

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_120397
Title of the Manuscript:	TEACHING ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY IN A LANGUAGE BRIDGING SETUP
Type of the Article	Article submitted to Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies (if correctly interpreted)

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Environmental literacy (EL) is a very important concept for research in educational settings especially for those who are environmental conservation advocates. Hence the title and focus areas of this manuscript is suitable for scientific community. Overall the presentation is not brief and concise with clarity of data collection and analysis for better readership properly formatted.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is still considered suitable but since this is qualitative case study with only 6 samples involved (and no mention of where the samples are from which language bridging set-up) in the interview, perhaps the title can be modified into 'Teaching environmental literacy: Case study with elementary teachers'	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is not well-written but may need to be improved a bit. There are some missing information especially the last part, more discussions should be made on the impact, limitation and future direction. The content of the write-up did not really reflect what was written in the abstract. E.g. there was not discussions on how to validate the interview (no info. on the interview protocol, what are the questions raised, etc.) A qualitative research design was mentioned in abstract but there is no mention of research design in the Method part.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not really, as the author did not follow Academic Writing style. For example, there is a need of an introductory paragraph to briefly include an overview of this study with thesis statement, etc. Overall, the Introduction is too long and perhaps break into sub-headings to ensure flow of discussions from one section to another, such as 'Background and Overview, Problem Statement and Rationale of Study, Aims and Objectives, etc.' will have better clarity for readers. If the author intended to include Literature Review (as there is no extra heading for this topic) in the Introduction section, then the sub-heading should include 'Review of Related Literature' before 'Aims and Research Objectives'.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Apart from not following proper Academic Writing style, this manuscript is also not formatted properly. Figure 1 is not illustrated properly (there is one circle 'Action in Teaching Environmental Literature' not linked to the rest with proper arrow to reflect the title of the Figure1). Figure 2 and Figure 3 are also not illustrated properly as there is no arrow and reader is unable to decipher what is to be illustrated in the diagram. The author needs to do some write-up before showing the subsequent Figure 1, 2 and 3.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	The author has provided almost 100 references (more than 30 and almost all are in the 2000++ within the past 5 to 10 years) are sufficient for high impact publication. However, the references are not formatted properly following APA style and there are also technical errors (please refer comments in the text). Some titles were written in all CAPS and not in Title case, also many of the titles of publications are not italicised.	

Review Form 3

<p>Major REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article was not written in academic writing style for scholarly communication. There are quite a number of technical and grammatical errors for better clarity. Technical terms such as (a) 'translanguaging' should be operationally defined; (b) 'norm activation model' (and other related theories) as well as 'code-switching, etc.' should also be operationally defined with support of theoretical framework in relation to this study. (c) The reader is not clear if the author is researching on environmental literacy or disciplinary literacy, both of which should be operationally defined and reflect in the title.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Research Method is not properly written with elaboration on the research design (was mentioned in abstract but not at the beginning of the text in Methods section) how qualitative data were collected and analysed (no mention of 'Framework Analysis' or 'Grounded Theory'), for what purpose, etc. with in-text citation (reference on research methods to be cited) to be listed in Reference. Moreover, what is the method used for Literature Review (since there is a long section in the Introduction part)? From what database (e.g. using Scopus or WoS or ERIC search) had the author referred? There is a need to operationally define Environmental Literacy in relation to the focus of this study at primary level. There are many long long paragraphs in which the author should break into shorter paragraphs preferably with sub-sections. The inclusion of Ethical considerations is good but need to explain how it relates to the study focusing on environmental literacy with in-text citations on policy and practice. It will be good to prepare a summary table of key interview findings and types of qualitative methods used (e.g. Framework Analysis or Grounded Theory, etc.). Key findings should be discussed in the section before Conclusion. This article should be ended with discussions on Future direction.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Ng Khar Thoe</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>UCSI University, Malaysia</p>