



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJESBS_12345
Title of the Manuscript:	Improving Communication Style Awareness in a Teacher Preparation Program
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. In this research, you have assessed two purpose with a statistical test, so it is better to integrate these two purpose. 2. What method is used to estimate the sample size? 3. Please report validity and reliability and method of scoring of communication styles instrument. 4. Independent variable is presented in an ambiguous way. Please explain more clearly. 5. Please report the results and discussion with two titles, separately.	The first purpose is to examine if the HRQD can be used successfully in an academic setting. The results describe this examination. The second is to start a conversation about communication in student-teacher programs and specifically if a program already on the market shows promise for use in such an academic setting. The paper itself will hopefully lead to this discussion. This was a quazi-experiment and so our intact groups dictated our sample size of this pilot study. This is a program used in business settings. The manual has very rudimentary information regarding reliability and validity. The company has not replied with more detailed information (requested last week). The IV is the HRDQ program components described in detail in the methods section line 128-202. The format for the article was provided by the journal. The purpose of the study was to examine if students would increase their preference for styles deemed advantageous for classroom communication and decrease it for direct which is deemed inappropriate for a positive environment. Since we were not examining interactions we planned paired t-tests in the design and they are appropriate and don't require a large sample size.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6. For data analysing paired t test is not suitable. MANCOVA test is recommended. 7. No comparison between experimental and control groups has taken place. Therefore, it is necessary to re-analyse the data using appropriate statistical tests 8. The raw of 6 & 8 of conclusion part are ambiguous and need to be changed.	We don't have any co-variables to control for so I am not sure why you suggest a MANCOVA. An ANOVA does show the same result with differences for CoC and CoD. Added to the results section. I am sorry but I don't follow this suggestion. Please see additions to the manuscript related to the positive and negative impact of communication styles related to this study.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please explain strengths and weaknesses of each style briefly. Please briefly explain the HRDQ program.	See the manuscript 9 Line 95-103 Lines 128-202 explain the program and the specific parts used during the intervention. Lines 132-135 explain how it was derived and is from the company. I have yet to receive additional psychometric information on the pencil & paper instrument used to measure the preferences I requested from the company.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please clarify the ethical issue, if any	? We don't note any ethical issues. Thank you for taking the time to review this manuscript and for the suggestions.