

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_85112
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARING ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS BETWEEN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES OF EDUCATION IN THE KUMASI METROPOLIS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. ABSTRACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The total population (respondent) was not stated in the abstract</li> <li>- Three instruments (questionnaires) as claimed by the researcher were not tagged appropriately</li> <li>- The category of respondents (sample) exposed to pilot study was not stated</li> <li>- The results of pilot study supposed to appear according to three categories of respondents before stating the total index of 0.72 as claimed by the researcher.</li> <li>- The extent of administrative support as claimed by the researcher was not seen in the results of findings from analysis of data such as Very High Extent (VHE), High Extent (HE), Little Extent (LE) and Very Little Extent (VLE). The researcher is advised to expunge the word "extent" if he or she must use the independent test for the analysis.</li> <li>- Recommendations did not properly state the reasons for the government and stakeholders to provide enough equipment and facilities for both institutions.</li> </ul> <p>2. BODY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Odedeyi and Onifade (1998) is obsolete and should either be replaced.</li> <li>- There is no state of arts in the study at the end of the body. The study was poorly concluded.</li> </ul> <p>3. Statement of the problem</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Statement of the problem need to be overhauled to capture the administrative constraints in administrative support for teaching and learning of physical education and sports between the two institutions in Kumasi metropolis.</li> <li>- Statement does not require quoting an author. The researcher is advised to rewrite it in a statement of problem format-use words observe, speculate, assume, appear et cetera.</li> <li>- The researcher should rewrite it in a problematic format to capture the variables of the study that engendered or prompted the study.</li> </ul> <p>3.0 Hypotheses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All the abbreviations should be written in full</li> </ul> <p>5.0 Review of related literature</p> <p>6.0 Research Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Research design supposed to be co relational survey and not descriptive. This is because the study deals with interpreting the relationship between the variables.</li> </ul> <p>6.2 Population of the study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- population was not stated in figure and very poor in description.</li> </ul> <p>6.3 percentage of sample from the entire population was not stated by the researcher.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contradiction exists between abstract and sampling technique. See the sampling technique in the abstract and the ones in the research methodology section.</li> <li>- Instruments for data collection were not properly defined. Kindly tag them accordingly.</li> </ul> <p>6.4 Instrument for data collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Cronbach alpha of 0.86 in the research methodology section was different from 0-72 in the abstract. Justify</li> <li>- The response options and modes were not were not stated</li> </ul> <p>6.5 Data analysis procedure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- for suitability of independent sample t-test statistical tool for this kind of study on comparism, you have adjust the research hypotheses to remove the word extent.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article is publishable when all the corrections are properly effected.	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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:	<b>Shaibu Leonard</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University Oye-Ekiti, Nigeria</b>