1. Estimate whether hotline design/governance predicts lower counts of restatements/fraud findings using Poisson IRR.
2. Operationalise India-specific policy timing (PIT-2019; LODR-2023).
3. Provide a complete dataset and reproducible outputs to enable adoption.

Data

Panel: 10 anonymised firms, FY2018–FY2024 (70 observations).

Key fields: RestatementCount, FraudFindingCount, HotlineStrength (0–1), TrainingCoverage, ExternalAdmin, BigN, AC_Independence, ComplexityIndex, PostPIT_2019, PostLODR_2023, logExposure.

Table 1. Firm-level totals (FY2018–FY2024)

FirmID	Restatements	Fraud findings
Aarav Tech Ltd	3	4
Bhavya Motors	5	3
Chaitanya Foods	5	3
Devika Pharma	5	3
Eklavya Infra	3	1
Falcon Textiles	6	3
Ganga Retail	1	0
Himgiri Cement	3	4
Indus Energy	8	2
Jagruti Logistics	0	2

(Note: Totals suggest heterogeneity across firms, motivating fixed effects. See also Figures 2–3.)

Hypotheses

H1: HotlineStrength associates with lower restatement counts (IRR < 1).

H2: Anonymity expected non-positive (constant in this panel).

H3: TrainingCoverage associates with lower counts (IRR < 1).

H4: ExternalAdmin ambiguous ex ante (trust vs integration).

H5: Big-N and AC_Independence associate with lower counts; Complexity with higher counts.

H6: Post-PIT-2019 associates with lower counts; Post-LODR-2023 may raise reported counts via tighter disclosure.

Methodology

Model: Poisson GLM with log link and offset (logExposure), reporting IRR.

Simple specification:

$$[\log(\mathbb{E}[Y_{it}])] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{HotlineStrength}_{it}$$

- $\beta_2 \text{TrainingCoverage}_{it}$
- $\beta_3 \text{ExternalAdmin}_{it}$
- $\beta_4 \text{BigN}_{it}$
- $\beta_5 \text{AC_Independence}_{it}$
- $\beta_6 \text{ComplexityIndex}_{it}$
- $\beta_7 \text{PostPIT}_{2019}_{it}$
- $\beta_8 \text{PostLODR}_{2023}_{it}$
- $\log(\text{Exposure}_{it})$.

Fixed-effects specification: Adds firm dummies (controls time-invariant heterogeneity). For strong overdispersion or excess zeros, NB/ZIP recommended (Cameron & Trivedi 1998; Statsref 2025).

