

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_122840
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Challenges of Future Social Studies Educators in the Age of Industry 4.0
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 timely study examines an important issue - preparing future social studies educators for the technology integration demands of Industry 4.0. Using a mixed-methods approach, it insightfully maps awareness, preparedness levels and challenges. Key findings reveal a gap between awareness and preparedness for certain technologies. It also surfaces critical obstacles like unreliable infrastructure and digital inequities. Though narrowly focused on one campus, the study has broad relevance regarding technology literacy in teacher training. Its implications could inform efforts to equip educators with the tools to leverage Industry 4.0 advancements. Overall, a well-structured examination of a critical aspect of contemporary teacher preparation.</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: "Exploring the Challenges of Future Social Studies Educators in the Age of Industry 4.0" The title is appropriate and effectively communicates the key focus of the study. Some key aspects it captures: 1. Future orientation - Exploring preparedness of future social studies educators 2. Context - Grounding the research in the age of Industry 4.0 3. Research focus - Centered on identifying the challenges faced by the target group The title is concise, clear, and aligns well with the stated research questions and methodology. However, a minor change that could make it slightly more precise: "Exploring the Challenges Faced by Future Social Studies Educators in Integrating Technology in the Era of Industry 4.0" The revised title specifies that the challenges are related to technology integration, which is an important nuance as per the study's goals. But the existing title also works perfectly well in encapsulating the research scope and direction. So there is no major need for change unless the authors want to add that element of precision. In summary, the current title is suitable and capturing the essence aptly. A possible minor modification is suggested but not essential.</p>	

Review Form 3

<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 effectively summarizes the key aspects of the study in a concise manner. It covers the major points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Background/context: Situates the research against the backdrop of Industry 4.0 and the need for education to adapt accordingly. - Purpose: Clearly states the aim to investigate the preparedness and challenges faced by future social studies educators regarding technological advancements. - Methodology: Succinctly notes the mixed-methods approach adopted. - Key findings: Highlights the major findings related to awareness levels, preparedness, their correlation and prominent challenges identified. - Implications: Touches upon the implications for teacher training to enhance technological literacy. <p>The structure flows well and the word limit ensures brevity while retaining the vital information. In terms of additions/deletions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deletions: No deletions needed as all points covered are relevant. - Additions: Could add a line situating the research context - "The study was conducted among 239 future social studies educators at Pangasinan State University, Philippines" <p>Also, the implications could be expanded a bit more: "The findings highlight the need for teacher education programs to prioritize technological awareness and preparedness through comprehensive training focused on emerging industry technologies." However, these are minor suggestions for an already well-written abstract. The existing one effectively summarizes the critical aspects of the paper within the word limit. So no major revisions are required in my opinion.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the structure of the manuscript follows a logical flow and the subsections are appropriately organized. Here is a brief assessment of the structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction: Comprehensively sets the background and context, situates the research gap, and highlights the purpose and questions driving the study. - Methodology: Clearly details the research design, participants, locale, instruments, data collection and analysis methods. - Results and Discussion: Findings are structured around the key research questions - awareness, preparedness, their correlation, and challenges. Discussion ties back the results to past literature. - Conclusion: Summarizes the major conclusions, acknowledges limitations, and recommends future research directions. - Implications: Discusses the implications of the results for teacher training and technology integration. <p>The use of subsections under the Results and Discussion section to map the findings to each research question enhances readability. The manuscript flows logically from introducing the problem and questions, to methods, results aligned with questions, and closing with conclusions and implications. As such, the existing structure is apt and segregation into subsections is appropriate. It reflects clarity of thought and aids reader comprehension. No major changes needed in my opinion.</p>	
<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>Here are a few reasons why I find this manuscript to be scientifically sound:</p> <p>Firstly, the study adopts a rigorous mixed-methods approach by combining surveys with open-ended responses. This allows for gathering both quantitative trends as well qualitative insights. Using suitable statistical tests (e.g. correlation analysis) to analyze the quantitative data also adds to the technical robustness.</p> <p>Secondly, developing the research instrument based on a validated questionnaire from past literature reflects scientific soundness. Appropriate inclusion criteria have been applied for selecting the study participants.</p> <p>Thirdly, the study methodology shows attention to ethical principles - informed consent has been taken and confidentiality of responses is guaranteed. This adds to the integrity of the results.</p> <p>Finally, interpreting the results in the light of previous evidence and theories in the field of technology adoption demonstrates the scientific lens applied by the researchers. Linking findings to implications for practice further validates the scholarly value.</p> <p>Overall, the scientifically grounded mixed-methods approach, validated instrument, ethical protocols and theory-backed analytical lens enhance the academic rigor and technical viability of this study.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>A relevant study conducted by Mahyoob, Algaraady and Elmahdi (2024) among EFL teachers examined similar challenges of e-learning adoption like lacking technological infrastructure and disparate access to digital technologies. Their research reinforces the need to address these persistent obstacles, as also surfaced in the present investigation of preparedness among future social studies educators. Equipping teachers-in-training to leverage technology would require strategies to mitigate impediments rooted in unreliable infrastructure and digital inequity.</p> <p>Ref,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Mahyoob, M., Algaraady, J., & Elmahdi, O. E. H. E. (2024). Challenges and sustainability of e-learning adoption among EFL teachers in the post-COVID-19 era. In P. Jacques, C. W. Yang & S. Phan (Eds.), Educational technology in a post-pandemic world: Sustainable practices for the future (pp. 428-447). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5266-6215-8.ch017 <p>I'd like to suggest adding this reference study.</p> <p>The key strategies I used to contextualize the citation more directly to this paper are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Noted the parallel focus of examining challenges to technology adoption2) Highlighted that their findings on specific challenges are consistent3) Reinforced these challenges as also reflected among the future social studies educators4) Linked these common impediments to interventions needed in teacher training programs	
--	---	--

