



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_46912
Title of the Manuscript:	Normalising the Concept of Death and the Promotion of Religiosity, Sociocultural Norms and Prejudices in Newspaper Obituary Announcements: A Review
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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>Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on this very insightful research. This is not a very well explored research topic, so I think with the changes suggested below; this article will definitely be publishable.</p> <p>General comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract contains some repetitive elements that can be shortened a bit. 2. A literature review should always contain a theoretical component that describes the theories upon which the topic is based. A sentence should be added into the abstract that indicates these main theories. 3. Also, please add a sentence or two in the abstract about the methodology that was used in order to analyse and synthesise the literature. In the introduction, it is mentioned that a literature review was done on newspaper articles, but which methods were used in order to analyse and synthesise the literature on newspaper articles? For example, presumably a form of content analysis or textual analysis, hermeneutics or textual criticism methodological techniques would have been used to distinguish between the various ways in which the obituaries are interpreted – this would have allowed the author(s) to distinguish themes for discussion in the literature review. 4. The aforementioned comment about the methods that were used in order to analyse and synthesise the literature should also be described in a bit more detail in at least a paragraph or two in the introduction. 5. A literature review should always contain a theoretical component that describes the theories upon which the topic is based. Throughout the manuscript various references are made to what the reviewer presumes as being the main theories that underscore this topic. For example, mention is briefly made to the “discursive construction of death announcements” in the introduction. This term occurs throughout the manuscript, and is used as a “construct” to understand and interpret death announcements. Constructs are essentially synonymous with being a theory in the social sciences; implying that this construct should be described as one of the important theories that underpin the topic of death announcements. Yet another example of the above is the construct “homely discourses” to death announcements by Miller (1984). These discourses should be expanded upon in more detail because they form the theoretical underpinnings of the topic being studied. Yet another example of a possible construct that could be interpreted as a possible theory is the “the analysis revealed six moves comprising both the compulsory and non-compulsory categories” as it relates to the “schematic arrangements” of text. 6. A literature review is done in order to establish the existing theories, general information, viewpoints, arguments and counter-arguments about a specific topic before any new empirical research is conducted. For that reason, a literature review should contain sources from a variety of countries from around the world, including from the developed, developing, and African countries. Additionally information should also be incorporated from the case study country for which new empirical research will be conducted. I am not able to trace through the text which country will be the case study country. This can be clarified by adding more literature about the topic from the specific case study country / area, if such literature exists. 7. As I said earlier, a literature review typically starts out with an introduction, then a section that deals with the theories, and thereafter, the text should be split up according to various themes of discussions. The author(s) attempted to do this to some extent (e.g. the discussion is split into the “normalisation of death, and the religiosity and cultural orientation” sub-headings). I did however experience problems with the flow of the argumentation of the concepts that were discussed below these sub-headings (i.e. in some instances the text seemed to jump from one point to the next a bit, and in other instances some of the content did not really relate very well to the two sub-headings). I would thus suggest splitting the discussion of the content below these sub-headings into more sub-headings – this would imply splitting the 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>themes of discussion into more themes and making each theme a sub-heading.</p> <p>8. The first part of the conclusions should be generalised (i.e. meaning that specific countries should not be mentioned). In this instance Malawi and Turkey is mentioned – this makes the reader wonder why specifically these two countries were mentioned – why are they so special and the other examples are not?</p> <p>The second part of the conclusions (i.e. the last paragraph or two of the conclusion) should shortly discuss how the literature review will be used to further new empirical research (i.e. a literature review always proceeds new empirical research – so how will this literature review inform the new empirical research that will be conducted?). Reference can be made to the specific country or case study area in this instance.</p> <p>Language and referencing comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “At the same time, this Nigerian brand of the English language would stand distinctive among other world Englishes representing...” (page 3, lines 94-95) – rephrase this to “....among the English dialect spoken around the world, thus representing....” 2. The text can benefit from the use of “linking sentences”. Linking sentences are used to “connect” sentences / paragraphs to one another, or to clarify what a paragraph will discuss. A typical example of a linking sentence at the beginning of a paragraph could be: Death announcements are normalised through various methods including A, B, C, D. The next sentence then starts to explain A (and its contents could extend over various sentences or paragraphs for example), thereafter B is discussed, then C and D. 3. Currently most of the text is written in the second person – e.g. Aremu (2011) states that.... and Nwoye (1992) conducted research about etc. Academic writing typically requires the writing to be in the third person – this implies that the references should be moved to the end of the sentences throughout. This not only changes the sentences into third person, but it also reduces the number of words significantly throughout the article, which is especially helpful if the journal limits the number of pages / characters / words that you are allowed to write. Only in rare cases, e.g. when a particular study was ground breaking in nature, can one start the sentence with the authors surnames. An example of a third person writing would be (taking p3, lines 85-87 as an example): The structural layout and the rate of recurrence of obituary announcements in Nigeria relates more to the socio-economic class of the deceased people and their family members (Nwoye, 1992). 4. It is unclear why in some instances page numbers have been added to the in-text references. Page numbers are typically only used in the in-text references when quoting the text directly. In addition, if a few in-text references are mentioned in at the end of a sentence, it implies that all of the sources have been used to write that sentence. Why were the page numbers added there then? A good example of this is on page 1, lines 22 to 25. Please check this and correct it throughout. 5. Related to the above comments (and still on page 1, lines 22 to 25), in-text references should be listed alphabetically or chronologically throughout. It is thus not common practice to add the word “see” into the middle of the in-text references – the mere fact that the in-text references are listed in brackets after the sentence implies that the reader must go and look at those specific sources. Thus, remove the word “see” from the in-text references please. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Lodene Willemse</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Stellenbosch University, South Africa</i>