

Bukti Koresponding review jurnal: Cogent Social Science *Publisher Taylor & Francis (Scopus Q2)*
<https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100872366&tip=sid&clean=0>
<https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100872366>

The screenshot displays a Gmail interface with a reviewer invitation email from Cogent Social Sciences. The email subject is "Reviewer Invitation for SNITCHES GET STICHES A WHISTLEBLOWERS CONUNDRUM, WHO IS PROTECTING THE WHISTLEBLOWERS? EXPLORING THE PERSONAL AND ORGANISATIONAL EXPERIENCES OF SOUTH AFRICAN WHISTLEBLOWERS." The email is dated Saturday, February 11, 12:54 PM (2 days ago). The sender is Gabriela Borz, Senior Editor for Cogent Social Sciences. The email content includes a welcome message to Dr. Nanang Shonhadji, an invitation to review a manuscript, and detailed information about the journal's peer-review process, including a link to the journal's website for more information. It also mentions that the journal follows a single blind peer-review process and that reviewers must have expertise in the topic and no conflict of interest. The email provides instructions on how to accept or decline the invitation, including links to "Agree to Review" and "Decline to Review". It also provides the reviewer's username (NANANG SHONHADJI) and a link to reset their password. The manuscript reference is COGENTSOCSCI-2022-0032. The email concludes with a thank you message and a note about the journal's collaboration with Publons for tracking and showcasing review work. A footer note mentions data protection regulations and a link to remove personal registration details.

Reviewer Invitation for SNITCHES GET STICHES A WHISTLEBLOWERS CONUNDRUM, WHO IS PROTECTING THE WHISTLEBLOWERS? EXPLORING THE PERSONAL AND ORGANISATIONAL EXPERIENCES OF SOUTH AFRICAN WHISTLEBLOWERS. External Inbox x

Cogent Social Sciences <em@editorialmanager.com> to me Sat, Feb 11, 12:54 PM (2 days ago) ☆ ↶ ↷

Dear Dr Nanang Shonhadji,

Gabriela Borz, Senior Editor for Cogent Social Sciences, would like to invite you to review a manuscript entitled "SNITCHES GET STICHES A WHISTLEBLOWERS CONUNDRUM, WHO IS PROTECTING THE WHISTLEBLOWERS? EXPLORING THE PERSONAL AND ORGANISATIONAL EXPERIENCES OF SOUTH AFRICAN WHISTLEBLOWERS." This involves completing a scorecard and submitting your recommendation, with the entire process conducted via an easy online system.

Please note that all journals in the Cogent Series follow the single blind peer-review process. All agreed reviewers must have expertise in the topic of the manuscript and have no conflict of interest preventing them from providing an unbiased view. For more information about our criteria for publication, expectations of reviewers and our review process please visit the website at <https://www.cogentia.com/reviewers>

If you have reviewed a previous version of this manuscript, please note that you should be primarily assessing the revision based on whether authors have successfully made the requested amendments, rather than identifying new issues.

Please find the abstract for the manuscript below for your information. The full paper will be available to read on the online system if you accept the invitation.

Developing countries such as South Africa are faced with a serious pandemic of corruption, theft, embezzlement, fraud, tender rigging, illicit capital outflow, nepotism, and maladministration. According to the 2014 Corruption Perception Index (CPI) out of 178 countries Nigeria was ranked 136th, whilst South Africa was positioned at number 54th of the 178 countries. In South Africa alone over 1 trillion rand has been lost due fraud and corruption. Whistleblowers in South Africa are faced with a serious quagmire. Although there is a piece of legislation the Protective Disclosure Act 2000 That is supposed protect them when exposing any wrongdoing. However, this is usually not the case in practice. Whistleblowers in South Africa are often harassed, victimized, purged, persecuted and in other horrific cases they are assassinated. A qualitative questionnaire was adopted. The questionnaire comprised of nine open-ended questions. Three research respondents participated in this study. This research comprised of respondents from both the public and private sector. For the purpose of this study the researcher favoured non-probability purposive sampling method. The sample involved of two males and one female, between the ages of 30 to 45 years.

