

[Editor tasks](#) | [Assistant Editor tasks](#) | [My submissions](#) | [My review assignments](#) | [Manager Tasks](#) | [User preferences](#)

Review of submission 2017-0444

Review

1. Is this manuscript of interest to ACE members?

YES to some

2. Comments:

This topic is relevant to the ACE membership as local food is a hot topic in the agricultural industry

3. Introduction: Is the literature review complete?

Adequate

4. Comments:

You could add a bit more about framing theory to build a stronger connection to your topic/study. You fall a little short there. Build a stronger connection to how framing fits.

5. Introduction: Does the topic add to the literature?

Adequate

6. Comments:

I think this is a good topic that adds to our understanding, but I think you could build a better connection between the topic and why you choose to utilize videos as your medium.

7. Introduction: Is the purpose of the study clear?

Adequate

8. Comments:

Your purpose statement could be worded a bit more clearly to truly get to the heart of what you are wanting to investigate. The term "carried by video" seems awkward here and doesn't really reflect what I think you are trying to do.

9. Introduction: Are the research questions/hypotheses clear?

Adequate

10. Comments:

While your objectives are clear, they could be cleaned up just a bit to aid in understanding. But your hypothesis only relates to RO2.

11. Methods: Were appropriate methods used?

Adequate

12. Comments:

Would the fact that more positive statements were used in the instrument have the potential to skew or lead respondents to answer a certain way? Why not have an equal number of positive and negative statements?

Does pilot testing with a group of college students ensure reliability/validity when they could potentially differ quite a bit from your sample?

13. Methods: Were the methods described in enough detail that they could be replicated?

Adequate

14. Comments:

A bit more detail could be added for this to be replicated correctly.

15. Methods: Were analysis methods described?

Adequate

16. Comments:

How was your analysis conducted? SPSS? R?

17. Results: Are the results clearly presented?

Inadequate

18. Comments:

Your results could be a bit easier to understand. In Table 4, why not just show the mean scores for each group for each question? Showing the percentage of who answered what makes for a huge and somewhat confusing table.

Seeing your questions in Table 4 also comes back to my point above about you leading participants responses.

Where is a description of your participants? This would be helpful in understanding how these results tie in. The population was just over 18 who were representative of the U.S. population, but is that really achievable and does that really tell us much about this data?

19. Results: Are descriptions of the data appropriate and clear?

Adequate

21. Discussion: Does the discussion follow the findings?

Good

23. Discussion: Does the discussion add relevance to the findings by providing context (literature, background, etc.)?

Adequate

24. Comments:

Could tie back to literature a bit more strongly. You seem to mention some lit here, but don't provide citations or actual references to it.

25. Writing: Was the writing clear?

Adequate

26. Comments:

For the most part, this was well written

27. Writing: Was it grammatically correct?

Adequate

28. Comments:

Several GSP errors, including incorrectly utilizing words in places, were found. A good read through would help

29. Writing: Did the article follow APA style?

Adequate

31. Writing: Are the references cited accurately and are they up to date?

Adequate

33. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION FOR THIS MANUSCRIPT:

ACCEPT WITH MINOR REVISIONS

34. Comments:

I think some clarification in this document would make it a bit stronger for publication.

[Return](#)