

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_84432
Title of the Manuscript:	ARE WE AT THEIR MERCY? A PERCEPTUAL STUDY OF JOURNALISTS ON THE ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF CITIZEN JOURNALISM
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The article is about an important and actual topic, which has also been studied in recent decades when looking at the sources of this article, and has also been analyzed by various researchers.</p> <p>Abstract - Length 246 words. Percentage figures could be changed in the text, generalizing the research results. Professional (ism), Nigeria would also be important as keywords The aims presented in the abstract are worded differently than later in the explanation of the problem (...Based on this, what could be the perception of Imo State based mainstream journalists on citizen journalism? It is against this backdrop, that this study sought to investigate journalists' perception of the ethical implications of citizen journalism in Imo State.)</p> <p>I suggest adding ... an ethical threat.. to the wording of the third research question.</p> <p>The background of the research, theoretical starting points, research on the topic is explained thoroughly, in good scientific language, relying on important sources in six subsections.</p> <p>Research methodology – You wrote.. <i>to express their thoughts and feelings regarding citizen journalism</i>. In the case of a quantitative study, this part of the sentence should be reworded, otherwise there will be an expectation of a qualitative part of the study</p> <p>Data Presentation and Analysis – it contains 12 tables that illustrate the research results. Only YES / NO answers have been taken into account and explained in the analysis, interpretation and further discussion of the research results. The proportion of “<i>Can't say</i>” answers is certainly important, because For some indicators it is a fifth or almost a third (e.g. table 9), and it is unclear where the author reads these answers. Differences should also be clarified when analyzing scale responses, for example if almost one-fifth respond differently from half part (e.g. table 6) The analysis from the table 7 - <i>This implies that majority of the respondent agreed that the practice of citizen journalism can affect the way people perceive news from journalists</i>. What about strongly agree / agree together.. it is 78,9%?</p> <p>In the conclusion you write that ... <i>In this era of digital technologies everyone is striving to be a journalist even without professional training</i>. In fact, the professionalism of journalists should be addressed by the professional community in different levels, taking into account important examples of practice, trends, etc. Professional development is already an area where you can get ideas from across areas, ie what can be changed so that ethics come first and activities are trustworthy.</p>	<p>Comment 1: Thank you very much.</p> <p>Comment 2: This has been corrected.</p> <p>Comment 3: This suggestion has been added.</p> <p>Comment 4: Thank you very much.</p> <p>Comment 5: Correction has been made on the sentence.</p> <p>Comment 6: Corrections have been made on the ones I feel it is necessary. Meanwhile, for the “can't say” and other ones I didn't touch I feel it will be too boring repeating what is on the table in the interpretation as it will amount to table reading and this is what I am avoiding.</p> <p>Comment 7: This has been done.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Theoretical Orientation move forward in the text</p> <p>To correct - Noor, R.(2017). Citizen journalism vs. mainstream journalism: A study on challenges posed by amateurs. Athens.</p>	<p>Comment 8: I have moved the theoretical orientation upward immediately after the hypothesis.</p>

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	<p>The analysis of the research results can be clarified, as well as the discussion of the topic can be continued</p> <p>It is not clear whether the author has treated traditional and professional journalism in the same way?</p> <p>It is not clear whether the author has treated traditional and professional journalism in the same way? if so, with the introduction of technology, It is clear and natural that trends will change over time and that people will use digital media, etc., more and more due to the development of their digital skills.</p>	<p>Comment 9: This has been addressed.</p> <p>Comment 10: In the context of this paper traditional and professional journalism are seen as the same.</p>
---------------------------	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	