

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_126580
Title of the Manuscript:	Instructional Practices and Self-Efficacy of Teachers in Selected Public Elementary Schools in Antique, Philippines
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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>
<p>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>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community for several reasons. Firstly, it addresses a crucial gap in the literature by examining the relationship between instructional practices and self-efficacy among teachers, particularly in the context of Philippine public elementary schools. The study's focus on correlating these two important constructs provides valuable insights into how teachers' competencies in planning, teaching, and assessing relate to their belief in their ability to perform their professional duties. Moreover, the research is timely, considering the ongoing educational reforms in the Philippines, such as the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum, making its findings particularly relevant for policymakers and educational administrators. The comprehensive approach, which includes various demographic factors, adds depth to the understanding of how different teacher characteristics might influence both instructional practices and self-efficacy. Additionally, the study's use of validated and reliability-tested instruments strengthens the credibility of its findings, making it a solid foundation for future research in this area. Lastly, the practical implications of this research, particularly in informing teacher development programs, make it a valuable contribution to improving educational quality in the Philippines and potentially in similar contexts globally.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is suitable, but it could be more specific to better reflect the content and focus of your study. The current title is:</p> <p>"Instructional Practices and Self-Efficacy of Teachers in Selected Public Elementary Schools in Antique, Philippines"</p> <p>This title does capture the main concepts of your study - instructional practices and self-efficacy - as well as the setting. However, it could be enhanced to more precisely convey the nature of your research. Here are a few suggestions to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include the correlational aspect of your study: "Relationship Between Instructional Practices and Self-Efficacy of Teachers in Selected Public Elementary Schools in Antique, Philippines" 2. Highlight the specific aspects of instructional practices you examined: "Planning, Teaching, and Assessing: Their Relationship with Self-Efficacy Among Public Elementary School Teachers in Antique, Philippines" 3. Emphasize the demographic factors you considered: "Instructional Practices and Self-Efficacy of Teachers: A Correlational Study Considering Demographic Factors in Antique, Philippines" 4. Focus on the implications of your study: "Enhancing Teacher Development: Correlating Instructional Practices and Self-Efficacy in Antique's Public Elementary Schools" <p>Any of these alternatives would provide more specific information about your study's focus and methodology, potentially making it more attractive to researchers interested in this specific area of educational research. However, the current title is acceptable if you prefer to keep it more general.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>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>	<p>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive and covers the key aspects of the study. However, there are a few areas where it could be enhanced for greater clarity and completeness. Here are my suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Addition: Include a brief statement about the theoretical framework (Bandura's self-efficacy theory) that underpins the study. This would provide immediate context for the research. 2. Addition: Mention the specific demographic factors considered in the study (sex, age, length of teaching experience, educational attainment, and current teaching position). This would give readers a clearer picture of the study's scope. 3. Addition: Include a brief mention of the statistical methods used (mean, standard deviation, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient). This would provide more information about the rigor of the analysis. 4. Clarification: Specify the scale used for rating instructional practices and self-efficacy (e.g., 4-point Likert scale), as this information helps readers interpret the results more accurately. 5. Addition: Include a brief statement about the ethical considerations of the study, as this is an important aspect of research methodology. 6. Refinement: The conclusion in the abstract could be more specific about the implications of the findings. Instead of a general statement about continuous improvement, you could mention specific areas where improvement might be focused based on your results. 7. Deletion: The statement about the validation of the theory could be shortened or removed from the abstract, as it's more appropriate for the discussion section. This would allow more space for other key points. <p>Here's a suggested revision for the last two sentences of the abstract to incorporate some of these suggestions:</p> <p>"Finally, a significant positive relationship ($r=0.807$, $p<0.001$) was found between instructional practices and self-efficacy. These findings imply that enhancing teachers' competence in planning, teaching, and assessing may positively influence their self-efficacy. The study recommends focused interventions in these areas to ensure successful instructional processes and improve educational outcomes."</p> <p>These suggestions aim to make the abstract more informative and aligned with standard scientific reporting practices while maintaining its conciseness.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate and follow a standard scientific format.</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>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness in several key aspects. Firstly, the study employs a well-defined and appropriate research design (descriptive-correlational) that aligns with its objectives of assessing instructional practices, self-efficacy, and their relationship. Secondly, the use of validated and reliability-tested researcher-made questionnaires enhances the credibility of the data collection process, with the reported Cronbach's alpha scores (0.954 for instructional practices and 0.958 for self-efficacy) indicating high internal consistency of the instruments. Thirdly, the study's adherence to ethical guidelines, including those of the Philippine Health Research Ethics Board, demonstrates a commitment to responsible research practices. Fourthly, the application of appropriate statistical analyses, including the use of Shapiro-Wilk test for normality and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for relationship analysis, shows methodological rigor. Lastly, the study's grounding in established theoretical frameworks, particularly Bandura's self-efficacy theory, provides a solid foundation for interpreting and contextualizing the findings within the broader scientific literature.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in this manuscript are generally sufficient in number and cover relevant topics related to the study.</p>	

Review Form 3

=		
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Based on my review of the manuscript, the overall language and English quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Based on the comprehensive review of the manuscript, including its structure, content, scientific robustness, references, and language quality, I would give this manuscript an overall mark of: 8.2 out of 10 This score falls into the "Minor Revision" category. Justification: The manuscript demonstrates several strengths, including a well-defined research design, appropriate use of statistical methods, and adherence to ethical guidelines. The study is grounded in relevant theory and addresses a significant gap in the literature. However, there are areas that require improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The structure could be enhanced by separating the Results and Discussion sections and adding a dedicated Limitations section. 2. While the references are sufficient, more recent sources could be incorporated to strengthen the literature review and theoretical framework. 3. The language quality is generally good but could benefit from some refinement to enhance clarity and adhere more closely to academic writing standards. 4. The abstract could be more comprehensive, including brief mentions of the theoretical framework and specific statistical methods used. <p>These issues, while important, are relatively minor and can be addressed without fundamentally altering the study's design or findings. With these revisions, the manuscript would be significantly strengthened and more suitable for scholarly publication.</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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Edgar Anud Jr.
Department, University & Country	Goose Creek High School, USA