

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_109799</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“ANALYZING TEACHERS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGY IN TEACHING AND LEARNING”</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short Research Article</b>

**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><b>Compulsory</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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The study is very pertinent to the present context of transitioning teaching-learning-assessment process in education. The author has tried to grasp the basic dimension and focus the study.</li> <li>2. The title is suitable.</li> <li>3. The abstract is crisp but lacks a hint on the outcome of the study.</li> <li>4. Yes, the subsections are well arranged and the structure of the manuscript is well organised. Table 1 caption is missing.</li> <li>5. The research report/findings documented in the manuscript lacks in coherence of methodology in few sections.</li> <li>6. The references are few but pertinent. There has been a lot of studies/surveys/action researches in this realm, especially carried out during 2019-present. The author has restricted the timeline of reviewing the related studies to 2017. The web references entered in the 'Reference' section must have the retrieval date.</li> </ol> <p>The detailed comments/suggestions on the manuscript are summarized below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i.The statement of the problem has been stated clearly.</li> <li>ii.Objectives have been presented appropriately.</li> <li>iii.Though it is a 'Short Research Article', only one hypothesis as well as a single independent variable (gender) seems to be insufficient for an article.</li> <li>v.The sample size is sufficient. The sampling technique (convenience sampling) used for descriptive surveys is not applicable for probability sampling. This non-probability sampling is quite prone to research bias. There is no explanation in favour of using this sampling technique in the article.</li> <li>vi.There are no details about the research tool used in the survey.</li> <li>vii.The results pertaining to the objectives have been presented elaborately. The scale (<a href="https://himalaya.socanth.cam.ac.uk/collections/journals/jbs/pdf/JBS_35_02.pdf">https://himalaya.socanth.cam.ac.uk/collections/journals/jbs/pdf/JBS_35_02.pdf</a>) that was used for the survey was a five-point Likert scale (5: strongly agree, 4: agree, 3: neutral, 2: disagree, 1: strongly disagree), but in the result, the attitude of the teachers was categorised into three groups, which also have no explanations. Categorisation into unfavorable, favourable, and highly favorable attitudes is also not appropriate to show neutrality in the middle category. The result was presented graphically in a systematic way.</li> <li>viii. There is no explanation why the z test has been performed. There is no information about whether normality test has been performed or not before testing the hypothesis.</li> <li>ix.There is no explanation or justification for the patterns identified in the findings.</li> <li>x.There is no mention about the implications/outcome of the study.</li> <li>xi. The 'conclusion' section is somewhat repetition of the 'interpretation' section. The author may have enriched this section with cross-references extrapolating the outcome and the significance of the study. This could have included areas like-benefitting school education and the society at large or a road map to school teaching-learning-assessment milieu.</li> </ol>	

## Review Form 1.7

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. There are few typos and grammatical errors, highlighted in the PDF ( <b>attached</b> ). Otherwise, the language of the article is accepted for scholarly communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>Kindly refer Part-1, Point-6. No further comments.</b>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Papiya Upadhyay</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Netaji Subhas Open University, India</b>