

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58453

Title: AN APPRAISAL OF EVALUATION TECHNIQUES IN PHYSICAL AND HEALTH EDUCATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING OUTCOMES IN NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality		√		
Clarity		√		
Significance		√		

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 212

Detailed Reviewer's Report

This research paper presents a comprehensive investigation into evaluation techniques used in Physical and Health Education (PHE) programmes in Nigerian universities and their implications for teaching effectiveness and learning outcomes. The study employs a descriptive survey research design with a substantial sample size and appropriate statistical analyses. While the paper demonstrates several strengths, particularly in its methodological rigor and clear presentation of findings, there are areas requiring attention before publication.

Detailed Evaluation According to Reviewer Criteria

1. Originality: Fair to Good

Strengths:

- Addresses an underexplored area in the Nigerian higher education context
- Contributes empirical evidence to the discourse on assessment practices in physical education
- Provides current data on the gap between traditional and digital assessment methods in a developing country context

Weaknesses:

- The research questions and hypotheses are relatively straightforward and do not break significant new theoretical ground
- Limited engagement with recent (2024-2026) literature beyond the few citations included
- The conceptual framework (Constructivist Learning Theory) is well-established but not extensively developed or critically examined in relation to the findings

Recommendation for Improvement:

- Strengthen the theoretical contribution by developing a more nuanced application of constructivist theory to assessment practices
- Consider addressing how the Nigerian context specifically shapes assessment challenges differently from other regions
- Include more recent comparative studies from similar developing country contexts

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

2. Technical Quality: Good

Strengths:

- **Research Design:** Appropriate descriptive survey design with clear justification
- **Sampling:** Multi-stage sampling procedure with adequate sample size (n=400, 95.5% response rate)
- **Instrument Development:** Researcher-developed questionnaire with proper validation by three experts
- **Reliability:** Strong Cronbach's Alpha coefficient (0.82)
- **Statistical Analysis:** Appropriate use of mean, standard deviation, Pearson correlation, and regression analysis
- **Hypothesis Testing:** Clear decision rules at 0.05 significance level
- **Data Presentation:** Well-organized tables with clear interpretations

Weaknesses:

- No factor analysis reported to confirm the construct validity of the questionnaire
- The questionnaire development process could be more thoroughly described
- No mention of checking for multicollinearity in the regression analysis
- The research questions and hypotheses are somewhat redundant (research questions 2 and 3 essentially test what hypotheses 1 and 2 examine)

Recommendations for Improvement:

- Conduct and report exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis to validate the instrument structure
- Include diagnostic tests for regression assumptions (normality, homoscedasticity, multicollinearity)
- Clarify the distinction between research questions and hypotheses more clearly
- Consider reporting effect sizes alongside significance values
- Include confidence intervals for correlation coefficients

3. Clarity: Good to Excellent

Strengths:

- **Structure:** Well-organized following standard academic format (Abstract, Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, Recommendations)
- **Writing Style:** Clear, academic tone with appropriate use of terminology
- **Data Presentation:** Tables are clear, well-labeled, and properly interpreted
- **Logical Flow:** Ideas progress logically from problem identification to conclusions
- **Language:** Generally good English with minor typographical errors

Weaknesses:

- Some paragraphs are overly long and could benefit from subdivision
- The abstract could be more concise (currently 31 lines)
- Minor typographical errors throughout (e.g., inconsistent spacing, numbering issues on pages 19-20)
- References section appears truncated/incomplete (stops at "Van der Mars")

Recommendations for Improvement:

- Reduce abstract length to journal specifications (typically 200-250 words)
- Break longer paragraphs into shorter, more digestible units
- Proofread carefully for typographical errors
- Complete the reference list and ensure consistency in citation style (APA 7th edition recommended)
- Consider adding a list of abbreviations/acronyms

4. Significance: Good

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Strengths:

- **Practical Implications:** Clear recommendations for policy and practice in Nigerian universities
- **Educational Impact:** Addresses real challenges in assessment practices that affect teaching quality and student outcomes
- **Contextual Relevance:** Specifically addresses Nigerian higher education context with actionable recommendations
- **Timely Focus:** Addresses the gap between traditional and digital assessment methods, relevant to post-pandemic educational reforms
- **Multiple Stakeholders:** Implications for lecturers, students, university administrators, and policymakers

Weaknesses:

- Limited discussion of how findings might generalize to other contexts (West Africa, other developing regions)
- The implications for curriculum development could be more extensively explored
- No specific implementation strategies or timelines for the recommendations
- Limited discussion of cost implications or feasibility of digital assessment integration

Recommendations for Improvement:

