UNIVERSITAS
AHMAD DAHLAN

BAMBANG PRATOLO <bambang.pratolo@pbi.uad.ac.id>

[IJELE] Editor Decision
1 message

Editorial team <ijele@ascee.org>
Thu, Jun 24, 2021 at 12:25 PM
To: Bambang Pratolo <bambang.pratolo@pbi.uad.ac.id>

Bambang Pratolo:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to International
Journal of Education and Learning, "The decline of Idealism: A Study of
Higher Education Teacher's Beliefs about Grading Decision Making".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Please revise your paper according to the reviewers comments below and also
the comments in the soft-copy of your article (file attached), then
highlight in yellow the revised part.

If you have any questions, please let us know

Thank you very much

Best regards

Editorial team
Editorial Office, International Journal of Education and Learning
ijele@ascee.org

Reviewer A:

Significance (- How important is the work reported? Does it attack an
important/difficult problem (as opposed to a peripheral/simple one)? - Does
the approach offer to advance the state of the art? - Does it involve or
synthesize ideas, methods, approaches from multiple disciplines? - Does it
have interesting implications for multiple disciplines?)::
Originality (- Is this a new issue? Is this a novel approach to an issue? -
Is this a novel combination of familiar ideas/techniques/methods/approaches?
- Does the paper point out differences from related research? - Does the
paper properly situate itself with respect to previous work?)::
Quality (- Is the paper technically sound? How are its claims backed up? -
Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its
contribution?)::
Clarity (- Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does
it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures,
algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described
and evaluated thoroughly? - Is the paper organized in a sensible and logical
fashion?)::
Relevance (- Is the paper closely related to the theme of the journal
(broadly conceived)? - Is the content interesting enough to a broad
audience? - Is the paper readable in a multi-disciplinary context?)::
Technical (1): Structure of the paper:
Technical (2): Standard of English:
Technical (3): Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper:
Technical (4): Use and number of keywords/key phrases:
Technical (5): Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables:

Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
Technical (7): Reference list, adequate and correctly cited:
Explanations for the above ratings and other general comments on major issues:
Comments on the minor details of the article:

Reviewer B:

Significance (- How important is the work reported? Does it attack an important/difficult problem (as opposed to a peripheral/simple one)? - Does the approach offer to advance the state of the art? - Does it involve or synthesize ideas, methods, approaches from multiple disciplines? - Does it have interesting implications for multiple disciplines?)::
Originality (- Is this a new issue? Is this a novel approach to an issue? - Is this a novel combination of familiar ideas/techniques/methods/approaches? - Does the paper point out differences from related research? - Does the paper properly situate itself with respect to previous work?)::
Quality (- Is the paper technically sound? How are its claims backed up? - Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contribution?)::
Clarity (- Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures, algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described and evaluated thoroughly? - Is the paper organized in a sensible and logical fashion?)::
Relevance (- Is the paper closely related to the theme of the journal (broadly conceived)? - Is the content interesting enough to a broad audience? - Is the paper readable in a multi-disciplinary context?)::
Technical (1): Structure of the paper:
Technical (2): Standard of English:
Technical (3): Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper:
Technical (4): Use and number of keywords/key phrases:
Technical (5): Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables:
Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
Technical (7): Reference list, adequate and correctly cited:
Explanations for the above ratings and other general comments on major issues:
Comments on the minor details of the article:

Reviewer A:

Significance (- How important is the work reported? Does it attack an important/difficult problem (as opposed to a peripheral/simple one)? - Does the approach offer to advance the state of the art? - Does it involve or synthesize ideas, methods, approaches from multiple disciplines? - Does it have interesting implications for multiple disciplines?)::
Originality (- Is this a new issue? Is this a novel approach to an issue? - Is this a novel combination of familiar ideas/techniques/methods/approaches? - Does the paper point out differences from related research? - Does the paper properly situate itself with respect to previous work?)::
Quality (- Is the paper technically sound? How are its claims backed up? - Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contribution?)::
Clarity (- Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures, algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described and evaluated thoroughly? - Is the paper organized in a sensible and logical fashion?)::

Relevance (- Is the paper closely related to the theme of the journal (broadly conceived)? - Is the content interesting enough to a broad audience? - Is the paper readable in a multi-disciplinary context?)::
Technical (1): Structure of the paper:
Technical (2): Standard of English:
Technical (3): Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper:
Technical (4): Use and number of keywords/key phrases:
Technical (5): Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables:
Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
Technical (7): Reference list, adequate and correctly cited:
Explanations for the above ratings and other general comments on major issues:
Comments on the minor details of the article:

Reviewer B:

Significance (- How important is the work reported? Does it attack an important/difficult problem (as opposed to a peripheral/simple one)? - Does the approach offer to advance the state of the art? - Does it involve or synthesize ideas, methods, approaches from multiple disciplines? - Does it have interesting implications for multiple disciplines?)::
Originality (- Is this a new issue? Is this a novel approach to an issue? - Is this a novel combination of familiar ideas/techniques/methods/approaches? - Does the paper point out differences from related research? - Does the paper properly situate itself with respect to previous work?)::
Quality (- Is the paper technically sound? How are its claims backed up? - Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contribution?)::
Clarity (- Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures, algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described and evaluated thoroughly? - Is the paper organized in a sensible and logical fashion?)::
Relevance (- Is the paper closely related to the theme of the journal (broadly conceived)? - Is the content interesting enough to a broad audience? - Is the paper readable in a multi-disciplinary context?)::
Technical (1): Structure of the paper:
Technical (2): Standard of English:
Technical (3): Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper:
Technical (4): Use and number of keywords/key phrases:
Technical (5): Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables:
Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:
Technical (7): Reference list, adequate and correctly cited:
Explanations for the above ratings and other general comments on major issues:
Comments on the minor details of the article:

_____
International Journal of Education and Learning
http://pubs2.ascee.org/index.php/ijele

☰ M Gmail   Q   ijele

[IJELE] Submission Acknowledgement   External   Inbox ✕

Zalik Nuryana <zalik@ascee.org>
to me

English   Indonesian   Translate message

Bambang Pratolo:

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "The decline of Idealism: A Study of Higher Education Teacher's Beliefs about Grading Decision Making" to International Journal of Education and Learning. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal web site:

Manuscript URL:
https://pubs2.ascee.org/index.php/ijele/author/submission/374
Username: bambang

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

Zalik Nuryana
International Journal of Education and Learning

_____

International Journal of Education and Learning
http://pubs2.ascee.org/index.php/ijele

[Reply]   [Forward]

UNIVERSITAS
AHMAD DAHLAN

[IJELE] Editor Decision
2 messages

Editorial team <ijele@ascee.org>   Wed, Aug 4, 2021 at 7:40 AM
To: Bambang Pratolo <bambang.pratolo@pbi.uad.ac.id>
Cc: Eko Purwanti <ekopurwanti@umy.ac.id>

Bambang Pratolo:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to International
Journal of Education and Learning, "The decline of Idealism: A Study of
Higher Education Teacher's Beliefs about Grading Decision Making".

Our decision is to: Accept Submission

You should submit your camera-ready paper (along with your payment receipt
and similarity report by iThenticate/Turnitin that less than 25%) within 4
weeks.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Editorial team
Editorial Office, International Journal of Education and Learning
ijele@ascee.org

International Journal of Education and Learning
http://pubs2.ascee.org/index.php/ijele

BAMBANG PRATOLO <bambang.pratolo@pbi.uad.ac.id>   Wed, Aug 4, 2021 at 7:41 AM
To: ekopurwanti@umy.ac.id

[Quoted text hidden]