

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_112915</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Cultural Values and Intercultural Sensitivity Among College of Teacher Education Students</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript addresses an important issue related to cultural attitudes among students who are likely to become future education practitioners. Specifically, it examines the relationships between two key factors, namely, cultural values and intercultural sensitivity, among the population that are relatively under-researched.</li> <li>2. The title of this manuscript is clear, covering the key variables and participants in this study. It might be more specific if Philippines is also mentioned, given the existence of previous literature on similar topics.</li> <li>3. The abstract is well-structured and comprehensively covers the method, findings, and implication. The mentioning of the full title and some details of methodology may be unnecessary. Another improvement could be made by elaborating more on the key findings.</li> <li>4. The overall structure of the manuscript is clear. The subsections of methodology and results are well organized. However, there are some improvements could be made regarding the literature review.  First, the author(s) are suggested to provide a definition of “intercultural sensitivity” and relevant theoretical frameworks (e.g., Guoming Chen, 1997), given that this concept is conceptualized as multi-componential.  Second, some paragraphs in the literature review could be rearranged. The paragraphs arguing for the significance of intercultural sensitivity could be put together. Literature relevant to another variable, cultural value, could be put in another subsection.  Third, some literature could be better summarized with less unnecessary details. Topic sentences might be helpful for readers to better understand the gist of the paragraph, such as the second paragraph starting with “De Villar” on p2.</li> <li>5. While the manuscript seems methodologically appropriate, more information needs to be provided for the methodology part. While the author(s) briefly mentioned the participants were “selected face-to-face and online”, how participants were recruited remain unclear (e.g., whether they were recruited through distributing questionnaires online or sending flyers in classroom; whether participation was fully voluntary or driven by incentives). This information might be important for research using survey.  Another area to improve might be the conclusion drawn from findings. It is worth noting that correlations do not denote casual relationships. The author(s) are suggested to reconsider their arguments and implications, and make cautious use of words such as “affect” (p8.&amp; p.9). Apart from statistical significance, the strength of correlation might be worth discussing.</li> <li>6. The manuscript demonstrates a good attempt to review the latest literature.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and writing standard of the manuscript is clear and appropriate for an academic journal audience. The citation format may need be more consistent (e.g., p2. Geert Hofstede (1980); p4. Nichaya Wattanavorakijkul [21]; p5. Suchodoletz, A., &amp; Hepach, R. (2021), [10])</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Potential improvements of this manuscript could also be made by considering the following areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The author(s) are suggested to illustrate more about why this population is worth studying, given previous literature on similar topics. As the author(s) reviewed, this study was conducted on a group of under-researched participants, namely, students studying Teacher Education in Philippine. The significance and value of this study could be greatly improved if the author(s) could consider the characteristics of students in Teacher Education and students in Philippine.</li> <li>2. The author(s) hypothesized that “cultural values do not significantly correlate with intercultural sensitivity” (p.2). The hypothesis might need literature support. The author(s) are suggested to review previous findings on the relationship between cultural values and intercultural sensitivity in other countries (e.g., Liu [33] on p.8).</li> <li>3. The author(s) use two paragraphs to describe the rating scale (p.4). This could be simplified by making two tables.</li> <li>4. The author(s) mentioned there are “diversity and differences” among participants (p.5). More demographic information about the participants should be provided to support this claim.</li> <li>5. The author(s) are suggested to use <math>p &lt; .001</math> to replace “<math>p = .000</math>” (p.8).</li> </ol>	

**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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Yingsheng Liu</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of California, United States</b></p>