

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_124626
Title of the Manuscript:	Language and Literacy Education in Austria – Perspectives of Teachers
Type of the Article	

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>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript addresses an important topic in the field of education, specifically focusing on language and literacy education in Austria. I appreciate the manuscript's emphasis on valuable insights into the challenges that teachers face and highlights the need for better support and professional development by offering data-driven perspectives directly from teachers</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title of the article is generally clear and appropriate as it reflects the focus on both language and literacy education from the perspective of teachers in Austria.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract clearly states the research objective and provides sufficient details about the methodology, making the research process understandable. However, there is a lack of clear connection between the results and conclusion. While the findings mention the challenges and teaching methods, it is not explicitly shown how these lead to the conclusion regarding the need for professional development. Strengthening the link between the findings and the final recommendations would improve the overall clarity and coherence of the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear generally appropriate for a qualitative research study, as it follows a standard format that includes an abstract, introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. However, there are a few areas where improvements could be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The introduction provides a broad literature review, highlighting the general background and importance of language and literacy. However, it does not clearly reflect the specific research gap concerning the challenges faced by teachers in Austria, which is central to the article's topic. - Clarify Sampling Method for example "Eighteen teachers participated in the survey, with an average of 19.5 years of teaching experience, ranging from 2 to 27 years. This wide range of teaching experience was deliberately chosen to capture a diverse array of perspectives" - In the section where it is mentioned that the number of respondents to the survey was low, beyond stating that the survey was sent out multiple times with few responses, it would be beneficial to provide a rationale for how the data was handled. For example, explaining that the responses were analyzed in-depth within the context of the schools the respondents were from could help justify the findings. Alternatively, if no action was taken to address the low response rate, this should be noted in the limitations of the study. It should be acknowledged that the low number of respondents may not fully reflect the opinions of the majority of teachers in Austria, potentially affecting the generalizability of the finding. - Review whether Figure 3: Visualization of the main and subcategories is categorized in alignment with the research questions outlined in the study. Additionally, ensure consistency in capitalization and avoid splitting words across lines. To improve readability and visual clarity, consider adjusting the spacing within the graphic to accommodate larger text sizes. - Making the connection between the results and the research questions clearer strengthens the alignment between the data and the study's objectives. - Consistency in terminology improves clarity and ensures readers do not become confused by varying terms that refer to the same concept - It is recommended to revise the Results section by presenting the qualitative data analysis clearly aligned with the research questions. In the Discussion section, these findings should then be interpreted in relation to the relevant literature. The Conclusion should summarize the key points according to the main topics and the objectives stated in the abstract, while also addressing the study's limitations. 	

Review Form 3

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its clear research design and methodology, which include both qualitative surveys and interviews to gather comprehensive data from Austrian teachers. The systematic use of qualitative content analysis, following established methods such as Kuckartz and Rädiker, ensures that the data are processed and interpreted rigorously.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to be comprehensive, covering a range of foundational and recent studies relevant to language and literacy education.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript could benefit from consistency in terminology</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Expanding on the broader educational policies in Austria that impact language and literacy education</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment <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>
<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>Sukanda Jongsermtrakoon</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Kasetsart University, Thailand</p>