



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>)



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	- Although the background describes how this particular course came to be (i.e. as a result of the author's PhD thesis), this work needs to be better placed in context of intercultural education in extension. Why do we need cultural education in extension (i.e. changing demographics)? What have other's tried in the past? How is this different? - One of the proposals of the article is that Competency Based Education should be adopted. How is this current curriculum competency based? - 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 - The manuscript states that "As a result of their participation in the class, the students have	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	demonstrated their cultural awareness, cultural knowledge and cultural understanding.” How has this been demonstrated? How is cultural competence assessed?	
<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.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Megan Riddle
Department, University & Country	Department of Psychiatry and Behavioural Sciences, University of Washington, USA