

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_109799
Title of the Manuscript:	“ANALYZING TEACHERS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGY IN TEACHING AND LEARNING”
Type of the Article	Short 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes. It is important, but it needs revision.</p> <p>2. No. <b>Teachers' Attitude about the Integration of Technology in the Teaching Learning Process</b></p> <p>3. Yes, but the recommendation is left.</p> <p>4. No. The statement of the problem section should be placed before the review of related literature.</p> <p>5. Yes, it is correct, but revision is needed.</p> <p>6. No. See the comments in the introduction. How much only six references are enough? The findings of the current research should be compared with the previously related researches.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, however revision is needed.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The authors should revise the manuscript to bring it into the expected standard.</p> <p>1. The introduction needs revision. Source is needed for some points ( see the comments from the manuscript)</p> <p>2. The problem is not stated well. Revise the statement of the problem section again.</p> <p>3. The way you discussed is not followed scientific approach. Support your findings with empirical evidences.</p> <p>4. Add references accordingly. What you cited are very limited.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Befikadu Lemma</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Addis Ababa Science and Technology University, Ethiopia</b>