

Review of: "Psycho-Social Factors as Elixir to the School Adjustment of High Ability Secondary School Students in Oyo State, Nigeria"

Ramona Obermeier¹

¹ Johannes Kepler University Linz

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors,

Thank you for the possibility to review the paper "Psycho-Social Factors as Elixir to the School Adjustment of High Ability Secondary School Students in Oyo state, Nigeria". The paper deals with an interesting topic and is basically logically structured. However, I have some major concerns and recommendations for improvement regarding several aspects of the literature review, methodological approach and discussion of the findings.

Major:

Abstract:

1. Please provide more information on the sample (size, average age of the students, gender).
2. What does the ANOVA refer to?
3. How do you relate the adjusted R^2 of 0.875 and the explained variance of 99.5%?
4. What do the mentioned r-coefficients regarding the scales and instruments refer to? I would expect to see Cronbach's α or McDonalds ω in order to report the reliability of the used instruments.

Introduction:

1. Overall: please provide a theoretical framework for your assumptions. Maybe self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2002; Ryan & Deci, 2002) would be adequate as satisfaction of the three basic human needs is related to well-being and other positive outcomes and can additionally be supported by all of your mentioned predictors
2. First paragraph and first five sentences of the second paragraph: Please provide adequate references for all your definitions (i.e., for school adjustment) and your claims.
3. "The above claims can be seen from the literature [...]". I'm not sure if I get this sentence right and I also don't see the clear link between the studies mentioned above and the lack of proper adjustment of HASSS. Please explain your argument more precisely.
4. You mention that family language and other aspects of socio-economic background are also relevant for school adjustment of HASSS, but you did not include such aspects in your analyses. I wonder why the explained variance in your model is so high, since you did not control for many aspects claimed to be impactful in paragraph 4. Please

discuss the lack of control variables as a limitation of the study.

5. Please provide a reference for your definition of psycho-social factors.
6. You describe peer-attachment as “an emotional bond between a child and the rest of the school environment [...]”. In my opinion this description is not appropriate, since the school environment includes much more aspects e.g., student-teacher-interactions, interactions with learning materials, requirements and rules.
7. “The world is a save place, and these beliefs will eventually survive.” This sentence is not well embedded in the paragraph. I would recommend to first introduce the meaning and impact of a secure attachment. You should also think about paraphrasing the sentence as it is has no scientific soundness. Overall, the paragraph is a bit confusing as there are first sentences on peer-attachment, but the definition is not really appropriate, second, research findings of Bowlby and primarily on parent-child-attachment and third, again claims of the importance of peer-attachment. Please restructure the paragraph and provide a proper definition of peer-attachment.
8. Please clarify that self-efficacy refers to self-related and self-assessed beliefs of a person regarding his or hers abilities to perform. You should also mention, that self-efficacy is context and domain-specific and not only task-specific.
9. In the chapter on self-efficacy you should include one or two sentences regarding the meaning of attribution styles, that are 1) strongly connected with self-efficacy and 2) decisive for the effect of success and failure. The sentence “Individual performance is a good predictor [...]” is not clear to me. Please link this sentence more to the concept of self-efficacy and classify that although performance and self-efficacy are strongly related, this relationship is mediated by other variables (e.g., subjective meaningfulness, attribution style) and accordingly the effect of performance on behavior is not the same for all students.
10. “School homework and school challenges are critical areas where H.A.S.S.S. needs” – this sentence is incomplete.
11. “Some parents in Nigeria do provide all the above parental activities [...]”. Providing materials, clothes, food and taking their children to school is necessary but not the only important thing parents can do to support the performance of their children. It is way more important that parents help their children to meet their basic needs (social relatedness, autonomy and competency; SDT). You should elaborate more on those aspects and also provide international studies concerning the impact of parental involvement (emotional involvement and support, high but realistic expectations, respectful communication etc.).
12. What do you mean with “needs anxiety”?
13. I miss more references that provide information why HASSS have more problems with school adjustment than regular students. Please provide them throughout the chapter and especially in the first paragraph of the section on ‘statement of the problem’.

