

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_78160
Title of the Manuscript:	USING INSTRUCTIONAL SCREENCAST TO TEACH DIGITAL IMMIGRANTS: A PARADIGM SHIFT IN THE 21ST CENTURY LEARNING PROCESS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This report has a title which is difficult relating with its content. It informs about attitudes of some postgraduate with respect to a particular use of a teaching technology. However, title refers to teaching of digital immigrants. So, first recommendation is to adequate title to content.</p> <p>Theoretical framework is presented in the introduction section, referring to student-centered education, and the following section, where the use of instructional screencast as a teaching and learning tool is described.</p> <p>Explaining how this tool serves to the purpose of designing teaching strategies based upon the work of students would help to understand the relevance of the study.</p> <p>Study proposes two objectives. The first one only requires registering birth date, so it can be considered as an objective.</p> <p>As for the second, it is fulfilled with the use of a questionnaire (adapted by the authors from another) and presenting results through a descriptive table. Although methodologically correct, this procedure has the problem that in this case only thirteen students responded. This is the reason why results must be taken with prudence.</p> <p>Authors highlight concordance of results with the ones of previous studies.</p> <p>Conclusions' section mention that "many digital immigrants have negative attitudes toward technology.", contrasting with results gathered. However, no bibliographical reference is presented arguing about this sentence. So, it's necessary to give one, or to remove it.</p> <p>Besides, when making recommendations, it's said that "...the study and literature have demonstrated that screencasts can be an effective technology tool for learning in the twenty-first century..." Since study refers to attitudes of students, it doesn't demonstrate anything. I suggest reformulating this section.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eduardo Mario Lacues Apud
Department, University & Country	Catholic University Of Uruguay, Uruguay