

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“Mediating Role of School Attachment in the Relationship between Perceived Stress and School Satisfaction”**

Corresponding Author: Tuncay Oral  
Email: [toral@pau.edu.tr](mailto:toral@pau.edu.tr)

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v7no3a11

Peer review:  
Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Sidney R. Castle  
National University La Jolla, USA

Published: 30.09.2020

## ***EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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: EJES 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.

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

Reviewer Name: Sidney R. Castle, Ph.D.	Email: <a href="mailto:scastle@nu.edu">scastle@nu.edu</a> / <a href="mailto:srcastle@msn.com">srcastle@msn.com</a>
University/Country: National University, La Jolla, California, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/13/2020
Manuscript Title: Mediating Role of School Attachment in the Relationship between Perceived Stress and School Satisfaction	
Manuscript Number: /	
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: Yes	
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.

<i><b>Questions</b></i>	<i><b>Rating Result</b></i>
-------------------------	-----------------------------



	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The title accurately describes the paper</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Concise and clearly written</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4.9</b>
Two awkwardly worded sentences: (a) page 14, under Limitations, Suggestions and Conclusion is the sentence <i>“As the first limitation, the use of self-reported measurement tools in the collection of research data can be expressed.”</i> – I understand that the author(s) are attempting to describe the limitation of using “self-reported measurement tools” but, as written, the sentence is a little confusing; and (b) page 15, under same section, the first sentence of a paragraph is <i>“Despite the limitations expressed, the importance of the model put forward within the scope of this study should not be relied.”</i> – I think that the author(s) ment to say that despite the stated limitations, the model they presented in the paper is meaningful and valid, however, they need to clarify and re-write this sentence.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4.8</b>
On page, under Data Collection Tools, the author(s) begin with <i>“The School Attachment Scale, developed by Hill (2006) and adapted to the Turkish language by Savi (2011), was used to determine the students' school attachment.”</i> --- I think that the paper would be enhanced by more fully describing Hill’s “School Attachment Scale” and specifically how Savi (2011) adapted it to the Turkish language along with any studies/measures taken to insure the validity of the adaptation.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
The body of the paper is generally clearly written and I don’t believe that I noted any errors.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
There is an area of concern with how the results are described in Tables 1 and 2 found on pages 8 and 9. These two tables contain the results of Pearson r correlation analysis and, while there no specific tables for interpretation of Pearson r values, the Question Pro model ( <a href="https://questionpro.com">https://questionpro.com</a> ) is considered to be a simple and liberal table. The Question Pro table consists of the following values: +/- .1 to +/- .3 small	

<p>association; +/- .3 to +/- .5 medium association; and, +/- .5 to +/- .1 large association.</p> <p>While writing my own dissertation many years ago, Dr. Gene V. Glass, who developed meta-analysis, was a member of my dissertation committee and we developed a more rigorous model for the interpretation of Pearson r values that I continue to use. This model has the following values: +/- .00 to +/- .20 indifferent or negligible relationship; +/- .21 to +/- .40 low correlation (present but slight); +/- .41 to +/- .60 substantial or marked relationship; +/- .61 to +/- .80 high relationship; and, +/- .81 to +/- 1.00 very high relationship.</p> <p>The description provided for Table 1 states that “<i>Given the inter-variable correlations presented in Table 1, it is observed that perceived stress has a negative and meaningful relationship with school satisfaction ..</i>”, however, the two values respectively are shown as -.27 and -.28 and, even given the Question Pro model, I seriously question describing these values as indicating a “meaningful relationship”.</p> <p>The author(s) state that “<i>Given the analysis results in Table 2, it has been found that all observed variables are significantly related to each other.</i>”, however, the majority of the Pearson r values listed in Table 2 range from -.16 to +.37 and I do not believe that you can state that these values represent “significant” relationships.</p> <p>It is suggested that some restatement of the Table 1 and 2 results are required.</p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The approximate seventy-four (74) references cited are comprehensive and appropriate.	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission – “ <i>with the suggestion that collected data be re-analyzed using more appropriate statistical measures.</i> ”	

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

A meaningful and important study needing only very minor revisions.

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

