

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

John Carey¹

¹ University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

MS Review, John Carey 1/16/23

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

The evaluation reported in this MS is interesting and worthy of publication. However, the MS itself need a complete revision before it can be published.

1_ The MS is too long, because it is stuffed with a lot of irrelevant detail. It should be cut from 36 to 20 pages.

The theoretical framework, for example, have very little to do with either the research questions or methodology and should be deleted.

Similarly, figures are not needed to present demographic data. These can be cut.

The section on Implications for Nursing can also be cut out.

2. The goals of the evaluation are presented in a very confusing manner.

In the introduction, the research questions are presents as:

“1. There is no significant relationship between the gender of students and their attitude towards school guidance and counselling services provided to them in Owo local government, Ondo State.

2. There is no significant relationship between the effectiveness of school guidance and counselling services and students' performance in secondary schools in Owo local government, Ondo State.”

Later on, 3 research objectives are introduced

Research objective 1: Assess the guidance and counselling services provided in secondary schools

“Research objective 2: Identify the benefits of guidance and counselling services

to secondary school students”

“Research objective 3: Identify the factors hindering effective guidance and counselling services in secondary schools”

This is very confusing. What is the relationship between the questions and the objectives??? Why not just use the research question to organize the analysis sections? Why this intermediate step?

Similarly, how is the gender comparison related to research objectives? Why is it important to do? Was there a gender difference in the relationship between services and benefits?

3. An effect size estimate is needed.

While the Chi2 analysis of effectiveness of services and student performance is statistically significant it looks like a small effect. An index w should be calculated to estimate the effect size to estimate how strong and robust the relationship actually is.

4) In addition there are some conceptual issues that need clarification:

It looks like data from teacher and students were analyzed together. What is the rationale? Does this make sense?

It looks like 53.6% of respondents respond “No” to the question “My school has a guidance counselor”. Why are these respondents’ data used to evaluate services if they do not know there is a counselor in their schools. Doesn’t it make more sense to eliminate data from people who do not know there is a counselor in their school rather than using their data to evaluate services?

5) Finally, some additional issues need attention:

Limitations of the study (e.g. self report, non-standardized instrument) need to be acknowledged.

The source of data on student performance needs to be described. Why should the data be trusted as an accurate estimate of student performance?

The recommendations do not necessarily follow logically from the results of this study and should be revised.

I believe that the evaluation project described is interesting and important and should be published once problems noted above are rectified.