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

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	Table 2- independent t-test. • 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. Table 4 & 5 • These 2 outputs did not reflect the actual output MANOVA. MAVOVA 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	
Minor REVISION comments	1. 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. 2. construct a suitable chart to represent the theoretical framework 3. 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	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	had chosen 5 dimensions instead of 3 in constructing the survey questionnaires.	
Optional/General comments	• 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.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Malaysia**