



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJESBS_14191
Title of the Manuscript:	Cultural Competency for Working in Agricultural and Extension Education
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

	- - - - - - - - The current article lacks any assessment or measurement of the outcomes of the curriculum, beyond a collection of student comments. The author suggests using the Intercultural Development Inventory as a measurement – this should be done prior to publication for the readers to be able to have a better assessment of whether this coursework was effective - - - - - - - - - - - - The author reports that “Adaptation and modifications to the structure, content and assignments have been made every semester to improve students’ success.” Readers will want to know how these modifications have been made – i.e. how is the curriculum assessed and changes decided upon -	Competencies” and develop online training in the D2L platform for the extension to take in their own time. The improvement (or not) of intercultural competence will be assess during the next semester. The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) will be use to assess the change. However, due the confidentiality of the results of this instrument, the students participation in the course could not be assess using this instrument. The instrument will only guide students personal intercultural competence development. The course is assessed using the normal grading (A, B, C, D, E, F, I). Pag 8 Some of these modifications and adaptations include, change of the type of assignments (from descriptive to reflective), improve of the rubrics (incorporating critical thinking), weekly quizzes, additions to the reading list
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- - - - - - The manuscript states that “As a result of their participation in the class, the students have demonstrated their cultural awareness, cultural knowledge and cultural understanding.” How has this been demonstrated? How is cultural competence assessed?	assignments, weekly videos, and summary of the readings Students evaluations include assignments that demonstrate their cultural awareness (like the power point presentation during the first week, and/or the description of their own culture), cultural knowledge (when the students describe different cultures, and emphasized commonalities and differences with their own culture), and cultural understanding with the exercise’s of working in different cultures.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- There are fairly extension details of the structure of the course – i.e. online discussions, what extra credit is available – but the actual content seems lacking. From reading it, I don't have a well-developed sense of how students' cultural competence is improved. Possibly taking out some of the structural detail and replacing it with a more in-depth example of the actual course content, such as a particular assignment/exercise would be useful - There are a lot of grammatical errors throughout the manuscript (lack of spaces between words, missing punctuation or incorrect useage). While some may reflect conversion between word documents, others seem simply to be errors. I would encourage that author to go through the piece more thoroughly or seek out editorial services	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper discusses an important topic, that of cultural competence for those working in extension programs. Having worked in extension, I can see how this curriculum could serve an important educational role. I would like to encourage the author to revise the manuscript and continue with their efforts, as it is a worthwhile concept that should be addressed.	