## Review Form 1.6

| Journal Name: | **Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies** |
|---|---|
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_AJESS_71672** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | |
| | **Sources of career inspiration of adolescents in secondary schools and their career choice in Delta State** |
| Type of the Article | **Original Research Article** |

**General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy)

## Review Form 1.6

**PART 1:** Review Comments

| | 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)* |
|---|---|---|
| **Compulsory** REVISION comments | 1. Many **studies are cited** regarding the state of research to date. However, there is no brief indication of whether this is a literature review or an empirical evaluation by the authors, and if so, what type of empirical evaluation: quantitative/qualitative, descriptive statistics, or multivariate analysis methods.<br>2. The **hypotheses are not consistent** with the state of the research presented. It is argued that there are gender differences that have already been shown in previous studies. However, the hypotheses for this paper are formulated to suggest that there are no differences. However, if differences are suspected, the hypotheses should be. This also improves the reading flow.<br>3. The term "**mean of the means score**" should either be worded differently or explained in a sentence. It is not clear without looking at the table that it is the mean of the scale.<br>4. A **Cronbach's alpha** value is reported, on what basis? The value provides information about the reliability of a scale. There are three different scales. So there should be three values, one for each scale. It is described that it is a scale with 5 scale points, the **labeling** is unclear. What do higher values mean? A higher level of agreement? Lower values a disagreement? Or just no agreement? The exact wording should be mentioned here to make the interpretation comprehensible and transparent. For example, a scale mean of 2 is described as "strongly disagree." With values of 1-5, this rather corresponds to a medium expression and not a strong disagreement. The **standard deviation** must also be interpreted against the background of the expressions, and a deviation of one scale point indicates heterogeneity of the statements, not homogeneity. Differences, especially in the second scale, are not sufficiently addressed.<br>5. The biggest problem is the **T-tests for significant mean differences**. SPSS is used, a p-value and an alpha value are given. If the p-value is greater than the alpha value, the null hypothesis is accepted. So there are no significant differences. In this paper, unfortunately, it is interpreted the other way around, the results are not correct. This needs to be revised urgently, as the abstract and summary also report such incorrect results. See also a **tutorial of SPSS**. Helpful: https://www.spss-tutorials.com/spss-independent-samples-t-test/<br>6. In the text, an **incorrect citation** (other style) is deposited at one point: „According to [15], gender refers to all the characteristics of men and women which a particular society has determined and assigned each sex. Fan et al. further described gender as socially constructed aspect of difference between men and women."<br>7. At one point in the text, reference is made to an **incorrect question number**: „The administration of the questionnaire structured for data collection was done through direct delivery approach. Data relating to research questions 1 - 3 was analyzed using mean and standard deviation. While research question 6 [should be 4] was answered using frequency and percentage". | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | 8. The intended research gap is not precisely formulated. It should be expressed more clearly what distinguishes this paper and to what extent it closes the research gap.<br>9. Bibliography: An unpublished thesis is cited. This is not testable or transparent to the reader. There are no DOI/ISBN. This would be helpful. | |

| **Optional/General** comments | 10. The introduction is very long and also covers the current state of research. It would be easier and clearer for the reader if this chapter is divided.<br>11. Citation: The chosen citation style ("The study by [X] shows...") makes it very time-consuming for the reader to find out which studies are involved. A mention of the author's name in addition to the citation in square brackets facilitates understanding and traceability in the text as well.<br><br>12. When citing, you talk about the effect size. For T-tests on gender differences, it is always useful to also calculate the effect size to show how meaningful the differences are. Cohen's d is often used for this purpose.<br>13. A graph would illustrate differences in the individual items of a scale, a boxplot would be suitable here, this also shows the homogeneity/heterogeneity as it takes the standard deviation into account.<br>14. The theoretical background and the state of research are already well elaborated. When the individual research findings are compared with each other to contrast previous strengths and weaknesses, the research gap becomes clearer. This allows the present paper to be better classified and improves the reader's understanding. | |

**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)* |
|---|---|---|
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | |

**Reviewer Details:**

| Name: | *Melanie Hochmuth* |
|---|---|
| Department, University & Country | *University of Applied Labour Studies of the Federal Employment Agency, Germany* |