- Expand the discussion section to address broader applicability and contextual limitations
- Develop more specific, actionable implementation strategies for recommendations
- Include a limitations subsection acknowledging study constraints
- Consider discussing the cost-benefit analysis of transitioning to digital assessment
- Address potential resistance to change among faculty and strategies to overcome it

Major Strengths of the Paper

1. **Comprehensive Methodology:** The study employs rigorous sampling procedures, validated instruments, and appropriate statistical analyses.
2. **Strong Empirical Contribution:** Provides current data on assessment practices in Nigerian universities with a large sample size.
3. **Clear Practical Recommendations:** Offers actionable suggestions for improving assessment practices.
4. **Balanced Discussion:** Integrates findings with existing literature and theoretical frameworks.
5. **Relevant to Current Educational Discourse:** Addresses the digital divide in assessment practices.

Major Weaknesses and Areas for Improvement

Structural and Content Issues:

1. **Incomplete References:**
 - The reference list appears truncated (ends mid-citation)
 - Several in-text citations (e.g., Slingerland et al., 2024; Van der Mars et al., 2018) may not be in the reference list
 - Inconsistent citation formatting
2. **Missing Information:**
 - No listing of the specific Nigerian universities studied
 - No demographic profile of respondents presented
 - No analysis of differences between lecturer and student responses
3. **Conceptual Gaps:**
 - Limited critical engagement with the limitations of the Constructivist Learning Theory framework

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- No discussion of alternative theoretical perspectives
- The distinction between formative and summative assessment could be more deeply explored

4. Methodological Gaps:

- No factor analysis reported
- No discussion of common method bias (all data from self-report questionnaires)
- Limited discussion of the generalizability of findings beyond the sampled universities

Writing and Presentation Issues:

5. Typographical and Formatting Errors:

- Page 19: "398" appears twice in the numbering
- Inconsistent use of bold and italics
- Some table formatting issues
- Variable spacing throughout

6. Abstract:

- Too lengthy for most journal requirements
- Could be more focused on key findings and implications

7. Discussion Section:

- Could be more critical and analytical rather than descriptive
- Limited discussion of unexpected findings or contradictions

Specific Recommendations for Revision

Essential Corrections:

1. Complete the Reference List:

- Ensure all in-text citations appear in the reference list
- Use consistent APA 7th edition formatting
- Add missing references (Slingerland et al., 2024; Van der Mars et al., 2018; others as needed)

2. Add Methodology Details:

- Include specific university names (or categories/types)
- Add a table showing respondent demographics
- Report factor analysis results
- Address common method bias

3. Correct Typographical Errors:

- Page 19: Remove duplicate "398"
- Standardize numbering throughout
- Ensure consistent formatting

4. Strengthen the Discussion:

- Add a "Limitations of the Study" subsection
- Discuss implications for theory development
- Address how findings might vary across different types of universities

Recommended Additions:

5. Add a Conceptual Framework Diagram:

- Visual representation of the relationships between variables

6. Enhance the Recommendations:

- Include specific implementation timelines
- Address feasibility and cost implications
- Suggest monitoring and evaluation strategies

7. Add Comparative Analysis:

- Compare findings with similar studies from other countries

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Discuss differences between public and private universities

8. Consider a Practical Assessment Model:

- Develop a framework for balanced assessment in PHE

Suggestions for Strengthening:

9. Theoretical Depth:

- Engage more critically with constructivist theory
- Consider adding a second theoretical lens (e.g., self-determination theory, assessment for learning framework)

10. Practical Tools:

- Include sample assessment instruments or rubrics
- Provide examples of technology integration strategies

Overall Assessment and Recommendation

Recommendation: Accept After Major Revision

Rationale:

This paper makes a valuable contribution to understanding assessment practices in Physical and Health Education in Nigerian universities. The methodology is sound, the data analysis appropriate, and the findings have significant implications for educational practice and policy. However, the paper requires substantial revision to address:

1. **Completeness:** Complete the reference list and methodology details
2. **Critical Analysis:** Strengthen the discussion and theoretical engagement
3. **Clarity:** Correct typographical errors and improve organization
4. **Depth:** Address limitations and provide more nuanced recommendations

With these revisions, the paper would make a strong contribution to the literature on

Reviewer's Final Comments

The study addresses an important gap in the literature and provides empirical evidence that can inform policy and practice in Nigerian universities. The methodological approach is generally sound, and the findings are clearly presented. However, the paper would benefit from strengthening the theoretical framework, providing more critical analysis in the discussion, completing the references, and addressing methodological limitations. The practical recommendations are valuable but could be more specific and actionable. With careful revision addressing the issues identified, this paper would be suitable for publication and would make a meaningful contribution to the field.