

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“Determining Children's Primary School Readiness Level”**

Corresponding Author: Yalçın Bay

Email: yalcinbay@anadolu.edu.tr

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v7no4a6

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Reuben Gitonga Mutegi

University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Sidney R. Castle

National University La Jolla, USA

Published: 30.12.2020

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:	
University/Country: University of Nairobi, Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/06/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/06/2020
Manuscript Title: Analysis of Children's Primary School Readiness According to Some Variable	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is clear and concise	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract indicates the objectives, methodology, results and recommendations. It gives detailed summary of the paper	
	4
<i>the introduction captures the theme of the paper and gives good motivation that's prompts paper of this nature to be developed</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methodology well defined as well as the target population and justification for the design</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>The body is clear but requires some editing. The thought process needs to be logical</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Conclusion well outlined and giving a true picture of the research problem</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>References are ok but need to be aligned to APA style of referencing</i>	

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):

There is need to include recommendations in the abstract in order to make it complete, on goals of the study, you can use the term “ objectives” of the study instead of “ Goal”. Objectives are more specific compared to goals which are general. Table 1 seem to be misplaced. If it represents target population, then no need of adding other categories of respondents who are not part of the target population. Table 2 also seem to be misplaced. The content in the CFA PATH diagram is not clear, need to increase the font. There is need to number the subheading under the results section e.g. 4.1, 4.2, 4.3. It’s easy to follow that way. No need to have citations in the conclusion since they are already been discussed under the results section

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Check the sequential organization of the thought process and grammar. Need also to ensure there is proper numbering of subheadings in the entire document. The paper is good and useful to guide in policies especially geared towards promoting high enrolment rates in pre-schools



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: scastle@nu.edu / srcastle@msn.com
University/Country: National University, La Jolla, California, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 06/28/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: July 3, 2020
Manuscript Title: Analysis of Children's Primary School Readiness According to Some Variables	
Manuscript Number: Sorry, I could not find a 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>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
-------------------------	-----------------------------



	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Suggest considering slight change to the title: Analysis of Children’s Primary School Readiness as Determined by Some Variables</p>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3.5
<p>Some grammatical and descriptive corrections would make the abstract easier to understand – for example: (a) Abstract line 5 “... was conducted in the general survey model” should be “was conducted <i>utilizing a general survey model</i> ...”; and, (b) Abstract lines 10-11 “descriptive statistics were calculated; Mann Whitney U, Wilcoxon sign-rank and Chi-Square tests were used” – None of the three tests are “descriptive statistics, Mann Whitney U and Wilcoxon sign rank are <i>Inferential Parametric</i> tests and Chi-Square is an <i>Inferential Nonparametric</i> statistical test. Also, I saw Kruskal-Wallis reported in the paper but not Chi-Square.</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5
<p>There are grammatical errors through out the paper and proofreading is suggested. Some examples are: (a) Page 2, line 4 correctly notes “and these <i>studies</i>” but in lines 11 and 20 the term “<i>researches</i>” is used and should be corrected to “<i>studies</i>”; (b) Page 2, paragraph 3, lines 5-7 contain a somewhat confusing sentence “Socio-economic conditions of families may affect to provide effective environments for children, and the socio-economic status of the family is determined by the working status of the parents.”</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On page 3, under “Participants”, it is stated that “The sample of the study consists of 402 students” – How was the sample drawn? --- Random or some other method? 2. Later at the bottom of page 6 mention is made of information being provided by 15 teachers for 402 students ----- again, how were the teachers selected? 3. Page 4, section 1.1 mentions that a “Personal Information Form” was used to collect “some demographic information of the children participating in the study” --- the description presented at the bottom of Page 4 and the top of Page 5, notes that “the teachers evaluated the readiness of the of the children based on their observations” but the question of who provided the parental data and how it was collected and verified is never explained. 	

<p>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p><u>Minor Errors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 1 on Page 3 shows a total of 402 students except for the category of AGE where a total of 396 students are shown, however, the percentage of 6-year old (70.6%) and 7-year old students (29.4%) are correctly reported for the 402 students in the study. • Table 1 also correctly notes that 374, or 93%, of the students had preschool education but in the text below the table, it is stated that “91% of the children received pre-school education” • Tables 1 through 5 are correctly sequentially numbered, however, beginning on Page 8, table numbering begins again with “Table 1” even though the accompanying text continues describing the tables with their correct sequential order --- text states “According to Table 7, ...” while referring to incorrectly labeled “Table 2” located immediately below the text. This error, text identifying correct sequential numbers for incorrectly numbered tables, continues from Page 8 to the end of the paper. • The term “zero-hypothesis” is used throughout the paper, however, the correct statistical term is “null-hypothesis” <p><u>Major Fatal Errors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorrect statistical measures were used and claimed results of statistical analysis were incorrect and confusing. • For example, Page 8 contains purports to report the results of “Mann-Whitney-U test”. Mann-Whitney-U is used with <u>uncorrelated data from independently draw samples</u> and statistical tables of critical values of “U” used to determine the statistical significance computed “U” values range from 1 to 138. I would be interested to see how the reported Mann-Whitney-U scores of 1962.500 to 3865.500 were computed. • Of more serious concern is found on Page 10 where the paper states that in Table 11 (labeled Table 6) are the results of Kruskal-Wallis H tests. The fact that no “H” values are shown is not as significant as the fact that this test was claimed to have been used to analyze “Age Groups” when only two age groups are noted in the paper – 6 and 7 year old students from a single population identified in some fashion by a total of 15 preschool teachers. The textbook description of the Kruskal-Wallis test is that is used to test the claim that several different independent samples come from identical populations and <u>uses ranks of sample data from three or more independent populations.</u> 	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>If more appropriate statistical measures such as ANOVA were used to determine if statistically significant difference in student skills areas did exist by the different demographic variable noted in the study, then this could still be an interesting and</p>	

important study. The suggestion is made that the author(s) consider re-analyzing their data with more appropriate and correct statistical measures.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	?
The thirty-seven (37) references cited appear to be comprehensive and may very well be appropriate but it is difficult to determine given that the majority of the references are written in languages other than English. I must confess my lack of ability to read the cited articles that were written languages other than English,	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I don't know if appropriate to state, but I would be willing to work with the author(s) to re-analyze their data because I believe that it could be a significant and meaningful study.



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

