



OPEN PEER REVIEW

Impact of Anti-Discrimination Laws on University Campuses: Student and Faculty Views

Zeynolabedin Jafari¹  Mohammadbagher. Jafari^{2, 3*} ¹ Department of Sociology, Faculty of economics, Management and Social Sciences, University of Shiraz, Shiraz, Iran² Department of Sociology of Culture, Istanbul, Türkiye³ Department of Social Sciences, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada


* Corresponding author email address: mbjafari@kmanresce.ca

Received: 2023-10-11

Revised: 2023-11-15


Accepted: 2023-11-19

Published: 2024-01-01

EDITOR:Zeynep Karal 


Department of Computer and Instructional Technologies Education, Trabzon University, Trabzon, Türkiye

zeynepkaral@trabzon.edu.tr

REVIEWER 1:Kaushalya Koralage 

Assistant Lecturer in Sociology at University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka

koralage@iouc.cmb.ac.lk

REVIEWER 2:Agwu Sunday Okoro 

Lecturer & Clinical Law Administrator at Baze University Abuja, Abuja, Nigeria

agwuokoro@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction could benefit from a more direct linkage to recent incidents or studies that highlight the urgency of investigating anti-discrimination laws. This could provide a more compelling context for the research and engage readers more effectively.

Increase the specificity in the description of the semi-structured interviews. Detailing the questions might help readers assess the depth and direction of the interviews. Additionally, discussing the rationale for the choice of questions could enhance the section's transparency.

The study should provide more detailed demographics of the participants, including their academic disciplines, as this might influence their perceptions. This detail will add depth to the understanding of how different backgrounds might interact with perceptions of anti-discrimination laws.

It would be beneficial to include a more detailed description of the coding process in the data analysis section. Information about how themes were derived and any discrepancies in coding between researchers could strengthen the credibility of the results.

The discussion could more explicitly connect the study's findings with existing literature. Comparing and contrasting your results with those from prior research could position your findings within the broader academic dialogue more clearly.

The recommendations are somewhat generic. Providing specific, actionable suggestions for university administrators, such as steps to improve legal literacy or examples of effective policy implementation observed in similar contexts, would make this section more useful.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Expand the literature review to include a broader range of sources that discuss both the successes and challenges of anti-discrimination laws in educational settings. This could provide a more balanced view and highlight gaps your study aims to fill.

Justify the sample size of your study. Discussing why the number of participants is sufficient for theoretical saturation in qualitative research could help in reinforcing the study's methodological rigor.

Elaborate on how and why data saturation was achieved with the chosen sample. This could involve describing the point at which no new information was observed and how this influenced the study's conclusion.

Address the inter-rater reliability in your thematic analysis. Mentioning any measures taken to ensure consistency across coders, such as kappa statistics, would strengthen the trust in your analytical outcomes.

Discuss potential biases in data collection and analysis. Acknowledging the interviewers' biases and their potential impact on data interpretation can enhance the study's transparency and reliability.

Include a cross-demographic analysis to explore how different identity groups (e.g., race, gender) may experience the impacts of anti-discrimination laws differently. This could add depth to the understanding of campus climate.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.