

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_108691
Title of the Manuscript:	Perceptions of B.Ed Faculty Members on the course 'Understanding the Disciplines and Academic Subjects' offered in Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>“Selected at random” of 42 faculty members. Why 10%? How was random selection conducted? Was there attrition? A clustering technique of 5/30 colleges is not random!</p> <p>The authors state null/alternative hypotheses, but they do not state upfront in the methodology the study is quantitative.</p> <p>The authors claim validity and reliability. Yet, there is only face validity. No mention of reliability. These points are major limitations. How long is the survey? Number of incomplete answers?</p> <p>Authors should state they only used descriptive statistics.</p> <p>How was the survey administered? What computer programs were used?</p> <p>There is an H-10 with a chi square test. Where/how conducted? How many tests conducted?</p> <p>There is a problem with conducting multiple inferential statistical tests. Power and confidence intervals are important.</p> <p>Authors must move beyond “statistical significance” and examine practical significance. Below a p-value of .05 does not necessarily mean a practical significance.</p> <p>There should be a proper discussion connected to the extant literature.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Could use significant English editing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	David C. Coker
Department, University & Country	Fort Hays State University, USA