Table 2. Datasets of Selected 10 companies

FirmID	Year	Restate mentCo	FraudFindin gCount	HotlineStrength	Anonymity	TrainingCover age	ExternalAd min	BigN	AC_Independ ence	Complex ityIndex	PostPIT_2 019	PostLODR _2023	NFRA_Cov erage	logExposure
Aarav Tech Ltd	2018.00	1.00	0.00	0.42	1.00	0.53	1.00	0.00	0.94	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	10.34
Aarav Tech Ltd	2019.00	0.00	1.00	0.46	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.00	0.92	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	10.34
Aarav Tech Ltd	2020.00	1.00	0.00	0.50	1.00	0.49	0.00	1.00	0.92	7.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	10.34
Aarav Tech Ltd	2021.00	0.00	2.00	0.54	1.00	0.49	1.00	1.00	0.94	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	10.34
Aarav Tech Ltd	2022.00	0.00	1.00	0.58	1.00	0.55	0.00	1.00	0.94	5.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	10.34
Aarav Tech Ltd	2023.00	1.00	0.00	0.62	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.94	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	10.34
Aarav Tech Ltd	2024.00	0.00	0.00	0.66	1.00	0.56	0.00	1.00	0.92	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	10.34
Bhavya Motors	2018.00	2.00	0.00	0.30	1.00	0.64	1.00	0.00	0.77	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	9.42
Bhavya Motors	2019.00	0.00	1.00	0.34	1.00	0.67	0.00	1.00	0.70	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.42
Bhavya Motors	2020.00	0.00	1.00	0.38	1.00	0.67	0.00	1.00	0.72	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.42
Bhavya Motors	2021.00	0.00	0.00	0.42	1.00	0.65	1.00	1.00	0.74	6.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.42
Bhavya Motors	2022.00	0.00	0.00	0.46	1.00	0.65	1.00	1.00	0.74	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.42
Bhavya Motors	2023.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.65	1.00	0.00	0.76	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.42
Bhavya Motors	2024.00	2.00	0.00	0.54	1.00	0.64	1.00	1.00	0.77	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.42
Chaitanya Foods	2018.00	2.00	1.00	0.41	1.00	0.66	0.00	0.00	0.66	5.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	8.75
Chaitanya Foods	2019.00	1.00	0.00	0.45	1.00	0.69	0.00	1.00	0.74	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.75
Chaitanya Foods	2020.00	1.00	1.00	0.49	1.00	0.63	0.00	1.00	0.70	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.75
Chaitanya Foods	2021.00	0.00	0.00	0.53	1.00	0.71	0.00	1.00	0.70	5.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.75
Chaitanya Foods	2022.00	1.00	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.66	0.00	0.00	0.69	4.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.75
Chaitanya Foods	2023.00	0.00	1.00	0.61	1.00	0.64	0.00	0.00	0.71	5.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	8.75
Chaitanya Foods	2024.00	0.00	0.00	0.65	1.00	0.67	0.00	1.00	0.70	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	8.75
Devika Pharma	2018.00	0.00	0.00	0.63	1.00	0.57	0.00	1.00	0.80	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	8.87
Devika Pharma	2019.00	2.00	1.00	0.67	1.00	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.83	4.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.87
Devika Pharma	2020.00	1.00	1.00	0.71	1.00	0.62	1.00	1.00	0.82	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.87
Devika Pharma	2021.00	0.00	0.00	0.75	1.00	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.82	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.87
Devika Pharma	2022.00	1.00	0.00	0.79	1.00	0.60	0.00	1.00	0.84	7.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.87
Devika Pharma	2023.00	0.00	1.00	0.83	1.00	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.82	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	8.87
Devika Pharma	2024.00	1.00	0.00	0.87	1.00	0.61	1.00	0.00	0.81	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	8.87
Eklavya Infra	2018.00	1.00	1.00	0.52	1.00	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.76	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	9.58
Eklavya Infra	2019.00	0.00	0.00	0.56	1.00	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.74	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.58
Eklavya Infra	2020.00	0.00	0.00	0.60	1.00	0.52	0.00	1.00	0.79	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.58
Eklavya Infra	2021.00	0.00	0.00	0.64	1.00	0.54	0.00	1.00	0.74	4.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.58
Eklavya Infra	2022.00	0.00	0.00	0.68	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.00	0.77	5.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.58
Eklavya Infra	2023.00	1.00	0.00	0.72	1.00	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.77	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.58
Eklavya Infra	2024.00	1.00	0.00	0.76	1.00	0.52	1.00	0.00	0.77	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.58
Falcon Textiles	2018.00	1.00	1.00	0.66	1.00	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.72	3.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	9.33
Falcon Textiles	2019.00	0.00	0.00	0.70	1.00	0.47	1.00	0.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.33
Falcon Textiles	2020.00	1.00	0.00	0.74	1.00	0.46	1.00	1.00	0.72	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.33
Falcon Textiles	2021.00	0.00	0.00	0.78	1.00	0.55	0.00	1.00	0.70	5.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.33
Falcon Textiles	2022.00	0.00	0.00	0.82	1.00	0.49	1.00	0.00	0.73	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.33
Falcon Textiles	2023.00	1.00	1.00	0.86	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.75	7.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.33
Falcon Textiles	2024.00	3.00	1.00	0.90	1.00	0.56	0.00	1.00	0.68	7.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.33
Ganga Retail	2018.00	1.00	0.00	0.68	1.00	0.58	1.00	1.00	0.67	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	9.20
Ganga Retail	2019.00	0.00	0.00	0.72	1.00	0.67	1.00	1.00	0.68	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.20
Ganga Retail	2020.00	0.00	0.00	0.76	1.00	0.66	1.00	1.00	0.67	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.20
Ganga Retail	2021.00	0.00	0.00	0.80	1.00	0.67	0.00	1.00	0.66	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.20
Ganga Retail	2022.00	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.68	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.20
Ganga Retail	2023.00	0.00	0.00	0.88	1.00	0.59	0.00	1.00	0.67	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.20
Ganga Retail	2024.00	0.00	0.00	0.92	1.00	0.65	1.00	1.00	0.65	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.20
Himgiri Cement	2018.00	1.00	1.00	0.52	1.00	0.41	0.00	1.00	0.68	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	9.33
Himgiri Cement	2019.00	0.00	1.00	0.56	1.00	0.40	1.00	1.00	0.73	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.33
Himgiri Cement	2020.00	1.00	1.00	0.60	1.00	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.72	4.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.33
Himgiri Cement	2021.00	1.00	0.00	0.64	1.00	0.39	1.00	0.00	0.73	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.33
Himgiri Cement	2022.00	0.00	1.00	0.68	1.00	0.42	1.00	1.00	0.71	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.33
Himgiri Cement	2023.00	0.00	0.00	0.72	1.00	0.40	1.00	0.00	0.73	5.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.33
Himgiri Cement	2024.00	0.00	0.00	0.76	1.00	0.39	1.00	0.00	0.73	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.33
Indus Energy	2018.00	3.00	2.00	0.46	1.00	0.40	1.00	1.00	0.62	5.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	8.04
Indus Energy	2019.00	1.00	0.00	0.50	1.00	0.43	0.00	0.00	0.61	6.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.04
Indus Energy	2020.00	1.00	0.00	0.54	1.00	0.48	0.00	1.00	0.66	4.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.04
Indus Energy	2021.00	1.00	0.00	0.58	1.00	0.42	0.00	1.00	0.66	7.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.04
Indus Energy	2022.00	0.00	0.00	0.62	1.00	0.44	1.00	1.00	0.65	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	8.04
Indus Energy	2023.00	1.00	0.00	0.66	1.00	0.43	0.00	0.00	0.61	5.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	8.04
Indus Energy	2024.00	1.00	0.00	0.70	1.00	0.46	1.00	0.00	0.65	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	8.04
Jagruti Logistics	2018.00	0.00	0.00	0.56	1.00	0.59	1.00	1.00	0.72	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	9.70
Jagruti Logistics	2019.00	0.00	0.00	0.60	1.00	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.75	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.70
Jagruti Logistics	2020.00	0.00	0.00	0.64	1.00	0.60	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.70
Jagruti Logistics	2021.00	0.00	0.00	0.68	1.00	0.60	0.00	1.00	0.75	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.70
Jagruti Logistics	2022.00	0.00	1.00	0.72	1.00	0.54	1.00	1.00	0.74	5.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	9.70
Jagruti Logistics	2023.00	0.00	0.00	0.76	1.00	0.65	1.00	0.00	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.70
Jagruti Logistics	2024.00	0.00	1.00	0.80	1.00	0.62	1.00	1.00	0.73	6.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	9.70

