

Review of: "Alas (Hellas), there is no hope: It's not a crisis, it's a culture"

Sebastian Zemla¹

¹ University of Pula

Potential competing interests: please look at my review

Enclosed is my review of the above article.

1) As preliminary information, I have taken the liberty of reading up on the author and his scientific career, which is very appealing. The list of his research activities is long and testifies much expertise. Likewise, it extends in part to crisis topics, so that the publication to be reviewed here presents itself as more than just a thematic first work.

2) As a first impression regarding the article, I would like to mention that the volume or page length clearly exceeds the usual norm for articles to be published. In my opinion, the three main sections ("Mother Hellene ...", "Absence of the Qualitative ..." and "The Elusive Nature ...") should be shortened by about 15-20%, as they discuss the topic in a philosophical and sociocultural way decidedly. Nevertheless, there would be no lack of technical substance if they were shortened somewhat.

3) The scientifically established IMRaD (Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion) procedure is recognisable, but should be made somewhat more concrete or better specified. In my opinion, it would be advisable to separate the methodological approach from the introduction and to make it a separate bullet point (e.g. as "Choice of the Method/Research Design"). This would make the IMRaD structure even more effective.

4) From the reviewer's point of view, it is also advisable to formulate 2-3 sentences introducing the research method from the general or specific literature, possibly also how it has developed historically, or what makes this method special or why it is so relevant in science and the topic of the article.

5) The research question or hypothesis should be formulated more clearly and separately so that it becomes the direct focus of the reader's attention. It is admittedly integrated within a section. However, it is recommended to list it separately in a small chapter to give this point more prominence.

6) The author should also consider giving the reader at least a small excerpt of the questions that the interview partners answered. This could give an even better picture of how the main chapters 1-3 came about, or how the interesting sociological answers are produced by the respective interview partners.

7) One more hint. As a first-time reader, it is difficult to directly identify what is "Section 1, 2 and 3" without a numbered outline. It would therefore be advisable to formulate the designation of the respective part in brackets, see:

a. The first part (The Mother Hellene and Social Dysfunction) therefore consists mainly of the findings from participant

observation and in-depth interviews with social scientists.

b. The second section (Absence of the Qualitative within an Ambiguous Quantitative Context) pertains mainly to extracts from interviews with economists and officers from the private and public sector.

c. The third section (The Elusive Nature of Value Creation) includes a major aspect of culture, that pertains to cultural indifference with respect to the process of value creation, that was a general extract of the research.

8) „The discrepancies between the two have made Greeks the hardest working nationality.“ → How does the author determine this?

9) „In Greece, there is no way to have a coffee or be in any social setting without being covered in second-hand smoke. Universities, taxis, shops, establishments and institutions are no exception. Even under EU rules, smoking in public, even (or especially) indoors, is the norm.“ Is this still the case in 2023??

10) A review of the literature used unfortunately reveals that there are no new sources in the list. It would be desirable if at least 5 could still be considered that are not older than 2020-2022.

These points should not obscure the fact that I nevertheless liked the work. Tidying up an almost classically economic topic in a socio-cultural and partly philosophical way won me a certain appreciation and showed me just as clearly that such relevant topics as crises have to be examined in an interdisciplinary way. It opens up a perspective for the readership, which is very welcome.

The conclusion is short and crisp, but could perhaps use another 2-3 sentences on the economic framework and results. I hope I have been able to provide the author with a few points to reconsider and wish him every success in this endeavour and best regards,

Dr. Sebastian Zemla