

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_111064
Title of the Manuscript:	Confirmed/ Disconfirmed Expectation in Success/Failure Attribution among Indian College Adults
Type of the Article	

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is not highlighting any specific variable relationships clearly for it to be valuable for the scientific community. Each variable needs to be defined cogently at the very outset. There is mention of attribution like external /internal without referencing Rotter's Locus of Control paradigm. On page 6, it is mentioned "At last it was assumed that Parenting Style, Generalized Self-Efficacy and Self-handicapping were expected to be significantly correlated with, and to predict Attribution significantly—" which seems to be reminiscent as an afterthought to include these variables as well. There is no mention of these variables in the abstract. What is the rationale for including, Parenting style, Generalized Self-efficacy and Self-handicapping? How does this study help students, such highly relevant is missing. This title is too wordy and non-specific not embodying the ethos of the entire study: "Confirmed/ Disconfirmed Expectation in Success/Failure Attribution among Indian College Adults." The abstract needs to provide a rationale for conducting this study in 2-3 sentences before describing the variables and their subsequent relationships. The abstract talks about group and individual settings without explaining these with an easy example. Further, when we talk of group setting, there are aspects like social loafing, felt dispensability, sucker effect that must be taken into cognizance. The wordings of the abstract lack lucidity. Participants: What was the sampling method employed to contact subjects for this study? Materials & methods: • Results & discussion: « The non-significant effects of High/Low SE, went against some of the reported findings in the existing literature. Nor was there support for self-related motivations, such as self-enhancement and self-presentation among High SE subjects, self-protection and a self-defeating attributional style among Low SE subjects, and a self-handicapping tendency among both, reported by several investigators (Cohen, 1959; Brockner & Hutton, 1978; Janoff-Bulman, 1979; Dinner, Lewkowitz & Cooper 1972; Kolditz & Arkin, 1982 ; Sinha & Gupta, 2006). The finding was difficult to explain, except by suggesting the possibility that self-esteem effects should perhaps be predicted in the case of <i>actual</i> rather than <i>stated</i> behaviour, and in attribution based on real rather than hypothetical outcomes. » In the the last sentence about self-esteem effects be predicted in case of actual (provide a concrete example for clarity), stated(provide a concrete example for clarity). Quantitative analyses have been conducted without proper expnations. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>4. The Conclusion section is missing; Limitations of this article have not been mentioned. The potential value of this research is not stated, and there is no mention of future directions for other scholars who may be engaged in researching on these variables.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is replete with older research and needs to incorporate recent research in their review of literature.</p> <p>7. In the Reference section, the volume of the journal has also to be italicized.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language is confusing, lacking in clarity, there is no logical sequence of explaining the variables. Background and the need for this study have not been mentioned.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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>
<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:

Name:	Neelam Rattan
Department, University & Country	San Jose State University, U.S.A.