Review of: "Motivational Variables as Predictors of Academic Achievement Among University Students"

Görkem Aydın[1]

1 Bilkent University

The manuscript entitled "Motivational Variables as Predictors of Academic Achievement Among University Students" sets out to investigate the relationship between students' level of motivation towards learning and their academic performance. The study concerns a relevant issue. Lack of motivation or low-quality motivation could be seen as a serious threat to learners' academic life, which has concerned many researchers and policy makers. It is also a pleasure to read about the potential connection among these very significant variables that also interest me.

Next to this, there are, in my view, a number of shortcomings that hinder me from being able to say it is ready to be published. I would like to share each point in detail, thinking that these may help you revise your MS. I listed below my comments, which you do not have to agree with.

1- Language: First, there is unfortunately a language barrier. Because of major problems in the use of English, meaning is hindered and therefore leaves the reader with some unanswered questions (i.e., " Research on students' attitude towards learning and their motivation levels to carry out learning at the university level…" on page 2). Some of the main grammatical errors are lack of a linker (sentences combined with a comma), capitalization (i.e., Engineering), alphabetical disorder of cited research, and unnecessarily italicized words. It would be better to use linking devices and connectors, especially while sharing background research, to show the reader how the main research question is linked to prior research.

2- Theoretical framework: Theoretical concepts have not been explained in relation to relevant research. It is more like a brief summary of the concepts which are poorly linked. It makes it hard for the reader to understand the link between variables aimed to be analyzed. Also, primary sources and better paraphrasing could be preferred. Also, the link between variables and why specific variables have been aimed at has not been clearly shown. It would be better for the reader to see why self-efficacy is seen as the main factor that could be related to academic achievement. Because we also cannot understand the nature of the context, which could be explained briefly under the method section, the discussion section remains ambiguous.

3- Methodology: I wondered whether the methodology could have been more rigorous. Authors chose a "non-random sampling approach." It would be useful if authors clarified the strengths of such an approach and why it was preferred. Besides, how you divided the population into subgroups cannot be seen in the MS. Also, can you check this statement "… aged from 18 to 24 years old, most of them, p 5) and this one "a first group from Engineering (19%), a second group from Engineering (24%)"? Do you mean different engineering departments? Additionally, you have shared the research question, which is, in fact, a statement (i.e., Relationship between *university students' motivation towards learning* and their *academic performance*). The main aim of the study should also be indicated in a more academic manner. Data collection procedures could also be explained in detail. Do students have consent? Did you receive ethical approval? How were the final grades included? The data analysis section concerns me as well. The wording, APA formatting, and explanation of the analysis process are not satisfactory. The reader may not be able to follow the steps easily, which is needed to interpret the results. It would be better to justify why you prefer multiple regression, what the suggested steps are, and whether you have followed each step or not. Seeing p-values would be better if you agree. Thank you for sharing information on the normality and linearity of the distribution of residuals. Multiple linear regression is somewhat more complicated than simple linear regression, which makes your study more reliable.

4- Conclusion & Discussion: More prudent conclusions are needed, in my view. The story behind your study cannot be seen well. How your main aims, hypotheses, and results are related and how you interpreted the results in your discussion section with more justification (references) cannot be seen. You may prefer to have answers to these questions in your study.

You may want to check the suggested research:

Holland, D. F., Kraha, A., Zientek, L. R., Nimon, K., Fulmore, J. A., Johnson, U. Y., ... & Henson, R. K. (2018). Reliability generalization of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire: a meta-analytic view of reliability estimates. *SAGE Open*, *8*(3), 2158244018802334.