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of this article is suitable for scholarly communication. Here are some key aspects that support this:</p> <p>Clarity - The ideas are expressed lucidly using simple, unambiguous language that conveys the intended meaning effectively. Complex terminologies have been avoided and technical jargon is minimized.</p> <p>Objectivity - The tone maintains academic objectivity, with factual statements backed by evidence. Opinions or biases are avoided.</p> <p>Coherence - The text flows smoothly by connecting ideas and sections coherently. Appropriate transition words and discourse markers have been used.</p> <p>Precision - Key terms and concepts central to the study context have been used with accuracy. The constructs of awareness, preparedness and challenges are precisely framed and analyzed.</p> <p>Spelling/grammar - No major spelling, punctuation or grammatical errors were evident. Proper sentence structure has been followed throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>In summary, the scholarly style, precise terminology, academic tone, coherence and absence of language-related issues make the communication align with high quality scholarly standards. The language quality is apt for dissemination in scholarly mediums to subject experts. I did not find any major areas needing improvement in terms of English quality.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Here are some suggestions that could further improve this paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include a limitations and future research section: The paper would benefit by clearly stating its limitations such as the narrow focus on one university's social studies program. Recommendations for addressing limitations through wider studies can then be presented. 2. Survey validation details: More details on pilot testing and statistical validation done to assess the survey could strengthen methods rigor. 3. Comparative aspect: Comparing awareness and preparedness by educational level (e.g. 2nd year vs 4th year) can yield additional insights. 4. Student perspectives: Supplementing the main findings with qualitative insights directly from open-ended student responses could provide richer elucidation. 5. Visual data representation: Using graphs and charts to visualize key quantitative results could enhance engagement. 6. Broader implications: Expand the implications beyond teacher training to wider policy-level impact e.g. formulating contemporary technology education standards. <p>In conclusion, the paper in its current form covers significant ground regarding the core objectives. Implementation of the above suggestions can help augment the scope and presentation - but are not imperative given the manuscript's well-structured current state.</p> <p>Based on my detailed review focusing on multiple aspects - content, methodology, analyses, ethics, structure, language quality and overall coherence, I would rate this manuscript an overall score of 9 out of 10.</p> <p>Justification of score:</p> <p>The manuscript examines a significant area that demands more scholarly attention - preparedness for technological disruption in contemporary education ecosystems. Both the conceptualization and rigorous empirical approach are appreciable.</p> <p>The mixed-methods design combined with suitable sampling, validated instrument, depth of investigations into awareness-readiness linkages and challenges establish sound technical viability. The quantitative findings are also enriched by qualitatively outlining specific obstacles described by participants.</p> <p>The author team reveals scientific astuteness - background rooted in cogent theories, unbiased analytical lens, linking results to implications for teacher education. The writing is lucid, well-structured</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>and language quality suitable for an academic audience. No major ethical or interest conflicts were noticeable.</p> <p>While broader studies can enhance generalizability of conclusions, the current work makes significant contributions for its defined scope. Potential augmentation of limitations and visual representation notwithstanding, the manuscript in its current form also meets merit for scholarly acceptance.</p> <p>In summary, given the manuscript's methodological rigor, ethical soundness, significant value-add for literature gap and practice, coherence in communication and minimal revisions needed, I rate it 9 out of 10 and recommend acceptance following minor revisions.</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Omer Elsheikh Hago Elmahdi
Department, University & Country	OUS, Sudan, Taibah University, Saudi Arabia