



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_13843
Title of the Manuscript:	PERCEPTION OF CONSTRUCTIVIST LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: GENDER AND SCHOOL TYPE DIFFERENCES IN SIAYA COUNTY, KENYA
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Table 2- independent t-test.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This output did not display the actual output of analysis. The actual output must show 'Levene's test of Homogeneity of variance' All the t-values were wrongly stated. For instance, the t-value for personal relevance is -14.697 instead of 10.362 based on the formula for t-value for independent t-test. <p>Table 4 & 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These 2 outputs did not reflect the actual output MANOVA. MANOVA reflects the 2 groups (Male and female) as compare to the 5 dimensions. Similarly, MANOVA reflects the 2 levels (high and low achieving schools) as compare to the 5 dimensions 	<p>Levene's test has been included</p> <p>The t-values were generated by from a computer using SPSS program. However the negative signs that were missing have been included.</p> <p>Revisions have been done to capture the noted discrepancies</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Theoretical framework mentioned the 3 dimensions by not fully supported by the literature review. LR mentioned mainly 2 constructivist theories namely cognitive and social constructivism. It should focus on the 3 main dimensions discussed in the theoretical framework. construct a suitable chart to represent the theoretical framework Author described 3 main dimensions in the theoretical framework. The author never explained why the first 2 dimensions relationship and personal growth dimensions need to be divided into 2 different 'dimensions' respectively. In another word, the author needs to explain in details why he/she 	<p>Since the study was based on moos theory of learning environment and not a conceptual framework, i felt a diagrammatic representation was not necessary.</p> <p>Since the instrument covered these 5 dimensions, it was necessary to show where each of the dimensions fell within the</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	had chosen 5 dimensions instead of 3 in constructing the survey questionnaires.	dimensions of moos theory. A critical look at the 5 dimensions of SPQ shows that personal relevance and uncertainty fall within the dimension of relationship, critical voice and shared control fall within personal growth, system maintenance change covers the domain of student negotiation.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The author didn't know how to analyse the 2 important analyses correctly – independent t-test and MANOVA for the 2 research questions.• The p-values from tables 2, 4 & 5 show almost 100% 'complete result' with significant values of 0.000.• Readjust the 'spacing' in references.	These have been addressed in the relevant sections.