

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58591

Title: A BLENDED LEARNING MODEL SUPPORTED BY A WEB-BASED PLATFORM FOR THE PRACTICAL TRAINING OF TECHNOLOGY AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP TEACHERS.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality		√		
Clarity	√			
Significance		√		

Reviewer's ID: JPR-212

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

This manuscript presents a well-conceived and rigorously executed study on the development and evaluation of a blended learning model supported by a specialized web-based platform for the practical training of Technology and Entrepreneurship teachers. The research addresses a timely and relevant topic in the context of digital transformation in teacher education. The study is grounded in a solid theoretical framework and employs an appropriate design-based research methodology.

2. STRENGTHS OF THE PAPER

2.1. Theoretical Foundation

The authors demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the relevant literature, effectively integrating multiple theoretical perspectives including the Community of Inquiry model, TPACK framework, experiential learning theory, and reflective practice. The theoretical framework is well-articulated and provides a strong foundation for the proposed model.

2.2. Originality and Contribution

The paper makes a meaningful contribution by developing an original blended learning model specifically designed for Technology and Entrepreneurship teacher education—an area that has received limited attention in the literature. The integration of methodological preparation, school-based practice, and web-based platform functionalities within a unified framework represents a novel contribution.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

2.3. Methodological Rigor

The design-based research approach is appropriate for this type of study. The sample size (n=93, including 81 student teachers and 12 mentors) is adequate. The use of multiple data collection instruments (questionnaires, pedagogical observation, platform activity analysis, expert evaluation) enhances the validity of the findings. The reporting of Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = 0.764$) demonstrates attention to instrument reliability.

2.4. Clarity and Organization

The paper is exceptionally well-structured and clearly written. The logical flow from introduction through literature review, model development, methodology, results, and discussion facilitates understanding. Figures and tables are appropriately placed and effectively communicate key findings.

2.5. Practical Implications

The study offers valuable practical implications for teacher education programs, particularly in terms of strengthening university-school partnerships and supporting the development of digital competencies.

3. WEAKNESSES AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

3.1. Limitations of Generalizability

The study was conducted at a single university with one teacher education program. The authors acknowledge this limitation but could strengthen the discussion by more explicitly addressing how the model might need to be adapted for different institutional contexts or subject areas.

3.2. Single-Cycle Implementation

The evaluation relied on data from a single implementation cycle. This limits the ability to assess the model's sustainability and long-term impact. The authors should consider addressing this more thoroughly in the limitations section.

3.3. Questionnaire Development

While the internal consistency of the questionnaire is reported, the paper provides limited information about the instrument's development process, including content validation and pilot testing procedures. This could be strengthened.

3.4. Missing Comparative Analysis

The study would benefit from a comparative analysis with traditional approaches to practical training. Although the high satisfaction ratings are informative, the absence of a control group makes it difficult to attribute improvements specifically to the blended learning model.

3.5. Platform Description

The paper describes the platform's functionalities but provides limited technical details about its

REVIEWER'S REPORT

architecture, development process, and specific features. More information would be valuable for researchers and practitioners considering adoption.

3.6. Assessment of Competency Development

The evaluation of professional competency development relies primarily on self-reported perceptions. The inclusion of objective measures of competency development (e.g., teaching performance assessments, portfolio evaluations) would strengthen the evidence base.

4. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISION

4.1. Strengthen the Limitations Section

Expand the discussion of limitations with more concrete suggestions for how future research might address each limitation. This will demonstrate greater reflexivity and methodological awareness.

4.2. Add Comparative Elements

Consider adding a brief comparison with existing literature on traditional practical training approaches to provide context for the findings and highlight the specific advantages of the proposed model.

4.3. Provide More Platform Details

Include a dedicated subsection or appendix with technical specifications, key features, and screenshots of the web-based platform to enhance replicability.

4.4. Include Competency Development Measures

Acknowledge the limitation of relying on self-reported data for competency development and suggest specific approaches for incorporating objective assessment measures in future research.

4.5. Address Diversity in Student Experiences

The relatively high standard deviation ($SD = 1.39$) for platform facilitation indicates variation in student experiences. The authors should explore potential factors contributing to this variation (e.g., prior digital literacy, engagement levels, mentor characteristics) and discuss implications for implementation.

4.6. Minor Editorial Issues

- Check consistency in the use of abbreviations (e.g., DBR introduced in Section 3.1 but not consistently used)
 - Consider minor formatting adjustments to improve table presentation
 - Review all references for completeness and consistency with journal style
-

REVIEWER'S REPORT

5. QUESTIONS FOR THE AUTHORS

1. How was the web-based platform developed, and what specific design principles guided its development?
2. What were the criteria for selecting school-based mentor teachers, and how were they prepared for their role in the blended learning model?
3. To what extent did students' prior digital competencies influence their experience with the platform and their overall satisfaction with the model?
4. How might the model be adapted for other teacher education programs or subject areas beyond Technology and Entrepreneurship?
5. What specific features or functionalities would you prioritize for the platform's future development based on the findings?

6. CONCLUSION

This is a well-executed study that makes a significant contribution to the field of teacher education, particularly in the context of digital transformation. The proposed blended learning model represents a thoughtful integration of pedagogical principles and technological affordances. The empirical findings provide encouraging evidence of the model's effectiveness in improving the organization of teaching practicum, facilitating collaboration, and supporting professional competency development.

With minor revisions addressing the limitations, providing additional implementation details, and strengthening the discussion of findings in relation to broader literature, this paper would make a valuable contribution to the international research community and inform practice in teacher education programs.

Recommendation: Accept after minor revision