

## REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: "Pre-Service Teachers' Cognitive Constructs Regarding the Characteristics of a Good Information Technologies Academician"

Corresponding Author: Mehmet Ramazanođlu  
Email: [m.ramazanoglu@siirt.edu.tr](mailto:m.ramazanoglu@siirt.edu.tr)

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no1a1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Intakhab Alam Khan  
King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

Reviewer 2: Rachel Dunbar  
The University of West Alabama, USA

Published: 31.03.2021

## ***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:	Date Review Report Submitted:
<b>Manuscript Title: PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' COGNITIVE CONSTRUCTS REGARDING THE CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES ACADEMICIAN</b>	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes/No</span>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes/No</span>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes/No</span>	

### **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><b>Questions</b></i>	<i><b>Rating Result</b></i> [Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
-------------------------	--



<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>It can be rephrased or grammar error be rectified (see manuscript pls)</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	



Reject	
--------	--

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

PLEASE see manuscript attached

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

PLEASE see manuscript attached



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF  
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES ( EJES )



## ***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: 1.24.21	Date Review Report Submitted: 2.2.21
Manuscript Title: <i>Pre-service Teachers' Cognitive Constructs Regarding the Characteristics of Good Information Technologies Academician</i>	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

### **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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>



<i>The title of the journal has the potential to be strong, but the last word “Academician” should be plural.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The abstract is meant to look at what pre-service teachers think will make a person good at technology. The reviewer had to read the abstract several times to glean this. The wording is a bit awkward, especially at the end of the abstract. The name of the department should be capitalized in the third sentence and a sentence in the middle of the abstract begins with digits rather than with the words of the number.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>There are several grammatical and spelling mistakes in the article. However, the reviewer made the assumption that it was possible that the author(s) of the article were not in the United States. The reviewer considered that some of the spelling may be related to the location of where the article originated.</i> <i>One concern the reviewer had was that grammatically, there were errors related to tense and number. For instance, the author(s) may have used present tense instead of past tense verbs, used a singular noun rather than a proper noun, and left out some words that would complete a sentence.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The methods for this study are not explained clearly. The author(s) say that they will use qualitative and quantitative methods and has a heading titled “Methods” is there. However, the author(s) do not actually tell what the methods are in that section. The author(s) have a section heading titled “Data Collection Tools” and use that to state what the collection methods are rather than necessarily state what the tools are. This can be remedied by adjusting the headings to match the information in the paragraph.</i> <i>The research questions need quite a bit of revision. They are very wordy and subsequently, confusing. It is unclear how the author may answer these questions as they are written. It is possible that the author(s) can either combine some of the questions or delete them if they are too similar to each other.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>There are multiple errors within this paper. Words within the sentences are repetitive so the structure is not strong. While editing, the reviewer made comments in the margins of the paper to indicate multiple places that were unclear. Some of the information was vague based upon what the author(s) wrote and it left many questions unanswered.</i> <i>The tables also are not necessarily clear, despite the descriptions associated with them, as the percentages do not make sense. Even though the graphics are a nice touch, they still must have a reasonable flow with the paper.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>1</b>

<i>The conclusion essentially indicates what the author(s) wanted to convey overall. However, the body of the paper is choppy and needs a considerable amount of work for it to line up with the conclusion.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><i>The references are not comprehensive. Many of them are outdated and should be more recent. There were references that were over 40 years old. Given that technology is constantly evolving, there is certainly more recent literature that would be applicable to support this paper. Additionally, direct quotes must have page numbers. There is one long quote that is over 40 words so it should be a block quote.</i></p> <p><i>The information was very disjointed in the paper. For instance, when the author(s) mention results from particular studies, one may have been placed at the top of the paragraph while another that aligned with it was placed near the bottom. The author(s) would benefit from grouping similar studies together so the information in them can connect in a logical format. Otherwise it appears to be in somewhat of a hodgepodge.</i></p>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>X</b>
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

European Journal of Educational Sciences 

*by*  
European Scientific Institute



**EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF  
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)**

