



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 comments (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In general Researchers investigated the effect of a communication improvement workshop on student teachers preferred style of communication. I think that the current research was properly timed and fit the current mindset of improving the preparation of teachers in general and student teachers in particular. From reading the article it is evident that the authors are proficient in the issues revolving "Teacher preparation" and "Communication styles". In my opinion the article can be accepted for publication subject to a number of issues that require clarification and perhaps a change. Need: 1) Further description of the control groups' results. A more descriptive table 1. Need to present the means and SD's of control group. Including the data for the control group is important for the purpose of estimating dispersal of data. 2) An indication should be included with the required equal variances and normality assumptions to perform a t-test. 3) Further analysis should be done to compare the results of the control and experimental groups in 2nd time determination of preferred communication style (post). Perhaps with a 2 tailed <u>Independent</u> student t-test.	
Minor REVISION comments	1) In figure 1, It is preferable to add SD lines or other indication on top of mean bars. 2) The author should indicate the amount of change in preferred communication style after the workshop that can be attributed solely to the influence of the workshop (the difference	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	between the change in the experimental group and the change in the control group).	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Perhaps authors should try to provide explanations about why there was no significant change in Spirited and Systematic communication styles.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eyal Weissblueth
Department, University & Country	Dept. of Physical Education, Ohalo Academic College, Israel