

Paper: “Whistleblowing Attitudes of Employees During Pandemic Process: A Research in Bursa”

Submitted: 09 August 2021

Accepted: 25 August 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Nilüfer Rüzgar

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p44](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p44)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Davide Calandra
University of Turin, Italy

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Davide Calandra	
University/Country: University of Turin (Italy)	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: WHISTLEBLOWING ATTITUDES OF WHITE COLLAR EMPLOYEES IN PRODUCTION SECTOR DURING PANDEMIC PROCESS: A RESEARCH IN BURSA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 67.08.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

<i>Yes</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Yes. Probably here, I would encourage you to mention the method employed in doing the analysis.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>No. The paper is well-written.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The methodology needs more and more elements. I explain after this table what kind of action the author could implement.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are interesting and well-written.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion is well-structured. However, there is the need for a more structured discussion of the results obtained in the general literature. Limitations and future research avenues should also report.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Yes.</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Author,

Below are some constructive suggestions to strengthen your research paper.

Introduction

This part is interest and well-written. However, I would encourage you to mention better why it is relevant, and a study like this is needed. Is there some evidence of the increase in whistleblowing in Turkey? Please, you can also cite practitioners sources. Finally, the last part of the section should include a map of the paper.

Literature review

I would encourage you to create a new section named "Literature Review". It should include the sub-paragraphs "Whistleblowing", "The ways of ...", and the other but considering the theoretical background. Additionally, considering the quantitative

nature of the paper, you should derive your hypothesis after the literature review section. I enclose a possible example: <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2161>

Methodology

This section should be enriched with more elements. You can find an example in the previous paper reported. In general, you should motivate better why gather your data from that case study ... automotive in Bursa ... Then, considering the questionnaire. How do you create it? From the literature review? Or it is a protocol already created by others? Is it with open or closed questions? Is it a structured interview or a semi-structured one? What kind of statistics do you implement with your data, and why do you consider them?

Therefore, I would encourage more and more elements to ensure that future readers can understand the point of your research and the methodological tools.

Results

Interest and relevant.

Conclusion

In this part, I would encourage you to discuss your results considering the previous literature you analysed. Therefore, for each result, you should discuss it with previous papers published. Finally, I would encourage adding:

1. Limitations of your study;
2. Future research perspectives for your colleagues.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

Thank you for selecting me as a reviewer. The paper is interesting. However, I believe that before the publication, the author should implement significant revisions.

Here, I enclosed some specific and general suggestions. I believe that the methodology and conclusion section should be strengthened more.

Kinds regards
The Reviewer

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 11/Aug/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/Aug/2021
Manuscript Title: WHISTLEBLOWING ATTITUDES OF WHITE COLLAR EMPLOYEES IN PRODUCTION SECTOR DURING PANDEMIC PROCESS: A RESEARCH IN BURSA	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>Title is clear but it should be better in a shortened version</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>More attention to the results might be addressed</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>In general, there are just few errors, economy of words should be considered to transmit clearly an idea</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Methodology is clear but it is necessary to introduce a definition of white-collar employees to eliminate the possibility of misconception</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Results are clearly presented</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Conclusions are accurate however discussion could be more in terms of quantity and analysis</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Check the update of APA 7 to cite studies of 3 or more authors and make the corrections according to that</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I consider your study could be more relevant if you include a deeper discussion of the implications to the companies. Also if explained why your focus is on white collar employees.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I consider the study is properly constructed, methodology is well designed and presented as well as the results however the discussion of the findings should be incremented.