

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_90052
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of family type on academic performance of secondary school students in Public secondary schools in Narok South Sub county, Narok County Kenya.
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>General: Topic and background</b>            The paper addresses an important issue that needs research. There is a good amount of literature on how family structure and family background, e.g., in terms of social economic status, migration status, education aspirations, have an impact on school achievement in the next generation. However, most of the research was done in developed countries and it is well-argued in the manuscript that there is a need to better understand how the family-school interaction work in other cultures.            In the current manuscript, however, the specifics of the culture that is investigated are not presented, and neither is the school system. So, the reader does not really know what exactly is under investigation (except for the polygamy which seems to be common practice in the community). But other information is missing: What other characteristics play a role? What is the typical education of the parents? What is the typical duration of schooling? How much value is generally placed on formal education? Is this the same for girls and for boys?            The introduction does not provide the full background information. Also, the research that is cited is the research that is relevant. If Ryan (2000) is a citation of Richard Ryan, the issue is – in the first place - that this citation is missing in the list of references and that – secondly – Ryan's theory is a motivational theory and looks at the interaction patterns of (mostly Western) families on the motivational development of children. The statement that families have an impact on their children is very broad and is probably true for a great number of developmental aspects (language, health, social competences, motivation, cognitive skills etc.). What would be needed here, however, is a review of more specific research on how different types of families can be defined (e.g., what is a nuclear family in a polygamous culture?), what is known about the effects of the general family situation on the development and achievement.  <b>Method section:</b>            The section starts by justifying the type of research, but without telling the reader what exactly the instruments and procedures are. Authors would need to structure this section the other way round: Present what you want to do to answer your research question and then explain why you think this will work. The way it is presented here is more like: "What we did was appropriate".            The method section contains unsupported claims: "excellent reliability was easily achieved by exposing all subjects to a standardized stimulus" ...            Reliability of a method needs to be demonstrated through an appropriate method not by just claiming that the research was reliable.            The method section contains textbook information that is not appropriate in a research paper, e.g., about the sampling procedure. The actual sampling procedure is presented in a confusing manner. In addition to sample size, it would be necessary to discuss self-selection biases, the general willingness to participate, the question if participation was voluntary or mandatory, if financial compensation was offered, how potential participants received the information about the goals and procedures of the survey and how their data would be protected.            The description of the instruments is not sufficient. The reader finds no sample items, no information about the duration of the survey. Was the survey designed by the author(s)? In addition, report information about the psychometric characteristics of the questionnaire.            It is not clear, what the open questions were and what the likert type questions were and what kind of constructs were measured and why.            The information on the document analysis is not complete: What categories were generated? How many raters did look at the documents? What was the average rate of rater agreement?  <b>Results</b>            Who were the 137 participants: Teachers, parents, children? How might the situation that the researcher stood and waited for the questionnaire to be completed have an impact on the response?            What are psychometric characteristics of the measures?            Reporting the distribution of girls and boys across school types is inflated. You can condense this information: The same applies to the information that about half of the students come from monogamous and half from polygamous families. This is not really surprising in an area where polygamy is part of the culture. This information would need a comment as to the question if the distribution reflects the general situation in this part of the country. If monogamous family were the absolute minority, 46% participation in</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>the survey would be remarkable and one could ask how this response rate affects the results.          In section 3.5 a hypothesis is tested that students from different family backgrounds differ in school achievement as measured in grades. However, this hypothesis has not been stated before and I could not find an explanation why this would be expected.          Table 2 presents data that look like copy and paste from a software output. Please extract the relevant data.  <b>Summary, conclusions and recommendations</b>          The overall result of the study is that students from monogamous and from polygamous families report the same level of achievement in school. This does, in my honest opinion, not contradict findings from Hofferth (2006), because the contrast is not so much between polygamous and monogamous, but between intact families and single-educator families, disrupted and otherwise dysfunctional families. I would not think that polygamous families are necessarily and by definition adverse for well-being and learning.          In the conclusion, the author discussed a finding that was not presented in the results section, i.e., the role of the number of spouses. In addition, there seems to be the silent assumption that the fathers take care of the children and support them in their school-work. How do you know? The studies that I know typically show that the mothers supervise the schoolwork of their children.          The recommendation is very general and not based on this research. To help parents understand that their support is important for academic success of their children is certainly relevant. But this is true in all types of families across the world.          The list of references is not complete and compiled in an idiosyncratic manner.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Margarete Imhof
Department, University & Country	Johannes Gutenberg University, Germany