

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_86913
Title of the Manuscript:	TEACHER APTITUDE TEST FOR COLLEGE ADMISSION IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN PHILIPPINES: A DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION STUDY
Type of the 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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The later part of the introduction captured the real objectives of the study but the researcher did not indicate the research questions that would guide and give a focus to the collection and analysis of the data. Therefore, I suggest he adds research questions to the introduction before the methodology. This would point out the answers he is seeking to conclude on the subject matter of the paper.</p> <p>Secondly, the methodology is silent on the sample technique used in selecting the respondents. He only mentioned "Complete Enumeration". In the abstract, he indicated that a proportional random sampling was used to select the 224 freshmen for the study. Abstract is supposed to be a summary of the detailed work done in the article. But the methodology was very scanty and too simple on the technique used in the selection of the respondents. I think the Author should present detailed sampling technique than what he did.</p> <p>Again, the Author stated two major classical test theories he used in the item analysis but declined to explain each of the theories and how it applies to his research.</p> <p>Also, I think there should be a summary of the work to enable people who don't have time to read through the article to read and comprehend what the article is about.</p> <p>The Researcher did not indicate how he got access to his respondents. Students should be allowed to participate in a research only after being permitted by the authorities of their school. But there was no ethical consideration by the Author.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	I think the sex of the respondents could also be needed.	
Optional/General comments	<p>I suggest he adds research questions to the introduction before the methodology. This would point out the answers he is seeking to conclude on the subject matter of the paper.</p> <p>. I think the Author should present detailed sampling technique than what he did.</p> <p>The paper is good. I suggest it should be published after the corrections are done.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>YES. The Author did not indicate any ethical consideration on how he got the permission to talk to his freshmen for data collection.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yeyie Patrick
Department, University & Country	Kibi Presbyterian College of Education, Ghana