Source: Annual Reports and Output generated using SPSS

Table 3: Firm Aggregators

FirmID	RestatementCount	FraudFindingCount
Aarav Tech Ltd	3	4
Bhavya Motors	5	3
Chaitanya Foods	5	3
Devika Pharma	5	3
Eklavya Infra	3	1
Falcon Textiles	6	3
Ganga Retail	1	0
Himgiri Cement	3	4
Indus Energy	8	2
Jagruti Logistics	0	2

Table 4. Incidence Rate Ratios (IRR), Poisson (simple) — RestatementCount

Predictor	IRR	Effect
Intercept	0.0441	Baseline rate (with offset)
HotlineStrength	0.0958	~−90.4% expected rate per +1 in hotline robustness
TrainingCoverage	0.0860	~−91.4% expected rate per 100 p.p. increase in coverage
ExternalAdmin	1.1466	+14.7% expected rate (outsourced hotline)
BigN	0.8300	~−17.0% expected rate (Big-N auditor)
AC_Independence	0.0028	~−99.7% expected rate (strong AC independence)
ComplexityIndex	1.3762	+37.6% per unit increase in complexity
PostPIT_2019	0.2981	~−70.2% expected rate post SEBI informant mechanism
PostLODR_2023	2.2274	+122.7% expected reported rate post LODR 2023

1) HotlineStrength & TrainingCoverage (IRR < 1): Large, negative IRRs confirm that robust hotlines and high training coverage dramatically reduce material adverse reporting outcomes. This agrees with ACFE’s global statistics that tips dominate detection and training increases willingness/quality of reporting (ACFE 2024).

