ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

s

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59730

Title:. CULTIVATING SELF-EFFICACY IN UNIVERSITYSCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY STUDENT CLUBS.

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 Name: Dr. Mithilesh kumar shukla

Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

This paper is A survey of 98 members of university science and technology clubs found innovative behavior uneven: idea generation (4.52) exceeded implementation (4.34) and dissemination (4.31), overall 4.39; self-efficacy (3.29/4) positively predicted it. The gap suggests members can propose ideas but struggle to realize and showcase them. The paper proposes four pathways: organize work around completed artifacts rather than events; direct support to people, not only equipment; tier tasks by stage (imitate, improve, define); and make senior members visible as imitable models. It outlines enabling conditions—time, space, staffing, safety, and handover—and warns against artifacts becoming task lists, feedback becoming praise, tiering becoming screening, and models becoming publicity. Evidence is cross-sectional and single-institution, so the proposals are testable propositions.

Recommendation: Accept after minor revision.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

STRENGTHS:

1- It identifies a concrete gap—idea generation (4.52) exceeds implementation (4.34) and dissemination (4.31)—rather than offering generic claims about student innovation.
2- It uses Bandura's four sources of self-efficacy—mastery, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and arousal.
3- It distinguishes starting a task from persisting after setbacks, highlighting the importance of feedback and failure resolution.
4- It recognizes that clubs offer fast feedback and cheap failure, making them dense sites of mastery experience—and also frustration.
5- It argues that equipment alone is insufficient and that interpersonal, instructional, and moral support matter more for self-efficacy.
6- It shifts evaluation from event counts to artifact completeness, public demonstration, and continuity across cohorts.

WEAKNESSES:

1- In the paper is Cross-sectional, self-reported, and depends on single-institution evidence.
2- Incomparable scales and unclear statistical testing.
3- Weak sampling and generalizability**,** Only 98 members from one institution are surveyed, with little detail on response rate,