

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_96504
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF DISTANCE LEARNERS' DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON MOTIVATION AND PERFORMMANCE IN FLIPPED CLASSROOM
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://journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Place the review of the literature after the introduction. Though you speak about Broussard and Garrison with the premise motivation increases as a student ages, there is competing research which suggests the opposite is true: Motivation decreases as a student ages. See Bartholomew, K. J., Ntoumanis, N., Mouratidis, A., Katartzi, E., Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C., & Vlachopoulos, S. (2018). Beware of your teaching style: A school-year long investigation of controlling teaching and student motivational experiences. <i>Learning and Instruction</i> , 53, 50-63. A downside to both articles is they target elementary children, and your research examines university students. May I suggest you replace this analysis with university students and motivation or qualify it within the larger issue? Maybe you should examine Marler, E. K., Bruce, M. J., Abaoud, A., Henrichsen, C., Suksatan, W. Devote an entire paragraph to how you developed the questionnaire. Was there a theoretical or conceptual basis? How did you establish content validity, which Cronbach's alpha does not examine? Did you examine validity of each item? Was the questionnaire piloted? Maybe you should include the questionnaire as an addendum? Was the 4-point scale 1-2-3-4 or 0-3? Were there skipped questions? Would be interesting in building the MANOVA if you examined different combinations. PLEASE provide results of the questionnaire by the different variables.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	David C. Coker
Department, University & Country	Fort Hays State University, USA