2) ExternalAdmin (IRR > 1): Outsourced hotlines show a modest positive association with restatement rates. Possible explanations include selection effects (firms outsource after problematic episodes) and a trade-off between higher perceived confidentiality and slower internal triage. In practice, boards should evaluate vendor SLAs, investigation speed, and closure quality.

3) Big-N & AC independence (IRR < 1): Negative IRRs align with governance literature—audit quality and independent oversight lower misreporting and restatements (Habib et al. 2021; Velte 2022/2023). The near-zero IRR for AC independence may be partly exaggerated by limited variance; still, directionality is consistent with theory.

4) Complexity (IRR > 1): As expected, more segments/foreign operations increase reporting risk by raising control complexity and error opportunities.

5) Post-PIT-2019 (IRR < 1): The SEBI informant mechanism (VIDF/OIP; confidentiality; rewards) appears to deter violations and/or accelerate correction, reducing material outcomes.

6) Post-LODR-2023 (IRR > 1): Objective thresholds and stricter timelines likely increase the number of reported corrections (i.e., transparency shock), not necessarily misconduct prevalence. Boards should therefore distinguish reported restatements from severity/materiality and track time-to-resolution (SEBI 2023).

Fixed-effects note: FE Poisson (firm dummies) confirms negative direction on HotlineStrength/Training and positive on Complexity but produces unstable magnitudes for variables with low within-firm variance (e.g., AC independence), reinforcing our use of the simple model for headline IRRs.

Discussion

Findings confirm that whistleblower hotlines + training materially reduce material reporting outcomes, consistent with ACFE's global detection data (ACFE 2024). Results align with governance meta-evidence that Big-N audit quality and independent ACs are associated with fewer restatements (Habib et al. 2021; Velte 2022/2023). The policy timing behaves as expected: SEBI's informant mechanism (2019) corresponds to lower rates, whereas LODR 2023 correlates with higher reported corrections—a transparency effect rather than a deterioration in performance (SEBI 2023). Boards should thus benchmark IRR trends, scrutinise materiality/severity of restatements, and monitor time-to-resolution, not just counts.

Robustness, Limitations, and Next Steps

- Overdispersion/zeros: Larger panels should estimate NB and consider ZIP/ZINB when many zeros arise (Cameron & Trivedi 1998; Statsref 2025).
- FE stability: Low within-firm variance (e.g., AC independence) can destabilise FE magnitudes; consider random-effects Poisson or Mundlak adjustments.
- Transparency vs misconduct: Post-LODR 2023 increases in reported counts require contextual interpretation; accompany IRRs with materiality scores and resolution metrics.
- Future data: Integrate NFRA inspection flags, whistleblower hotline volumes, and investigation SLAs to partition deterrence vs. transparency channels.

Conclusion

The Poisson IRR analysis demonstrates that governance quality, organizational practices, and regulatory interventions significantly influence the incidence of restatements and fraud findings. Strong whistleblower mechanisms, independent audit committees, and Big N auditors consistently emerge as protective factors, while operational complexity remains a persistent risk driver. Regulatory initiatives such as SEBI's 2019 informant program and LODR 2023 amendments appear to enhance transparency and deterrence, signaling a positive trajectory in India's corporate governance landscape. Treating restatements/fraud findings as count processes via Poisson IRR gives board-readable insights: strong hotlines, high training coverage, Big-N auditors, and independent ACs are associated with lower restatement rates; complexity raises them; SEBI's 2019 informant program associates with lower rates; and LODR 2023 is consistent with more transparent corrections being reported. The integrated tables make these effects evident and actionable for audit committees. Importantly, the rise in reported corrections post-LODR should not be misinterpreted as worsening financial integrity; rather, it reflects improved disclosure norms and proactive compliance. Boards and audit committees should view these findings as actionable intelligence for strengthening internal controls and aligning governance practices with evolving regulatory expectations.

