

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_124337
Title of the Manuscript:	Strategic Approaches to Streaming in Secondary Education: Insights from Teachers and Students on Balancing Lower and Higher Achiever Needs
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>2. Introduction</p> <p>i. The introduction effectively sets the context of the study by providing background information on streaming in the Tanzanian educational system. It succinctly presents the key issue: the debate over the effectiveness and fairness of streaming practices, particularly in Kilolo District.</p> <p>ii. Consider including international perspectives on streaming practices to frame the issue within a broader context. This would enrich the background and allow readers to see the Tanzanian experience in light of global trends.</p> <p>iii. Suggested improvement: Specify the gaps in existing research that your study aims to address. This would clarify the contribution of your study.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	i. Title: The title accurately reflects the core theme of the manuscript and provides a good first impression.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>Abstract: The abstract is well-organized and summarizes the key components of the research. However, it would benefit from slight rephrasing for readability:</p> <p>Methodology Using a qualitative research design is appropriate for capturing the nuanced perspectives of teachers and students. The case study approach is well-justified given the need for an in-depth understanding of streaming practices in a specific context.</p> <p>Sampling and Data Collection: The inclusion of 20 teachers and 96 students from four public secondary schools is a reasonable sample size for qualitative research. However, more details are needed regarding the criteria for school selection and stratified sampling of students. Consider elaborating on the focus group dynamics and the specific questions posed to participants, as this would enhance transparency and allow replication of the study.</p> <p>Data Analysis: Thematic analysis using an interpretative phenomenological approach is well-suited for this type of study. However, include a section on how you ensured trustworthiness and credibility (e.g., member checking, triangulation, or peer debriefing).</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Research Questions</p> <p>i. The research questions are clear and directly address the study's aims.</p> <p>ii. Consider rephrasing to ensure specificity: a) Current question: "What are the attitudes of teachers toward the effectiveness of current streaming practices?"</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>b) Suggested revision: "What are teachers' perceptions regarding the effectiveness and fairness of current streaming practices in Kilolo District?"</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>5. Results and Discussion The findings are presented clearly, and the inclusion of direct quotes from participants strengthens your argument. Thematic Presentation: The themes such as "Focus on Streaming Duration," "Professional Development for Teachers," "Establishing Special Schools for Lower Achievers," and "Number of Subjects" are relevant and well-structured. Suggestions for improvement: Highlight the contrasting views among participants more prominently. For example, while some teachers advocate for early streaming, others suggest starting in Form Three. This contrast should be emphasized and discussed in relation to educational theory. Include subheadings for each thematic section to guide readers through the discussion. This would enhance readability and flow. Connection to Literature: The manuscript references a wide range of relevant literature, but it could benefit from stronger integration of these sources into the discussion. For example, when discussing the timing of streaming, draw more explicitly on the findings of studies like Spina (2018) and Magableh & Abdullah (2020). 6. Conclusion The conclusion effectively summarizes the key insights and reiterates the need for a more inclusive approach to streaming. Suggested improvement: Explicitly state the "implications for policy and practice" This would help to contextualize your recommendations within the Tanzanian educational system and guide policymakers in implementing your findings.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>Recommendations The recommendations are practical and grounded in the findings. However, consider prioritizing them in order of feasibility or potential impact. For example, "early streaming implementation" and "professional development for teachers" may be easier to implement in the short term compared to establishing "specialized schools for lower achievers", which would require significant resources. 8. Language and Style The language is clear, but there are minor grammatical errors and instances of awkward phrasing that could be improved. For example: Current wording: "Teaching lower achievers effectively requires techniques and methods that we are not typically trained in." Suggested revision: "Effective instruction for lower achievers demands techniques and methods for which teachers often lack adequate training." Consistency in "tense" should be maintained throughout the manuscript. Most of the findings should be presented in the past tense.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Current wording: "Students, particularly lower achievers, reported feelings of confidence and great hope for academic success due to streaming involving subject reduction."</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Suggested revision: "Lower-achieving students reported increased confidence and optimism regarding academic success due to the subject reduction associated with streaming</p> <p>Formatting and References Ensure that the "APA citation style" is consistently applied throughout the manuscript. Some references (e.g., "Follwell and Andrew, 2021") are missing publication details. Consider including a "table or figure" to summarize key findings or strategies suggested by participants. This would provide a visual representation of the data and enhance reader engagement.</p> <p>10. Overall Impact The manuscript addresses a critical issue in educational research and provides valuable insights into the challenges and opportunities of streaming practices in Tanzanian secondary schools. The findings have the potential to inform "policy reforms and educational strategies" in similar contexts. A "stronger narrative connection" between the introduction, findings, and conclusion would enhance the overall coherence of the manuscript. Specifically, revisit the initial discussion on the "philosophical underpinnings of streaming" and link these ideas to your final recommendations.</p> <p>Final Opinions The manuscript has a solid foundation, with a clear focus and well-defined research objectives. By refining the language, enhancing the methodological rigor, and integrating the literature more closely with the findings, the paper will be more impactful and accessible to both researchers and policymakers</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nadia Masood
Department, University & Country	National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Pakistan