



**Paper: “Teachers' Attitudes towards Using Cooperative Learning through Technology for Developing Writing Skills in a Military Context”**

**Submitted: 10 September 2025**

**Accepted: 22 October 2025**

**Published: 30 November 2025**

Corresponding Author: Maia Kharchilava

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n31p46

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Antonella Maria Giacosa  
University of Torino, Italy

Reviewer 2: Isaac Ogundu  
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni, Port Harcourt

Reviewer 3: Grazia Angeloni  
University “G. d’Annunzio”, Italy

Reviewer 4: Blinded

### **ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025**

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Professor Isaac Ogundu	
University/Country: Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rivers State. Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 18-09-2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 19-09-2025
Manuscript Title: Teachers' Attitudes towards Using Cooperative Learning through Technology for Developing Writing Skills in a Military Context	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0955/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:	

#### **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
The abstract line 5 and 6 has apostrophe inverted in the wrong direction	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Page 8, line 3: homogenous teams was misspelt as *homogeniouse* teams	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
The female participants were far higher than the male participants	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
Percentages were mostly used for data analysis	

<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
Adept and explanatory.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
Obsolete authors were cited and referenced in the work Such as Dudley Evans & ST John, 1998, Department of Army 2003	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

- The statement of problem did not reference data explaining the illiteracy of computer skills by military students as it might be a personal conception and not the actual reality. Cite some already existing data ( like print media, etc ) to buttress the facts stated.
- The researcher did not clearly explain the similarities and differences with related literature reviewed. The researcher only established that studies on cooperative learning related with technology did not focus on the military context in teaching writing skills.
- Please cite and reference authors in the last decade like from 2014-2025. Obsolete authors and references were made
- The author did not highlight certain difficulties that would be experienced while trying to implement cooperative learning with technology.
- Use APA 7<sup>th</sup> edition style for references.

### **ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025**

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: 18/09/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/09/2025
Manuscript Title: Teachers' Attitudes towards Using Cooperative Learning through Technology for Developing Writing Skills in a Military Context	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 55.09.2025	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: no	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: no	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: yes	

### **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	4
While the title clearly reflects the article's content, it fails to convey the study's relevance, which should be made apparent, at least, in the abstract.	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	4
While the abstract is clear and to the point, it would benefit from a final sentence connecting the findings to the study's purpose—for instance, why teachers' positive attitudes towards CL matter.	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	5
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	3
Although the methods are clearly presented, the authors should more explicitly highlight the connection between technologically enhanced cooperative learning and its benefits for military	

English learners. Furthermore, they should make more explicit to what extent teachers' positive attitudes towards this type of activity matters.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
See above	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
If the authors strengthen the points above, they will also improve the conclusions.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Dear Authors,

Your topic is relevant, interesting, and not extensively studied, which makes your article potentially valuable. However, I suggest clarifying how cooperative learning (CL) positively impacts learning outcomes and how teachers' attitudes play a significant role in this process. If you elaborate on what you have already written and clearly articulate these connections, I am confident that your article will be successful.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

## ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear

statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the

paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be

recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial

team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Grazia Angeloni ;

University/Country: “G. d’Annunzio” Chieti; Ministry of Education Rome

Date Manuscript Received: Sept. 17, 2025 Date Review Report Submitted: Sept. 23, 2025

Manuscript Title: Teachers’ Attitudes towards Using Cooperative Learning through Technology for Developing

Writing Skills in a Military Context

ESJ Manuscript Number: 55.09.2025

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:

You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions

Rating Result

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. 5

The title is concise, specific, and well aligned with the scope and objectives of the paper. It clearly reflects

the focus on teachers’ attitudes, cooperative learning, technology, and the military context.

2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. 4

The abstract summarizes the objectives, methodology, and key findings effectively. However, it could benefit from slightly clearer phrasing of the research gap and limitations to strengthen its scientific contribution.

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. 4

Overall, the manuscript is written in good academic English. Nevertheless, there are minor issues with style, word choice, and occasional grammatical inconsistencies that could be improved with light proofreading.

4. The study methods are explained clearly. 4

The methodology (quantitative, descriptive design using questionnaires and SPSS analysis) is described adequately. Sampling, participants, and instruments are explained, but further detail on questionnaire validation and reliability would strengthen the rigor.

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. 5

The results are presented systematically with tables, figures, and descriptive statistics. The interpretation is coherent and logically connected to the research questions.

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. 4

The conclusions are consistent with the findings and highlight both positive attitudes and challenges.

However, the section could be more concise, with a stronger emphasis on the study's originality and practical implications.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. 5

The reference list is extensive, up-to-date, and includes both foundational and recent works. Sources are relevant and appropriately cited. Minor issues with formatting (e.g., capitalization, spacing) should be corrected.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed

Accepted, minor revision needed X

Return for major revision and resubmission

Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript addresses an underexplored but important topic by examining ESP teachers' attitudes

towards cooperative learning through technology in a military context. The research is original, methodologically sounds, and provides valuable insights into both opportunities and challenges.

To further strengthen the paper, I recommend:

- Minor proofreading to correct stylistic inconsistencies.
- Providing more detail on the reliability and validity of the questionnaire.
- Streamlining the conclusions to emphasize originality and contribution to military education research.

Overall, the paper makes a strong contribution and is suitable for publication after minor revisions.