Methodology:

1. You mention that the study comprises all high-ability senior students in Oyo State, but shortly after this claim you report that only 30 secondary schools were selected. How is it possible to gather data from all HASSS when only taking about 10 % of the schools in Oyo Sate into account?
2. I miss information on the age, gender and socio-economic background of the students right in the first paragraph of the

methodological section. You should also elaborate more on the way you conducted the study (e.g., During which period were the students questioned? How were the questionnaires distributed? Did you obtain informed consent of the students? How did you assure voluntariness and anonymity? How high was the percentage of drop outs?)

Instruments:

1. Please report a more common reliability coefficient than 'r'. You already use Cronbach's α for the scale on peer-attachment, emotional intelligence, general self-efficacy and parental involvement and should also use it for all the other scales.
2. Please explain why you used the scale for general self-efficacy rather than for academic self-efficacy. However, both constructs are correlated in my opinion academic self-efficacy as the reflection of self-beliefs in the academic context would be quite more relevant for your study.
3. Please also provide a sample-item for every instrument.

Results:

1. The amount of explained variance in the first regression-model seems quite too high since it must be theoretically assumed that other aspects like student-teacher-relationships, study conditions and characteristics of the schools should also predict school adjustment. Please explain your approach in more detail so that it becomes clear to me how you calculated the shared variance and computed the first regression-model. Please, add also information on the statistical software.
2. Please provide information on the explained variance of regression-model two. Since the independent variables are the same and there are no additional predictors in the second model, the explained variance should be the same as in model one.
3. The negative relation between 'parental involvement' and 'school adjustment'. Based on your theoretical framework high parental involvement should promote school adjustment. How do you explain this? Could this be due to the instrument?

Discussion:

1. The effect of peer-attachment is really low. Maybe it is only significant due to the sample size. Thus, you should interpret it more carefully.
2. Second paragraph: Am I right that the first regression-model refers to the joint contribution of all variables and not only to emotional intelligence?
3. Third paragraph: "without self-efficacy". I question if a person can really lack completely in self-efficacy and would recommend you replace this phrase with 'low self-efficacy'.

Fourth paragraph:

1. What do you mean with "[...] there was a contribution of self-efficacy and school adjustment [...]."
2. "However, H.A.S.S.S. with low self-efficacy experience depression and inability to cope in school". This interpretation

is way too far from your findings. You did not analyze relations between self-efficacy and psychical problems and thus this argument is out of place. It is also formulated way to general as it implies that all students with low self-efficacy suffer from depression and are unable to cope with the requirements in school. I would recommend you delete the sentence as it is also not necessarily needed for the further argumentation.

3. Fifth paragraph: The sentence regarding the reluctance or policies of schools against early entrance is not clear to me. Why is it relevant for the relation between parental involvement and school adjustment that parents must work vigorously to gain early entrance or other accommodation for their children? Is early entrance really beneficial for HASSS school adjustment?
4. The last paragraph is redundant as all aspects are already mentioned in the former paragraphs.
5. Please add a section on limitations of the study including aspects like deviations between sample and overall population of HASSS, lack of control variables; usage of student-ratings etc.

Minor:

1. "On the other hand" – abstract; there is no "on the one hand"
2. Semicolon after "that focus on parental education, occupational or family background (family income, family language, family activities, and work methods); [...]"
3. Please unify the wording "HASSS" or "H.A.S.S.S." or "H.A.S."
4. "because they have set very high personal standards." 'they' seems not appropriate here.
5. "However, to the best knowledge of this researcher". 'this' is not appropriate here.
6. After "worrisome to both [...]" there is a enumeration of more than two groups.
7. Description of Table 1: P in capital letters and degrees of freedom subscript – please change.
8. Description of Table 2: It is not necessary to mention the t-value in brackets after β .

References

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (Eds.). (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research* (Vol. 2004).

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). Overview of Self-Determination Theory: An Organismic Dialectical Perspective. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 3–33).