If you are able to accept the invitation, please click this link:
[Agree to Review *](#)

If you are unable to review the manuscript on this occasion, please click this link:
[Decline to Review *](#)

*If these links do not work, please go to <https://www.editorialmanager.com/cogentsocsci/> and log-in as a reviewer.
Your username is: NANANG SHONHADJI
[click here to reset your password](#)
The manuscript reference is COGENTSOCSCI-2022-0032.

We are collaborating with Publons to give you the recognition you deserve for your peer review contributions. On Publons you can effortlessly track, verify and showcase your review work and expertise without compromising anonymity. [Sign up](#) now for free so when you complete any reviews they can be instantly added to your profile.

If possible, I would appreciate receiving your review 14 days from the date of accepting this invitation.

Thank you in advance for your support,
Cogent Social Sciences Editorial Office

*If clicking the link above does not open an Editorial Manager window, your email program may have inserted some spaces and/or line markers into the link. Please open a browser window manually and copy and paste the entire link from the email into the url address box. The link starts with the letters "http" and ends with the letters "rev=X" (where X represents a number such as 0,1,2, etc.) Note that the end of the link may be shown on a different line in this email, and may be shown in a different color than the beginning of the link. The entire link must be copied and pasted into the browser in order for the correct Editorial Manager window to be displayed. After copying the link into the url address box, you must also remove any spaces and line markers (e.g. > or >>) by using the delete or backspace keys on your keyboard.

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. ([Remove my information/details](#)) Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

10 of 12,425

Thank you for agreeing to review External Inbox x

Cogent Social Sciences <em@editorialmanager.com>
to me

Feb 11, 2023, 1:44 PM (2 days ago)

<p>Review Due</p> <p>When Sat Feb 25, 2023 (WIB)</p> <p>Who Cogent Social Sciences*</p> <p>Add to calendar</p>	<p>Agenda</p> <p>Sat Feb 25, 2023</p> <p>No earlier events</p> <p>All day Review Due</p> <p>No later events</p>
---	--

Dear NANANG SHONHADJI,

Thank you for agreeing to review manuscript COGENTSOCSCI-2022-0032, "SNITCHES GET STICHES A WHISTLEBLOWERS CONUNDRUM, WHO IS PROTECTING THE WHISTLEBLOWERS? EXPLORING THE PERSONAL AND ORGANISATIONAL EXPERIENCES OF SOUTH AFRICAN WHISTLEBLOWERS", for Cogent Social Sciences.

To download the paper, please click this link: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/cogentsocsci.asp?i=549259&l=YG3QYMRV>

Your review of this paper is due by Feb 25, 2023. If you are unlikely to be able to provide comments by this date, please contact the Editorial Office who will be happy to help.

You can submit your review at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/cogentsocsci/> your username is Your username is: NANANG SHONHADJI and your password can be set at this link: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/cogentsocsci.asp?i=549260&l=V3MNVFPWM>

We encourage you to focus your review on the methodological and/or theoretical rigour of the manuscript and its relevance to the journal's audience, rather than on a prediction of its future level of importance to the field. In addition to completing the scorecard, we would appreciate you providing thorough and constructive feedback for the authors in the comments box.

When submitting your recommendation, you can choose from the following options:

- Sound
- Sound with minor or moderate revisions
- Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Please do highlight severe language issues (you could refer the author to the Taylor & Francis Editing Services), but bear in mind that all accepted articles are copyedited and references are correctly styled if needed.

We greatly appreciate the voluntary contribution that each reviewer gives to the Journal. As a token of our appreciation, and to assist you with your review, we are able to offer you 30 days free access to Taylor & Francis Online. You can sign up for the free access at the following web address (please make sure that you register an account first): <https://www.tandfonline.com/revieweraccess>

For more information about our criteria for publication, expectations of reviewers and our review process please visit the website at <https://www.cogentia.com/reviewers>

With kind regards,

Gabriela Borz
Senior Editor
Cogent Social Sciences

*If clicking the link above does not open an Editorial Manager window, your email program may have inserted some spaces and/or line markers into the link. Please open a browser window manually and copy and paste the entire link from the email into the url address box. The link starts with the letters "http" and ends with the letters "rev-X" (where X represents a number such as 0,1,2, etc.) Note that the end of the link may be shown on a different line in this email, and may be shown in a different color than the beginning of the link. The entire link must be copied and pasted into the browser in order for the correct Editorial Manager window to be displayed. After copying the link into the url address box, you must also remove any spaces and line markers (e.g. > or >>) by using the delete or backspace keys on your keyboard.

