

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: "Attitudes of Prospective French Teachers Towards School Experience and Teaching Practice Courses"

Corresponding Author: Zuhre Yilmaz Gungor
Email: zyilmaz@anadolu.edu.tr

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no4a65

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yasemin Acar-Ciftci

Reviewer 2: Abdullah Aydın

Published: 31.12.2021

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:09/06/2021 | Date Review Report Submitted:09/09/2021 |
| Manuscript Title: ATTITUDES OF PROSPECTIVE FRENCH TEACHERS TOWARDS SCHOOL EXPERIENCE AND TEACHING PRACTICE COURSES | |
| 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] |
|--|--|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 5 |



| | |
|---|---|
| <i>The title is clear, and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 5 |
| Yes | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 3 |
| <i>In the text, do not use the first person, i.e. "I", "we", "my" "our", etc. For example, rather than "I show that..." or "I argue..." write "This paper shows that..." or "As argued here ... ". Rather than "We found... " write "As demonstrated here...". You can find them all in the journal Author Guidelines. Turkish characters need to be converted to English characters. It is indicated on the manuscript</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| Yes | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 5 |
| (Yes) | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| Yes | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 2 |
| <i>No, References need to be reviewed. Please follow the APA 7 guide.</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|---|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | X |
| 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: Sept. 03, 2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: Sept. 13, 2021 |
| Manuscript Title: ATTITUDES OF PROSPECTIVE FRENCH TEACHERS TOWARDS SCHOOL EXPERIENCE AND TEACHING PRACTICE COURSES | |



| |
|---|
| 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] |
|--|--|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 4 |
| <i>The title is partially clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i> ❖ “The title / aim of this study”, this should be checked. | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 3 |
| <i>The abstract clearly presents partially objects, methods and results.</i> ❖ The abstract needs to be restructured so that it is suitable for scientific research and not in a form suitable for a thesis. ❖ The methodology is missing in the abstract. | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 3 |
| <i>These are marked on the Drafr Word.</i> | |

| | |
|--|---|
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3 |
| <i>The study methods are partially explained clearly.</i> ❖ More depth is needed about the method employed. | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 3 |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>The body of the paper is partially clear and does not contain errors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Introduction part <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “The training of teachers, responsible for the education of the future generations, depends on a qualified education system.” Reference should be given. ○ “...qualified education system.” This should be explained based on the literature. ○ “...sophisticated training...”. This should be explained based on the literature. ○ “Table 4”, this should be referenced (in the text). | |
| <p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p> | 3 |
| <p>The conclusions or summary are partially accurate and supported by the content.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Original reference should be given. | |
| <p>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</p> | 2 |
| <p>The references are partially comprehensive and appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The references are quite poor. In 41 references, we can find nine with five years or less. For this, since there are available several papers and even books about [School Experience & Teaching Practice courses]. | |

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):

Please see **Draft Word** attached.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Please see **Draft Word** attached.





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

