Author Responses to Reviewers – Professional Faces

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer #1 | Author Response |
| What was unclear throughout the document was the gap in the literaturethey were attempting to address and the purpose of examining theparticipants’ beliefs and attitudes. | I have included several current examples of teachers being fired or disciplined for self-disclosure as well as examples of district and state policies that are being created in response. I think this provides more of better picture of the current state of the issue and why it needs to be addressed in teacher education. |
|  In addition, it was unclear what specific kinds of attitudes or beliefsthey were examining. I am guessing that the intent of the researcher(s) wasto identify the impact of a brief intervention on pre-service teachers’attitudes on self-disclosure on social media sites.  It was not clear in theabstract or the manuscript title that the goal of this research was toexamine the effectiveness of an intervention (i.e., reading articles relatedto use of social media and risks to teachers) on pre-service teacherattitudes and/or behavior. | Thank you for this very insightful and constructive feedback. I have revised the title to reflect the paper more accurately, which is a study on the level of awareness of the impact of self-disclosure on social media by teachers. I have also emphasized this more in the introduction. |
| •        There is not a clear connection between the research question and themethods used, please clarify. •        The author(s) need to address the way in which those who did not consentwere treated in the study and how their data was handled.•        A description in the narrative of the pre-survey instrument would behelpful (i.e., type of scale, number of items, types of items).•        While the author(s) described how the open-ended questions in thepre-survey were analyzed, there was no discussion of the analysis of theitems addressing personal use.  | I have done this by explaining that I wanted to begin by gauging pre-service teachers’ general ideas and assumptions about the topic without leading them to specific points.There was a 100% rate of consent. I have included this information in the Methods section.This has also been included in the Methods section.This is now supported with previous research in this area. |
|  The author(s) missed some key limitations to the study. They shoulddefinitely include the impact of test-retest and issues related to theresearcher serving as instructor, as well as others. | I have addressed test-retest/carryover in the limitations section. While in this case there was a short time period between the pre- and post-surveys, it was needed to examine the impact of the intervention, however, a future direction for the research would be the study of a longitudinal effect.The issue of instructor-researcher has also been addressed in both the methods and limitations sections. |
| In the conclusions, the author(s) should avoid causal language (ex.,“…results from the present study show…”). Instead, try a term like“suggests.” | This section has been revised to include more formal language. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer #2 | Author Response |
|  The introduction needs to be reorganized with paragraph breaks forclarity. The introduction  starts with info about how secondary pre-serviceteachers must consider the change in their role to professionals as theyembark on student teaching/first year teaching. This seems key to the paper.However, then the introduction moves to the amount that undergrads usesocial networking in general . The paragraph finally moves back to the roleof the teacher in taking responsibility in         his/her posting. Recommendation-keep same ideas together (1st and 3rd) and make into two paragraphs.  | I have made this change and placed the previous information about usage in the results section to support similar findings in this study. |
| •        P.4-5 Roblyer, McDaniel, Webb, Herman and Witty (2010) found that in a highereducation setting, students were more inclined to view and use Facebook asan instructional tool, whereas faculty viewed it more strictly as a means ofsocial interaction. Arikan (2009) found that Turkish students studying tobecome English teachers used Facebook as a way of developing their Englishlanguage skills by interacting with native speakers. Atay (2009) discussedthe challenges and responsibilities of accepting students as friends onFacebook in higher education , and its implications for the teacher-studentrelationship. LAST FOUR SENTENCES DO NOT FLOW TOGETHER – READ LIKE FOURDIFFERENT IDEAS THROWN TOGETHER•        p. 6“The call for teaching digital citizenship does not rest solely on theshoulders of teachers. TWO SENTENCES DO NOT MAKE SENSE TOGETHER DeSouza andDick (2008) conclude from their work with MySpace and children that bothparents and teachers must become more familiar with the social networkingsites that their children and students may be using in order to help thembecome safe and responsible users.”•        p. 8SECTION - Ethical and Legal Issues“There are numerous implications for this when it comes to pre-serviceteachers entering the profession.” BE REALLY CLEAR AND SAY WHAT ‘THIS’IS AS THE READER WANTS TO REMINDED SINCE THIS IS THE FIRST SENTENCE OF NEWSECTION•        p. 6 Facebook, Teachers and ProfessionalismTHIS SECTION IS CONFUSING AS IT BEGINS WTH DISCUSSION ABOUT TEACHERS BUTQUICKLY MOVES TO STUDIES INVOLVING PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS AND THE REST OF THEPARAGRAPH CONTINUES WITH PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS WHICH SEEMS TO FIT BETTER WITH“Facebook and Pre-Service Teachers “ ORGANIZATION COULD BE CLEARER INLITERATURE REVIEW WITH THIS SECTION AND THE “Facebook and Pre-ServiceTeachers”•        P. 8 Ethical and Legal IssuesGREAT SECTION OF LITERAURE REVIEW- KEY TO PAPER FINDINGS AND SETTING UP THEDISCUSSION.  | I would like to thank this reviewer for this very helpful, concise and constructive feedback.I have removed the Atay and Arikan pieces; they did not fit.I have also removed this reference as well, since it is outside the scope of this study.I have revised the language in this section.I have made this change and included the bulk of this in the reviewer’s recommended section. I have included several current examples of teachers being fired or disciplined for self-disclosure as well as examples of district and state policies that are being created in response. I think this provides more of better picture of the current state of the issue and why it needs to be addressed in teacher education. Thank you! This was my favorite section! |
| •        What % gave consent to have their course assignment used in theresearch? •        Is the researcher the instructor in the course? Important to disclose ifso.•        A bit more detail could be included as to how the author determined thefour themes from the pre-survey. •        Limitations- it could be important to note that the students were givenpoints for the assignments which could influence how they responded. | There was a 100% rate of consent. I have included this information in the Methods section.The issue of instructor-researcher has also been addressed in both the methods and limitations sections.XXXXThis has been discussed further in the Methods section. |
| P.27 “…what people, especially teachers, say and post on socialnetworking sites is a matter of “common sense”…” THIS SHOULD READ“PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS” NOT “PEOPLE, ESPECIALLY TEACHERS” AS THEPAPER IS REALLY ABOUT THEM. | I have made these changes. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer #3 | Author Response |
| There is also no true purpose statement for this paper. •        The research questions are not stated until the end of the methodologysection. These should be also stated near the beginning of the paper forclarification.  | This has been developed more and added to the abstract and the introduction.This has been moved earlier on in the methods section. |
| The author needs to discuss the instrument being used in this study.Where did it come from? What do the questions look like? Validity?Reliability? Was it created by the author or someone else? Was it piloted?Were the pre- and post- surveys the same? | I have addressed this in the Methods section and have also included Appendices of the pre- and post-survey questions as well as the in-class discussion. |
|  A description of the intervention would also help. How was theintervention applied? What was the class like? Purpose? Goals? How manydiscussions were there? Was the author also the instructor?  | This has also been described in greater detail in the Methods section. |
|     The results section also needs to be checked, as it appears to bemissing at least Table #1. Please check to make sure all tables are added tothe document.  | Table #1 has been included in this section. |