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/cogentsocsci/login.asp?a=1>) Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.



Reviewer Recommendation and Comments for Manuscript Number COGENTSOCSCI-2022-0032

SNITCHES GET STICHES A WHISTLEBLOWERS CONUNDRUM, WHO IS PROTECTING THE WHISTLEBLOWERS? EXPLORING THE PERSONAL AND ORGANISATIONAL EXPERIENCES OF SOUTH AFRICAN WHISTLEBLOWERS.

Original Submission
NANANG SHONHADJI Reviewer 2

Back Edit Review Print Submit Review to Editorial Office

Recommendation: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Custom Review Question(s):

As a thank you and to acknowledge the contribution of our reviewers, the journal may publish a list of the names of those who have reviewed at the end of the year. This will not be linked to any specific paper and will only be done if the list of reviewers is long enough to protect the anonymity of the review process for individual papers. If you would prefer for your name not to be included in a published list of reviewers, please indicate this below.

If anyone else was involved in writing this report, for example a student or a colleague, and they agree to be recognised for this work please provide their name and email address in the free text box below.

Do you want to get recognition for this review on Publons?

Don't let your reviewing work go unnoticed! Researchers the world over use Publons to effortlessly track their valuable peer review contributions for any journal. If you opt in, your Publons profile will automatically be updated to show a verified record of this review in full compliance with the journal's review policy. If you don't have a Publons profile, you will be prompted to create a free account. [Learn more]

I confirm that I have the necessary subject knowledge and expertise to review this article, and have no conflict of interest that would prevent me from offering an unbiased review.

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Title, Abstract and Introduction – overall evaluation

Methodology / Materials and Methods – overall evaluation

Objective / Hypothesis – overall evaluation

Figures and Tables – overall evaluation

Results / Data Analysis – overall evaluation

Interpretation / Discussion – overall evaluation

Conclusions – overall evaluation

References – overall evaluation

Compliance with Ethical Standards – overall evaluation

Writing – overall evaluation

Supplemental Information and Data – overall evaluation

Comments to the author

Response

Include my name

Yes

Yes

Yes

Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Not applicable

Not applicable

Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Outstanding

Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Outstanding

Sound

Not applicable

1. Introduction:
 - a. The explanation of the phenomenon of the whistleblower problem in South Africa is supported by previous research but needs to be explained further by linking relevant behavioral theories that support the case. The paper does not yet demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature on case whistleblower. Please cite an appropriate range of literature sources or previous research that is relevant in this case
2. Method
 - a. Participant criteria are unclearly described such as former whistleblower in any case in a private or government organization
 - b. Clarify the rationale for selecting participants based on racial profile
3. Result and Discussion
 - a. The results discussed in each theme will be strong findings if linked to behavioral theories that support whistleblower behavior. Previous research results is also needed to strengthen the qualitative narrative of research results
 - b. Researchers also need to make a summary of each theme from the results of the information submitted by each participant.
 - c. The explanation of the results on theme 2 is still too shallow. Researchers need to clarify the financial impact information experienced by whistleblowers on career, work performance and family. Psychological theory support that is relevant to the whistleblower will complement the narrative of research results to make it interesting and unique.
 - d. The risks of losing a job and victimization in the workplace (also themes 6 and 7) are further explored, and please relate to legal protection guarantees provided by organizations or governments.
 - e. It is also necessary to explain why the existing legal protection laws are not working effectively
4. Reference

Reference from reputable journals that relevant to this topic need to be added and used

Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor:

Thank you as apart of Cogent Journal Reviewer

Attachments:

Action	Description	File Name	Size	Last Modified
Download		Note from Reviewer_COGENTSOCSCI-2022-0032.docx	12.4 KB	Feb 15, 2023

Back Edit Review Print Submit Review to Editorial Office