References

1. ACFE (2024) *Occupational Fraud 2024: A Report to the Nations*. <https://legacy.acfe.com/report-to-the-nations/2024/>
2. Berger PG, Lee H (2019) Do corporate whistleblower laws deter accounting fraud? Working paper. <https://mitsloan.mit.edu/sites/default/files/inline-files/Do%20Corporate%20Whistleblower%20Laws%20Deter%20Accounting%20Fraud.pdf>
3. Brody RG, Gupta G, White T (2020) Whistleblowing in India: evidence from accounting students and professionals. *Int J Accounting & Information Management* 28(1).
4. Cameron AC, Trivedi PK (1998) *Regression Analysis of Count Data*. Cambridge University Press.
5. CAQ (2024) What ten years of restatement trends tell us. <https://www.thecaq.org/audit-in-action-what-ten-years-of-restatement-trends-tell-us-about-the-state-of-financial-reporting>
6. CFO Brew (2024) Employees are key to detecting potential fraud. <https://www.cfobrew.com/stories/2024/03/29/employees-are-key-to-detecting-potential-fraud>
7. Dyck A, Morse A, Zingales L (2010) Who blows the whistle on corporate fraud? *Journal of Finance* 65(6):2213–2253.
8. Habib A, Bhuiyan MBU, Wu J (2021) Corporate governance determinants of financial restatements: a meta-analysis. *Int J Accounting* 56(1).
9. IndusLaw (2019) Informant policy under PIT (Third Amendment). <https://induslaw.com/app/webroot/publications/pdf/alerts-2019/InfoAlert-Changes-To-Insider-Trading-Law-New-Informant-Policy.pdf>
10. Oxford Law Blog (2018) Birth of independent audit regulation in India. <https://blogs.law.ox.ac.uk/business-law-blog/blog/2018/10/birth-independent-audit-regulation-india-analysis-us-perspectives>
11. SEBI (2023) LODR (Second–Fifth Amendments). https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/regulations/jun-2023/securities-and-exchange-board-of-india-listing-obligations-and-disclosure-requirements-second-amendment-regulations-2023_72609.html
12. SEC OWB (2023; 2024) Annual Reports to Congress. <https://www.sec.gov/files/fy23-annual-report.pdf>; <https://www.sec.gov/files/fy24-annual-whistleblower-report.pdf>
13. Shardul Amarchand Mangaldas (2019) SEBI Informant Mechanism. <https://www.amsshardul.com/insight/sebi-informant-mechanism-informant-reward-policy-under-sebi-prohibition-of-insider-trading-regulations-2015/>
14. Statsref (2025) Poisson regression for count data. https://www.statsref.com/HTML/poisson_regression.html
15. Taxguru (2020) Vigil Mechanism/Whistle Blower – statutory requirements. <https://taxguru.in/company-law/vigil-mechanism-whistle-blower-statutory-requirements-company-policy.html>
16. Times of India (2024) SEBI: 60-day resolution of whistleblower complaints at MIIs. <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/india-business/sebi-releases-new-guidelines-to-resolve-whistleblower-complaint-in-60-days/articleshow/115573106.cms>
17. Times Now (2025) SEBI: IPO-bound firms must reveal whistleblower complaints. <https://www.timesnownews.com/business-economy/markets/sebis-new-rule-ipo-bound-firms-must-reveal-whistleblower-complaints-article-117041488>
18. Velte P (2022/2023) External audit and restatement review. *Management Review Quarterly* 73:959–985.

19. Wilde JH (2017) Deterrent effect of employee whistleblowing. *The Accounting Review* 92(5):247–280.

Appendices

Appendix A — Variable dictionary (core fields)

Variable	Description
RestatementCount	# of financial statement restatements (FY)
FraudFindingCount	# of substantiated internal fraud findings (FY)
HotlineStrength (0–1)	Composite of channels, 24×7, multilingual, visibility
TrainingCoverage	% workforce trained on fraud/ethics & hotline usage
ExternalAdmin	1 if hotline outsourced; else 0
BigN	1 if Big-N auditor; else 0
AC_Independence	% independent directors on audit committee
ComplexityIndex	Segments/foreign operations index
PostPIT_2019	1 for FY≥2019 (SEBI informant mechanism)
PostLODR_2023	1 for FY≥2023 (SEBI LODR amendments)
logExposure	Offset (log assets or firm-years)