

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_112410
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT COMMUNICATION STUDENTS' PREFERENCE IN TEACHING-LEARNING DURING THE NEW NORMAL: A CONJOINT ANALYSIS
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community, because many institutions are experiencing the technological switch related to pedagogical approaches in teaching/learning. The results of this study are relevant as professors/instructors plan for the delivery of curriculum. 2. The title is a bit confusing, since the name of the department is also stated in “non-standard” language. Maybe the tile could be stated in the following way: STUDENTS’ PREFERENCE IN TEACHING-LEARNING USING NEW TECHNOLOGIES: A CONJOINT ANALYSIS. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive and clear. 4. The subsections and structure are effective, but the content within some of the paragraphs does not explain concepts explicitly. For example, under “RESULTS AND DISCUSSION” the author does not explain simple things like “...Php...”. Even in the discussion of the results the author does not refer to the cost, income, Philippine pesos. <p>“Tertiary institution” is not defined.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references are sufficient, current, and relevant. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language used detracts from clarity/specificity of what the author is trying to state.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies in the use of tenses, even within the same sentence. With this, Abender (2020) revealed that upon the dynamic surge of the virus, all countries create a method to adopt the new normal education system that altered the normal communication into a new normal. The immergence and innovation of new teaching modalities arises which dominated by the online distance learning via social networking sites and alternative means was self-paced learning using printed hard copies of module.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies in the verb-noun/subject agreements.</p> <p>There are word-choice errors. “...the online learning mode through social media was primordially utilized for Teaching...”.</p> <p>Incomplete sentences/phrases. Alternative and adjustment regulated the communication of teaching-learning system (Perveen, 2016; Magsambol, 2020).</p> <p>Having somebody proof-read/edit the article for language/translation would make it more understandable.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	<p>The article contains simple errors. For example, the author cites (Abender 2020), in the article and in the references. The actual last name of the author cited is Bender.</p> <p>This paper is technically correct. However, the use of improper/non-standard language, throughout the paper, hinders the understanding of it. The research and the procedures seem effective, but the author does not provide enough context for the reader to understand the circumstances under which the research was conducted. The author does not define “tertiary institution”. This is important because the research and the results can then be “situated” so that readers can fully understand the meaning of the research.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Justin Saldana
Department, University & Country	University of La Verne, United States