

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_128224
Title of the Manuscript:	CLASSROOM VULNERABILITY AND DELIVERY OF LEARNING ACTIVITIES OF TEACHERS IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
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: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed change: Which location? Specify if it to India, Africa, or a particular state or area. The title must be explicit and precise.</li> <li>Re-examine your work and get assistance of expert if considered essential.</li> <li>Correct mistakes like (Pregoner &amp; Baguio, 20240. ? I think it will be (Pregoner &amp; Baguio, 2024).</li> <li>Kindly explain the rationale for selecting only teachers from public elementary schools in the Carmen District, Division of Davao del Norte for your research. Is there a rationale behind that? If so, please explain.</li> <li>Could you explain the methodology used for reliability assessment by a panel of specialists in Educational Management? Or is it accomplished by a survey including a sample of 30? Did you include the sample of 30 in your final analysis, or did you do a retest of those 30? Articulate and define in your manuscript.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Table 3, which illustrates the significant relationship between classroom vulnerability and the delivery of learning activities by teachers, it is noted that although the degree of significance (p-value) is provided, the value of the product moment correlation should be included on place of that.</li> <li>Improvements are necessary in the regression findings. You must quantify the degree to which your model (Dependent Variable) predicts the independent variable. Example of that</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 4.28: Showing the Separate and Conjoint effect of locus of control and self efficacy on emotional intelligence of Male gifted students (N=240)</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Variable</th> <th>R</th> <th>R<sup>2</sup></th> <th>% Variance</th> <th>F</th> <th>Inference</th> <th>Step-Up Regression Equation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Y X<sub>1</sub></td> <td>0.170</td> <td>0.028</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>7.060</td> <td>Significant at 0.01 level</td> <td>Y = 45.596+0.316 X<sub>1</sub></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y X<sub>2</sub></td> <td>0.041</td> <td>0.001</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>0.406</td> <td>Not Significant</td> <td>Y = 67.452+ (-0.052) X<sub>2</sub></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y X<sub>1</sub> X<sub>2</sub></td> <td>0.169</td> <td>0.028</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>3.517</td> <td>Not Significant</td> <td>Y = 46.059+0.315 X<sub>1</sub> + (-0.005) X<sub>2</sub></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The effect of first predictor variable i.e. locus of control is assessed on emotional intelligence and the contribution of locus of control on emotional intelligence of male gifted students is found significant at 0.01 level of confidence with F = 7.060. The computed value of R<sup>2</sup> of emotional intelligence and locus control (YX<sub>1</sub>) is 0.028 which indicates a variance of 2.8% in emotional intelligence is due to locus of control. The contribution of locus of control on emotional intelligence of male gifted students is 2.8%.</li> <li>The effect of second predictor variable i.e. self-efficacy is assessed on emotional intelligence and the contribution of self-efficacy on emotional intelligence is found to be not significant with F = 0.406. The computed value of R<sup>2</sup> of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy (YX<sub>2</sub>) is 0.001 which indicates a variance of 0.1% in emotional intelligence is due to self-efficacy. The contribution of self-efficacy on emotional intelligence of male gifted students is 0.1%.</li> <li>The effect of both independent variables i.e. locus of control and self-efficacy was assessed on emotional intelligence of male gifted students and the conjoint contribution of locus of control and self-efficacy on emotional intelligence is found to be not significant with F = 3.517. The computed value of R<sup>2</sup> of emotional intelligence with locus of control and self-efficacy (YX<sub>1</sub>X<sub>2</sub>) was 0.028 which indicates a variance of 2.8% in emotional intelligence due to locus of control and self-efficacy. The contribution of both predictor variables i.e. locus of control and self-efficacy on emotional intelligence of male gifted students is found to be 2.8%. As R<sup>2</sup> shows a change in its value from the locus of control with no increase (0.028-0.028) and from self-efficacy with an increase of 0.027 (0.028-0.001) which indicates that the conjoint effect of both independent variables i.e. locus of control and self-efficacy on emotional intelligence of male gifted students is higher than their separate effect.</li> </ul>	Variable	R	R <sup>2</sup>	% Variance	F	Inference	Step-Up Regression Equation	Y X <sub>1</sub>	0.170	0.028	2.8	7.060	Significant at 0.01 level	Y = 45.596+0.316 X <sub>1</sub>	Y X <sub>2</sub>	0.041	0.001	0.1	0.406	Not Significant	Y = 67.452+ (-0.052) X <sub>2</sub>	Y X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>2</sub>	0.169	0.028	2.8	3.517	Not Significant	Y = 46.059+0.315 X <sub>1</sub> + (-0.005) X <sub>2</sub>	
Variable	R	R <sup>2</sup>	% Variance	F	Inference	Step-Up Regression Equation																								
Y X <sub>1</sub>	0.170	0.028	2.8	7.060	Significant at 0.01 level	Y = 45.596+0.316 X <sub>1</sub>																								
Y X <sub>2</sub>	0.041	0.001	0.1	0.406	Not Significant	Y = 67.452+ (-0.052) X <sub>2</sub>																								
Y X <sub>1</sub> X <sub>2</sub>	0.169	0.028	2.8	3.517	Not Significant	Y = 46.059+0.315 X <sub>1</sub> + (-0.005) X <sub>2</sub>																								

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	Sanjay Chandwani
Department, University & Country	DAN College of Education for Women, India