

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_127288
Title of the Manuscript:	Construction of Attitude Scale towards Choice Based Credit System (CBCS)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.	The paper's objective remains ambiguous, leaving it unclear whether the focus is on "developing and preparing a tool or scale to assess students' attitudes toward the Choice-Based Credit System (CBCS)," evaluating "the quality of individual attitude-related items within the CBCS framework," or examining its broader implications. The stated aim requires refinement and greater precision, particularly to establish whether the paper seeks to make a methodological contribution to the field. Clarifying this will not only sharpen the manuscript's focus but also help position it more effectively within the existing body of literature. The scope of the paper also remains unclear, particularly regarding whether it analyzes a specific country case in testing its proposed tool or seeks to contribute to the broader higher education literature at a global level. In later parts of the paper it refers to India? This ambiguity extends to the abstract, which fails to accurately capture the paper's central focus. A more precise and well-defined abstract is essential to clearly convey the study's primary objectives, scope, and intended contribution.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is suitable.	
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.	The abstract falls significantly short in articulating the paper's aim and the core field it seeks to contribute to. It is unclear whether the study focuses on developing a scale or testing tool, whether it pertains to the higher education sector specifically, and whether it addresses the global context or a particular country case. For instance, the statement, "The academic reform necessarily includes changes in admission procedures in various courses..." lacks specificity, leaving the reader uncertain about the nature of the reform or the context in which it is occurring. Similarly, the subsequent sentence, "Now the education evaluation system has entered into a semester-based system..." fails to clarify where this shift is taking place and how it relates to the Choice-Based Credit System (CBCS), a term that itself remains undefined within the abstract. While the abstract focuses on the methodology, it neglects to capture the essence of the paper, such as its primary objectives, scope, and contribution to the field. A well-crafted abstract should focus on these elements, providing readers with a clear and concise understanding of the study's significance, while leaving methodological details for the main text. Revisions are necessary to ensure that the abstract accurately and effectively reflects the purpose and focus of the paper.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	To some extent. It needs to clarify the details of the studied scales, what these scales are for, CBCS, and the intended wider implications of the findings.	
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.	While the paper appears to employ sound methodological calculations, it lacks sufficient detail to enable a comprehensive assessment of its scientific findings. Greater clarity is needed regarding the specific objectives of the study, the scope of the tool being tested, and the context in which it is implemented. Additionally, further elaboration on the scales studied and their relevance to the research would enhance the paper's rigor and contribution to the field. Addressing these gaps is essential to provide a more robust understanding of the study's framework and its implications.	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The author is suggested to incorporate additional references on higher education reform, particularly those addressing the Choice-Based Credit System (CBCS), and to integrate these into the text. Doing so would not only enhance the paper's scholarly foundation but also improve the clarity and contextual understanding of its arguments, justifying the need for a methodological contribution. Expanding the literature base will provide readers with a more comprehensive perspective and strengthen the study's contribution to the field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In addition to the comments provided above, I offer the following constructive suggestions aimed at further enhancing the quality of the research:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity of References: The phrase “<i>After review of previous paper and article</i>” is ambiguous. The author should specify which paper and article are being referred to and provide proper citations. Originality of the Questionnaire and Scale: If the “<i>self-made structured questionnaire</i>” is original, this should be explicitly highlighted as a contribution and reflected in the abstract. The same applies to the statement, “<i>The researcher prepared and standardised a scale/tool</i>”—if this is an original contribution, its uniqueness and significance should be clearly emphasized. The phrase “<i>There are numerous institutions playing this role in our country</i>” is unclear. The author must specify the country being referred to and provide examples of these institutions for better context and precision. The reference to “<i>The 11th plan</i>” and its recognition of academic reform in universities is not sufficiently explained. Choice-Based Credit System (CBCS): The paper should clearly explain what the CBCS entails, its objectives, and who has implemented it. This key information is essential for readers unfamiliar with the system. Explanation of the Attitude Scale: Terms like “<i>quality of each item of attitude scale</i>” should be elaborated upon. The scale itself, its components, and its relevance to the research should be clearly defined. Information Gathering and Expert Contributions: Statements such as “<i>The first researcher gathered various information’s from various sources</i>” and “<i>After this both favourable and unfavourable attitude items were formed with the help of expert in this field</i>” are vague. The author should clarify what information was gathered, from which sources, and the specific role and area of expertise of the expert consulted. Attribution of the Likert Scale: The paper states, “<i>In the attitude scale there are five (5) alternative options based on Likert summative five (5) point rating scale (Yavuz, 2005)</i>”. It should be clarified whether this scale originates from Yavuz (2005) and, if so, how it has been adapted or applied in the current research. Reliability Testing: A separate explanation of the reliability testing of the tool should be included, detailing if the data collection process is separate or it is for only the methods used for validation. Significance of the Methodology: While the paper focuses heavily on methodological calculations, it should address why this methodological approach is necessary. Specifically, the aim of developing a new scale/tool and its ultimate implications for higher education should be clarified. Discrimination Index and Attitude Test: The terms “<i>discrimination index</i>” and “<i>attitude test</i>” lack sufficient context. The paper should explain what these include, who developed them, and why they were chosen for this research. Consistency in Research Aim: There is inconsistency in how the paper's aim is articulated. For example, it alternates between “<i>this study shows how to prepare and develop the tool/scale to assess attitude of students towards the choice-based credit system</i>” and “<i>this study aims to explore the quality of each item of attitude related to choice-based credit system (CBCS)</i>.” The author should reconcile these statements and provide a unified and clear articulation of the paper's purpose. Integration of Implications: The implications section requires a coherent connection with the discussion section. Consistent and logical alignment between these parts will strengthen the overall impact and conclusion of the research. <p>By addressing these points, the manuscript will achieve greater clarity, rigor, and alignment with academic standards, ultimately enhancing its contribution to the field.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Ayselin Yildiz</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Istinye University, Turkey</p>