

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_78874
Title of the Manuscript:	Redefining the senses of "model of teaching" and "teaching strategy": An alternative approach
Type of the Article	Theory

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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment Redefining the senses of "model of teaching" and "teaching strategy": An alternative approach ...	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>I have started reading this article and nostalgia has seized me because in my initial education lexicography, philosophy and, above all, ancient Greek philosophy was present. The references to canonical authors of the sixties and seventies have also made me nostalgic since Ausubel, Bruner, Piaget, not to forget Vygotsky, Dewey, Bloom, Slavin, Rogers, Maslow, Bandura, and Skinner are associated with my early college years and therefore enthusiastic learning.</p> <p>However, when I started my university teaching, the turn "from teaching to learning", "from teacher to learners", "from teaching objectives to learning results and learner achievements" had already happened. We miss in this theoretical study a focus on this turning point, on the new paradigm centered on the learner. The authors keep in a totally outdated references in relation to the subject. The sense of "models of teaching" as the authors underline has been established in pedagogical science since the second quarter of the 20th century, but we are reaching 2022, and a series of revolutionary twists have occurred in Didactic that deserve an account and that have transformed the search for models of teaching to search for models of learning, which have changed the way of planning, placing the learner at the center of curricular design. The teaching content plans have been transformed into the design of skills and interconnected practical-theory activities.</p> <p>And furthermore, learning is now situated learning; the social and natural context has become a point of reference when designing learning activities. Now there are a great consensus and emphasis on these "student-centeredness" models, which focus on social learning theories.</p> <p>But clearly, the authors focus on teaching is dominant. The "model of teaching", for the authors, remains a coherent interconnection in a single set of teaching objectives and teaching contents as basic elements. For this reason, his vision does not include the advances and changes that the international educational community has produced in recent decades.</p> <p>Consistently, the illustration (fig 2) corresponds to the theory of objectives, currently demolished by the learning of competences. In the illustration, also coherently, the learner ceases to be the center to be tiny rows of equal and uniform learners that will be introduced into similar igloos and will be returned converted into similar teachers objectives. Where is the vision of the autonomous, divergent, creative and self-determined learners here?</p> <p>We recommend that the authors advance in the search for current educational models in that long road that they have forgotten to travel. If they do so, with the correctness with which they have travelled the first evolutionary stretch of curricular theory, they will undoubtedly end up correctly.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	<i>Maria A. Martínez</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Alicante University, Spain</i>