



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJESBS_25979
Title of the Manuscript:	AN INVESTIGATION OF PSYCHOLOGICAL COUNSELLING AND GUIDANCE DEPARTMENT STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION RELATED COMPETENCE
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 <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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Inclusive Education Questionnaire is supposed to include four sub-dimensions. Please provide evidence for the validity of these sub-dimensions. How were these sub-dimensions determined? Is this passed solely on face validity? Has any factor analysis been done to confirm the sub-dimensions? I would also recommend that the author(s) of this paper conduct confirmatory factor analysis to confirm the sub-dimensions. If the sub-dimensions cannot be confirmed, then interpreting the results for sub-dimensions may be invalid and unjustified. • Table 2, Table 4, Table 6 refer to multiple groups, but they do not describe what the four groups are. Please define the four groups. Are these four grade levels? If so, which grade is Group 1, etc? The means and standard deviations of the individual groups should be listed. If the groups are grade levels, is there an overall trend across grade levels? How do you explain the significant difference between specific groups? • Tables 1-8 correspond to the four sub-dimensions of the instrument. Where did the scores for "General competence" come from in Tables 9 and 10? If these are total scores from the instrument, this should be explained. • The authors have run 10 primary statistical analyses, plus (presumably) six Tukey comparisons for each of the five grade level tests. If that is correct, this makes a total of 40 statistical tests. If alpha = .05, then the overall Type I error rate is inflated to about .87. At this rate, some statistically significant findings would be expected. Perhaps author(s) 	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

	<p>should consider an Bonferroni adjustment to reduce the overall Type I error rate, or at least discuss this limitation in the Discussion and Conclusion section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Author(s) have repeated the Results in the Discussion and Conclusion section, but have not offered any conclusions. What do the results mean? They have also not discussed limitations of the study, or made any suggestions for future research. <p>The recommendations in the Discussion and conclusion section are not supported by the study. The study does not show that programs need more special education courses. Nor does the study support the other two recommendations. Given the inconsistencies between previous research cited and the results of this study, I would recommend recommendations to improve research quality and find out why results are inconsistent. What research studies would help clarify the inconsistent findings of different studies?</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page2: Please cite this statement: “The most important factor that effects learning in inclusive education are considered to be the inclusion training provided to teachers.” • The author(s) should be supported as they write scholarly work in English. I would recommend a careful editing for standard English. The text includes many grammatical errors. The sentence quoted in the previous note is one typical example. • Lines 57-82 are all one sentence. This point should be expressed more concisely. A longer list is does not make for a more persuasive argument. • Please note in Tables 2 and 4 and 10 that it is statistically impossible for a p-value to equal 0. This p-value may be < .005, but it is not equal to zero. • Throughout the statistical descriptions the text notes “At p < .05 significance level . . .” However, author(s) are referring here to the alpha (α) level, not the p-value. The p-value is the probability resulting from the analysis. The alpha level is the maximum level p-value that will be considered significant. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Bob Ives</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>College of Education, University of Nevada, Reno, USA</p>