

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_130374
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship between Self-Esteem and Academic Achievement of Senior Secondary School Students in North-Central, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is important contextually, however, its results are limited to these group of students and cannot be taken as a generalized result. Thus, its use is practical only to the setting and the participants of the study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Partially. . Considering that there are three areas of the academe are involved – English, civil education and mathematics. These are essential subjects. If academic achievement is defined based on this three subjects, I believe it should be defined well in the context of the study..	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is simple and comprehensive.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Partially.. it needs improvement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. there are two instruments but there is only one reliability test result. Self-esteem and Academic achievement Questionnaire (SEA-Q) seems to me, to constitute both academic achievement and self-esteem. Literally, the name of the instrument to seems to measure both academic achievement and self-esteem and then, you are using another instrument to assess academic achievement. 2. Which of the two are pilot tested. Why only one was pilot tested and the other was not? 3. How did they measure academic achievement of the students? What kind of instrument did they use? The instrument used for academic achievement should be a test questionnaire otherwise use the overall grades of the learners. If test questionnaire was used for the academic achievement, Cronbach's alpha is not the suitable statistical tool to test for reliability. For the level of 4. Selection of Participants: were all of the 101,467 Senior Secondary Schools students taking the same subjects – civil education, mathematics and English? Were all of them on the same grade level? .Sampling can be valid if taken from a population of the same characteristics. What are the basic qualifications of the participants of the study?.. Where are the data in terms of age? What are the ages of the students? 5. Why do you include age and gender when the title expressed more on academic achievement and self-esteem? 6. Statistical treatment: I don't exactly know but senior high school will have two grade levels- grade 11 and 12, thus, more likely, there will be two major categories of ages, 17 and 18.. and a few out from these two. Based on my readings, t-test are used to some particular number of subjects in an experimental research comparing scores.. but in the study, I noticed that the Ho for gender and age, are expressing, "categorical variables".. Thus, there is a sort of nominal data here.. I believe it is not appropriate to use t-test and one-way ANOVA. 7. R-value(0.697) is not a strong correlation... but 0.708.. the authors should support the decision of stating "strong correlation" with specific standards... Based on common standards, 0.697 is a moderate correlation. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Jerald C Moneva</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Jagobiao National High School, University of the Visayas, Philippines</p>