

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“Teacher Candidates’ Cyberloafing Behaviors in Terms of Different Variables”**

Corresponding Author: Fatma Sadık
Email: fsadik@cu.edu.tr

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no3a81

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Zouhaier Slimi

Reviewer 2: Sandra Chistolini

Published: 30.09.2021

EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: 10 06 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 15 06 2021
Manuscript Title: AN INVESTIGATION OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' CYBERLOAFING BEHAVIORS IN TERMS OF DIFFERENT VARIABLES	
Manuscript Number:	
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
<p><i>Yes, the title is clear and reflects the content of the article. However, it suggested getting rid of “an investigation “as it is not needed. It would be better to say:</i></p> <p><i>PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' CYBERLOAFING BEHAVIORS IN TERMS OF DIFFERENT VARIABLES</i></p>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3.5
<p><i>The abstract clearly presents methods and results.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>However, the objectives need to be stated clearly.</i> • <i>It is recommended to review the introductory sentence of the abstract and clarify the objective (s)</i> • <i>Use “this article” instead of “this research.”</i> 	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5
<p><i>The article contains few consistency and clarity issues to be reviewed as it makes some paragraphs hard to read. (Avoid long sentences, and the use of “etc...” in academic writing).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>e.g., The data collection tools were delivered to all students who were in the classroom on the days of the application, and a. A total of 918 pre-service teachers participated in the study voluntarily.</i> • <i>Descriptive Statistics On on Pre-Service Teachers' Internet Usage Behaviors On on MP</i> • <i>Very long question (review it, please)</i> <p><i>“3. Do pre-service teachers' cyberloafing levels during the lesson differ significantly according to their gender, age, department, grade level, and their habits of using the internet on mobile phones (the duration of using internet service on MP, the daily internet connection time on MP, internet usage skill on MP, the frequency of using the internet on MP in the educational setting, and the duration of spending time on the internet without interruption)?”</i></p>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p><i>Yes, the study method is well explained.</i></p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<p><i>Yes, the body of the paper is clearly structured.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>However, the number of words is 9792, better to bring it down to 8000.</i> • <i>E.g. “in terms of” can be replaced by one word “regarding.”</i> • <i>More than half of the participants defined their internet usage skills as at the advanced and expert level. and It was revealed that the level of cyberloafing increased as the expertise increased.</i> 	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes, conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Yes, references are relevant and comprehensive.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>However, adding few up-to-date sources would be valuable. (2020-21)</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: 10/06/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/06/2021
Manuscript Title: AN INVESTIGATION OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' CYBERLOAFING BEHAVIORS IN TERMS OF DIFFERENT VARIABLES	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
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.	2
The place of the sample should be quoted	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
It is not clear the benefit of the research in terms of scientific results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Spelling mistakes to be controlled	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
Method is not fully explained. "Description" is a word repeated several times without scientific references. Variables are not clear.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
Some sections of the paper are repeated. Repetition appears useless.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
Conclusion should be more accurate. There are not evidences about the period in which the level of cyberloafing increased. The research was made in one academic year only there is not comparison from different academic years.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
To be controlled for the style the formatting rules.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	



Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

