

Review of: "Assessment, Benefits and factors that affect Guidance, Counselling Services in Secondary Schools in Owo Local Government, Ondo State."

Swaib Yarro Seguya¹

¹ National Institute of Transport

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Title	<p>"Assessment, Benefits and factors that affect Guidance, Counselling Services in Secondary Schools in Owo Local Government, Ondo State.</p> <p>Comment: The title is too loaded and gets the article out of focus. I suggest that the authors focus specifically on one of the three issues [Assessment of.... Benefits of.... Factors that affect....]. When you choose to focus on a single issue, your review of the literature becomes smooth, choice of the methods and reporting of the findings becomes easier and leaves out nothing unattended</p>
Abstract	<p>Methodology: Review of empirical and theoretical literature should not be part of the methodology. This is not a review paper.</p> <p>Sample: Identify the people that constituted your sample (i.e. pupils, teachers etc)</p> <p>Design and approach: the study adopted "a quantitative design" using "a descriptive approach". Consider revising this part and point out which quantitative research you used (in your case I think you used a cross-sectional survey), then the approach can not be descriptive. The approach must have been quantitative.</p> <p>I suggest that you read Creswell and Creswell (2018), Saunders et al. (2019) to appreciate the typology of research approaches and the designs that are used therein.</p> <p>"Self-structured" questionnaire?</p>
Introduction	<p>Kindly indicate the page number where quoted Owoni (2015)</p>
Background	<p>If you are dealing with secondary or primary schools; it is more appropriate to use "pupils" in place of students.</p> <p>The authors should check and confirm if indeed absence of counselling leads to increased suicide. Suicide rate in Sweden for example is high despite the fact that they are well established in psycho-social services</p> <p>Owusu et al. (2018) the authors have described this study in details but paid little attention to the results that would have informed their review. I suggest that they say less on the methods and capitalize on the relevant findings.</p> <p>I suggest that the authors see Sima (2010) to enrich their understanding of the challenges in providing counselling services https://journals.udsm.ac.tz/index.php/ped/article/view/1451</p> <p>Amani and Sima (2015) https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jacquiline-Amani/publication/341479696_The_Status_of_Career_Counselling_Services_in_Higher_Learning_Institutions_in_Tanzania/links/5ec3750f92851c11a8741e61/The-Status-of-Career-Counselling-Services-in-Higher-Learning-Institutions-in-Tanzania.pdf</p> <p>The hypothesis as stated do not sufficiently fit in the title of the article and that is why I suggested at the outset of my review that the authors should be more specific. If this article has been extracted from a dissertation, then pick one specific objective and address it in details. Then your article will make an interesting piece of reading.</p> <p>I fail to connect Bronfenbrenner's model to the hypothesis that the authors tested</p>
Methodology	<p>Point out the approach and design, take advantage of seminal authors such as Creswell, Bryman and others to strengthen your methodology section.</p> <p>Be brief, the sections of questionnaire as described in the manuscript is not necessary in my subjective opinion.</p> <p>Ethical consideration: Now I get to know that this was originally a dissertation. Since the authors are turning it into a publishable work, then the "supervisor" should be omitted.</p>
Data analysis	<p>It should be "Data were" and not "data was"</p>

Results	<p>The table that summarizes the demographic information looks awesome.</p> <p>There is no need of having graphs that presents the gender, class and family structure distribution. These have already been presented in the table. Kindly get rid of them.</p>
	<p>There is no difference between what is presented in the tables and what is written in the texts. To cut the long story short, this is just a presentation of raw findings. No analysis has been done; the voices of the authors are lacking.</p> <p>The authors should inform their readers what their findings communicate to them.</p> <p>Again, I have not seen any Bronfenbrenner's model being referred to in the results</p>
Hypothesis testing	<p>If you used SPSS to compute the Chi-square statistic, then you did not have to report the critical value. SPSS doesn't have that anyway. Simply report the statistic, degree of freedom, and the actual p-value that the software displays.</p> <p>It is good to report the size effect (phi or crammer's v) to tell your readers; how much of the variance has been explained by the independent variable.</p>
Summary	<p>Not required unless it is a requirement by the journal</p>
Verdict	<p>There are many interesting ideas in this manuscript, however the authors have to trim their work and focus on a single issue. Re-writing the manuscript in accordance with the suggestions would give us a more readable and interesting article.</p>