

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: “**A Study On the Construct Validity of the Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale (BFNE)**”

Corresponding Author: Sabahattin Çam
Email: yerlikaya@cu.edu.tr

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v7no4a4

Peer review:
Reviewer 1: Zouhaier Slimi
International Maritime College, Oman

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 30.12.2020

EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: EJES promotes peer-review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.



EJES editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands EJES out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 16/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/09/2020
Manuscript Title: A STUDY ON THE CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF THE BRIEF FEAR OF NEGATIVE EVALUATION SCALE (BFNE)	
Manuscript Number: 1	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3.5
<i>The objectives and results of the study are clear. However, the method depiction needs clarifications as the author has only mentioned the number of participants without elaborating on the method applied and how it contributed to the research conducted.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5
<p><i>Abstract:</i></p> <p>The Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale (BFNE) consisting of 12 items, eight straightforwardly scored and four reverse-scored items, the 12-item Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale-Revised (BFNE-II) revised to be straightforwardly worded, and the Brief Fear of Negative... (An expert audience might find this sentence hard to read. Consider breaking it into two. So, delete “and” to start a new sentence, as, e.g. Finally, the Brief Fear of negative...)</p>	

The item analyses conducted for three different **forms and** the calculated internal consistency coefficients also revealed that the BFNE-II and BFNE-S had better psychometric properties than the BFNE. (*forms, and ...*)

...students in Turkey due to its theoretically based, robust factor structure and its **high reliability** coefficient despite consisting of fewer items.

(It appears that **high-reliability** is missing a hyphen. Consider adding the hyphen)

Introduction:

P1.

However, despite its common use, it is observed that many studies have been carried out, especially on the construct validity of the scale, and discussions based on the results of these studies have continued for many years. (*Consider rewriting the sentence as sounds wordy.*)

P2

...allows for a more sensitive measurement. (*delete "a"*)

The second result is that the single-factor structure assumed in previous studies, both in **the brief** and long versions... (*for fluency engagement change the word "brief" with the word "short"*)

One of the two important results reached by **Rodebaugh et al.** in this study is that the response approach based... (*review the citation, year is missing*)

P4

..in the fear of...(*in fear of...*)

P5

...the results of the factor analysis previously conducted (Rodebaugh et al., 2004; Weeks et al., 2005) and **determine** the most appropriate way to be followed for reverse-worded items. (*determined*)

Based on these results, Carleton et al. (2006) suggested the use of the BFNE-II, which was created by revising these items to be straightforwardly worded, instead of removing the reverse-scored items from the scale or leaving them in the scale and not including in the scoring. (*review the sentence as it sounds wordy*)

P7

...convergent and divergent validity, **while the** reverse-scored items constituted only... (*Split the sentence as it is hard to read, e.g. in contrast,...*)

P8

In fact, the purpose (*In fact, is not needed here*)

P9

One of these options is to use only eight straightforwardly worded items **in the scale** (*on the scale*)

P10

Based on the findings obtained in this study, Carleton et al. (2011) suggest that the four items revised to be straightforwardly worded, which they consider to be unnecessary and which are potentially problematic, should be removed from the scale and that the use of the BFNE-S, which is composed of eight items straightforwardly worded in the original scale, will be more appropriate both in research and for clinical purposes. (*Review, long sentence*)

P11

It is observed that the adaptation studies of the BFNE to Turkish culture were carried out by three different research groups. (Use active form; It is observed that three different research groups carried out the adaptation studies of the BFNE to Turkish culture)

...both the total score and two factor scores were also high. (two-factor)

P12

...the reliability of the second factor scores was quite insufficient. (second-factor...insufficient)

*Method:**Measures:*

...it was concluded that the scale exhibited a two-factor structure, and eight straightforwardly scored items were loaded with appropriate values in one factor, and the other four reverse-scored items were loaded with appropriate values in the second factor. (consider splitting the sentence as it is a long one)

The correlation value of first factor...(of the first)

The correlation value of first factor with the total score were .97, of the second factor with the total score were .90, and the correlation value between the two factors were .76. (was in both cases)

Table 1: CFA model indices of BFNE, BFNE-II and BFNE-S (review)

BFNE: Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale, BFNE-II: Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale Revised, BFNE-S: Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale Straightforward Items (Scale-revised)

Discussion

This finding can be considered as evidence for the views of many authors stating that the four reverse-scored items in the scale do not actually reflect a separate structure,...(remove actually)

There is a very high correlation between the eight item scores and the total score ($r=.93$). (eight-item)

The high reliability coefficients were obtained with 12 items (.90) for the BFNE-II form and eight items (.87) for the BFNE-S form. (The high-reliability)

Conclusion

Based on this results,... (These results...)

Limitations

It is necessary to examine which of these three forms of the tool better distinguish (the tool to better)

...are not involved in educational life... (it would be better to use "academic life")

...can be applied to. (Avoid using prepositions at the end of a sentence)

References

12. Karademir, T. (2011). The assessment of parental attitudes (attitudes)

<p>20. Rodebaugh, T. L., Woods, C. M., & Heimberg, R. G. (2007). The reverse of social anxiety is not always the opposite: the reverse-scored items of the social interaction anxiety scale do not belong. <i>Behavior Therapy</i>, 38, 192–206. (anxiety is... interaction anxiety...)</p> <p>21. Rodebaugh, T. L., Woods, C. M., Thissen, D. M., Heimberg, R. G., Chambless, D. L., & Rapee, R. M. (2004). More information from fewer questions: the factor structure and item properties of the original and brief fear of negative evaluation scale. <i>Psychological assessment</i>, 16, 169–181 (structure and)</p> <p>30. Weeks, J. W., Heimberg, R. G., Fresco, D. M., Hart, T. A., Turk, C. L., Schneier, F. R., & Liebowitz, M. R. (2005). Empirical validation and psychometric evaluation of the brief fear of negative evaluation scale in patients with social anxiety disorder. <i>Psychological assessment</i>, 17, 179–190 (of negative)</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The study method is well explained with clear elaboration on the number of participants, their gender as well as the process of conducting the study and analyzing data.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3.5
<i>The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions are genuine, accurate and supportive to the content of the paper.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The article uses an up-to-date reference list that is appropriate to the topic discussed and comprehensive.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	Yes
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the author (s):

Elaborate a bit on the method described in the abstract.



Review the language issues highlighted.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Accept the paper with a minor revision required.



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

