

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: Socialization at Universities: A Case Study

Submitted: 01 December 2021

Accepted: 11 April 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Ayşegül Atalay

Email: a.a.atalay8@gmail.com

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v9no2a19

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luka Pongračić

Reviewer 2: Yasemin Acar-Ciftci

Published: 30.06.2022

EJES 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: EJES 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.

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

Date Manuscript Received: 24.2.2022.	Date Review Report Submitted: 4.3.2022.
Manuscript Title: Socialization at Universities: A Case Study	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

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
The title of the paper is clear and corresponds to the content of the article. It is concise enough. Nevertheless, I suggest adding to the title the place where the Ankara case study was conducted. My suggested title is: Socialization at Universities of Ankara: A Case Study	



2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<p>The abstract presents only methods and results, the object of research is missing. It is necessary to add a few sentences at the beginning of the abstract about the theoretical basis of the paper. Give an overview of socialization and the questions that will be answered by the presented research.</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<p>Using semicolons (;) instead of commas in the introduction is unnecessary. It is not advisable to use both quotation marks and italics, one should opt for one of the two.</p> <p>In addition, in some cases, they enter the classroom and function as teaching. – this sentence is confusing.</p> <p>In this study, the organizational and professional socialization processes of research assistants were investigated as a whole. – as a group</p> <p>The themes in Figure 1 were reached when the researchers' expectations about the organizational and professional context and what they faced before entering the profession were examined. – this sentence is confusing.</p>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p>The research method is clearly described and explained. Literature confirming the methods used is also cited</p> <p>The subtitle Validity and Reliability is given which is not needed here as there is no statistical analysis of the results. Since the research is not quantitative, we do not have data on validity and reliability.</p> <p>It would be better to state the number of people who gave a particular answer in the tables than to say who they are. Here we do not care who chose what, but only the frequency of responses.</p> <p>In general, the methodology is good and corresponds to the conducted research, only these minor changes are needed.</p> <p>Although this methodology is more of a professional than a scientific contribution, it has been elaborated in detail and still represents a scientific contribution in this case.</p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<p>Figure 2 is unnecessary and is not part of the research results and also has too little data to be part of the paper.</p> <p>Rich and dense description is a technique in which the researcher describes his experiences during data collection in a detailed way (Lincoln & Guba, cited in Arastaman, Öztürk Fidan, & Fidan, 2018). – missing year</p> <p>This process gives the researcher the opportunity to determine whether the comments made by the participants based on their views really reflect the experiences expressed by the participant (Lincoln & Guba, cited in Arastaman et al, 2018). – missing year</p>	

...administrators and civil servants who affect academic life, including academicians themselves (Trow 1977 as cited in Corcoran and Clark, 1984). – missing comma

There are no major errors in the article, the language is written very correctly. The tables correspond to the content and are in good places. A clear overview of the results with respect to the research procedure is given.

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.

2

The fourth paragraph in the conclusion should be transferred to the discussion or earlier in the article because it brings some new insights, and in the conclusion should be only what has emerged from the research. Some things are too generalized and the conclusion should be focused only on what was obtained in the research.

The second paragraph draws conclusions that cannot be drawn with such a small sample, but would require quantitative support.

It is recommended to rewrite a conclusion with a more concrete reference to the conducted research.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

3

The literature is quite extensive, but most of the references are quite old. Recent research and theoretical assumptions need to be found. Almost half of the literature is between 20 and 30 years old, which is not good considering that the topic of the paper is socialization. This is also a modern topical issue and there is a lot of new literature that would be desirable to include in the article.

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):

The paper certainly needs to supplement the summary with theoretical starting points, add a few newer references and write a conclusion according to the instructions. I also suggest considering changing the title.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



The article makes a good scientific contribution. I suggest accepting it after the author makes the proposed changes. It is certainly worrying that the literature is quite old because it is a field of science that is quite topical. The conclusion must change significantly. I also suggest considering changing the title.



**EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)**



EJES 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: EJES 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.

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

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/03/2022
Manuscript Title: Socialization at Universities: A Case Study	
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.	5
<i>The title is clear, and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Yes</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>No</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Yes</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>Yes</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Yes</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Yes</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

