

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJ SSE_103148</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>INFLUENCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS AND TRAINING OF ADULT FACILITATORS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMME IN ENUGU STATE</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><b>Congratulations for your research and time and effort put into it!</b> The research is very interesting and on a very current topic. It proposes a study on environmental adult education programs and their efficacy. I recommend that the article be published with major revisions. My reason for this recommendation is that the idea of the research is good, but reading the article, I think that certain aspects of the methodology should be clarified, starting from the variables, hypotheses, instruments, and statistical calculations. The authors can take into account some suggestions: The name of the study (the title of the article) and of the research instrument do not reflect the measured relationship between the study's variables. The study did not measure the influence of environmental awareness (for that, a causal relationship had to be measured), but assessed the differences in the perceptions of facilitators and adult learners on environmental knowledge and educational programs. A more appropriate title would be "Effectiveness of adult environmental training programs from the perspective of trainers and learners". In the first part of the abstract, it would be interesting to briefly present the relevance of the study, the need for its implementation, and the research gap. Some expressions should be reviewed more carefully. For example, in the abstract, it is stated "The data collected from the 2 research questions", the data cannot be collected from the questions but to answer the questions. In the keywords, please correct the misspelled word "education". In the APA 7 citation style, in-text bibliographic references, when there are more than 2 authors, write (the name of the first author et al., the year). Some statements in the text are not supported by scientific evidence, as mentioned through bibliographic references. Please insert bibliographic references wherever needed. In "creation and use of appropriate resources", the word "creation" should be replaced with development or design. In quantitative studies, like the present one, it is recommended to formulate at most one general research question. Otherwise, quantitative research is designed to test hypotheses. Hypotheses are formulated too intricately. They should be reformulated in a shorter and clearer form. In the result section: The research questions are specific to qualitative research. They cannot be answered by numerical, statistical calculations. Therefore, I recommend formulating hypotheses in their place. It is not at all clear what is being measured or what the variables of the study are. A variable cannot be influential, influence is measured statistically as a correlation between two variables. Please clarify. Table 1 only represents the descriptive statistics for the calculations related to Hypothesis 1. The names of the tables were too long. It must be shortened, and the calculations highlighted in the table should be presented briefly and clearly. The comments to the tables are not written in APA 7 statistical manner. For example, in table 4 it is stated that "above shows that sig. (2-tailed) (associate probability) (0.168) is greater than the level of significance of 0.05." It should be reformulated as follows: An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in the development of environmental awareness between trainers and learners. The environmental awareness was more engaging to trainers (M=, SD=) than learners (M=, SD=), a statistically non-significant difference, t(df) = , p = .. The statement from the discussions, "The findings in Table I revealed that the creation of environmental awareness among adults influenced the implementation of an environmental</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	adult education program in Enugu State" is not true. Table 1 shows averages and standard deviations. Based on them, a correlational conclusion cannot be drawn. Please review all similar affirmations from the results and the discussions. There are too few bibliographical references in the text. Please revise.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Anca Luștrea
Department, University & Country	West University of Timisoara, Romania