

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	<p>How does the multistage sampling procedure used in the study address a study sample size of 791 students (15% of the entire student population)? Why was disproportionate stratified sampling technique used? Further discussion is needed to justify the above sampling procedures and whether there were adjustments made in the analyses for the differences in samples.</p> <p>I would also recommend a discussion from the authors about limitations of generalizing the findings to the student population.</p> <p>Be wary of the following language found in the results section, such as "Data relating to the corresponding hypotheses in Table 2 indicates that the significant value is greater than the alpha value, hence there is a significant difference." While value is bigger than the alpha value (and statistically significant), when looking at the means, the difference is 0.01 between girls and boys in their means. While the difference is statistically significant, I am not convinced that this is a significant difference.</p> <p>Also, I would recommend more discussion of these findings in relation to prior findings. For example, it was found that there was no statistically significant difference for Hypothesis 2, which does not support the findings from Adegboyega LO's study. What do the authors think why this might be the case?</p> <p>It's curious why the authors only mention the homogeneity of responses in Table 5 (seen in this statement "More so, the standard deviation score reveals homogeneity of the respondents rating.") when the standard deviation scores appear similar for specific statements in Table 1 (see "My place of birth and the position in my family determines my career choice") and Table 3 (see "I consider careers only traditionally accepted by people of my gender"). If the standard deviations are being used in to support the claim that responses are homogeneous, why not bring this up in discussions for other tables?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Proofread manuscript for spelling and grammatical errors such as "Based, on the foregoing and empirical studies conducted, they still exist a gap..." in para. 10.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tanya Sanabria Sociology
Department, University & Country	California State University- Los Angeles, United States