

Paper: “Italian Society and Gender Role Stereotypes. How Stereotypical Beliefs Concerning Males and Females are Still Present in Italian People at the Beginning of the Third Millennium”

Submitted: 26 March 2022

Accepted: 19 May 2022

Published: 31 May 2022

Corresponding Author: Giuseppina Sacco

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n16p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Bupinder Zutshi
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Reviewer 2: Mondira Dutta
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Reviewer 3: Daisy Waked
Holy Spirit University of Kaslik, Lebanon

Reviewer 4: Toma Ernesto
University of Bari Aldo Moro, Italy

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Bupinder Zutshi	
University/Country: Former Professor, Jawaharlal Nehru University/ India	
Date Manuscript Received: 28 th March 22	Date Review Report Submitted: 2 nd April 2022
Manuscript Title: ITALIAN SOCIETY AND GENDER ROLE STEREOTYPES	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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.	4
<i>Yes the title is clear and depicts the content of the article appropriately</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract has given too much emphasis on violence against women, whereas the theme is gender role stereotypes. Abstract should focus on the titles rather than specify gender violence, which is not exhibited in the text as the research questions selected are not actually referring to gender violence instead they indicate perception related to gender role.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The research papers is grammatically Ok</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Research methods utilized are in sync with the research requirements</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Yes the title is clear, but the text should not give too much emphasis on gender violence rather it should focus on perception of gender roles in the society.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Yes</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed. Minor revision is required as suggested above	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Author is advised to consider the changes suggested.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: After suggested changes the article may be published

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Mondira Dutta	
University/Country: Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, INDIA	
Date Manuscript Received: 30 March 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 2 April 2022
Manuscript Title: ITALIAN SOCIETY AND GENDER ROLE STEREOTYPES	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0411/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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.	1

<i>The title does not reflect any meaningful theme or purpose of the article. It may be reconsidered as “Role of Culture in Establishing Gender Stereotypes in Italy”</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
<i>The abstract may be shortened to make it more meaningful and clearer. The first half of the abstract is out of context and hence only the last portions seem to be valid. It may begin with the main purpose of the paper, followed by the gender stereotypes that emerge in Italy based on Cultural and gender dominance region wise. The language is unprofessional such as “thanks to the survey”</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Language needs more clarity and needs to be more professional</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<p><i>The whole study seems to be based on only one survey “Gender role stereotypes and the social image of sexual violence”. This was carried out by ISTAT in 2019 (referred to 2018). Based on this survey the same methodology has been adopted for the present study. Literature Review is almost missing in the study. Introduction is sketchy. Methodology is devoid of any rationale for selecting the traditional gender roles.</i></p> <p>The survey that was undertaken in the present study does not state the magnitude, rationale and type of sample selected. How many people were interviewed and in which region, what type of sampling procedure was adopted and so on. It is shabbily presented without any details of the survey undertaken and in which year etc. What is the gender breakup of the survey and the relationship of such classification with the gender stereotypes that emerge? What kind of dominance is existing with examples and in which region of Italy.</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
<i>Results are all based on a survey already undertaken earlier entitled Gender role stereotypes and the social image of sexual violence” – carried out by ISTAT in 2019 (referred to 2018). What is new or innovative in this article. It seems like a review of the survey conducted earlier. It looks like duplicating the already published survey. The study has neither been thematically presented. A total of 9 or 10 tables are presented without a single one being diagrammatically presented.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>The Conclusion highlights more about the results of the ISTAT Survey on traditional gender roles stereotypes rather than the present study. It seems a duplication of the study.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>There are only three references at the end although the paper does refer to one more (“Sacco G., Sacco P., Zizza A., 2021”) in the text but does not cover it under</i>	

references. However the references are too few in number and have not been properly reviewed as there is no literature review either.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper needs to be studied and the framework prepared with a theoretical base. Requires some literature Review and methodology depicting clear outputs and innovative findings.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The format of an article needs to be specified to the authors. I have mentioned this before. For otherwise the article will lack in focus and be devoid of a structure

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Daisy Waked	
University/Country: (formerly) Holy Spirit University of Kaslik, Lebanon	
Date Manuscript Received: April 5 th , 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: April 18 th , 2022
Manuscript Title: ITALIAN SOCIETY AND GENDER ROLE STEREOTYPES	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.	3
<i>The title is still too broad and could use a subtitle to narrow down the scope of the study a little bit.</i>	

<i>What is the angle, theory or perspective that is chosen to approach the topic?</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<p><i>The abstract clearly presents the method of research and mentions the results in summary.</i></p> <p><i>The main premise of this study is quite interesting. The study is thorough and delves deeply into the issue of gender roles in Italian society, taking into consideration numerous facets of the subject at hand; namely social, economic, gender-based and in a way that it pertains to traditional patriarchal social constructs.</i></p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5
<p><i>There are very few grammatical errors such as subject-verb agreement.</i></p> <p><i>There are sentence construction errors and run-on sentences that need to be dealt with.</i></p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p><i>The five items on page 3 ought to be phrased as questions since the declarative sentence mentions them as questions. The same applies to the numbered parts where the title is a declarative sentence while the paragraphs describe questions.</i></p> <p><i>The study methods are clearly unpacked and their use are very well explained. The authors' exposition of the methods, questions and percentages in details facilitate the development of the main premise of the study.</i></p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<p><i>The results are well presented and interpreted in enough details.</i></p> <p><i>The tables are clear and well detailed.</i></p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<p><i>The conclusions have been presented in a clear manner and the outcomes well synthesized.</i></p> <p><i>The article does well in not just exposing the results, but also analyzing them in a thorough way.</i></p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<p><i>The references are appropriate and enough for the current study. They are updated and recent.</i></p> <p><i>However, the list of references should not be numbered.</i></p>	

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 article is very interesting and well developed.

Minor editing and proofreading is needed.

For the sake of parallelism, and in order to retain consistency, the numbered titles in bold should all be either full sentences or titles.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: TOMA Ernesto	
University/Country: University of Bari Aldo Moro	
Date Manuscript Received: 30 th March 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 11 th April 2022
Manuscript Title: ITALIAN SOCIETY AND GENDER ROLE STEREOTYPES	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0411/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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
Yes, the title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
It is advisable to indicate in the abstract which statistical methodology will be applied	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The article is grammatically correct	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Yes, the study methods are clearly explained throughout the article	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are clear explained.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Yes	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Yes	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is advisable to also indicate in the headings of tables 16, 17 and 18 which regions belong to the various clusters

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: