



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_46300
Title of the Manuscript:	Teacher self-efficacy and its antecedents among Post Graduate Diploma in Teaching trainees of Dilla University: Implications for Ethiopian Secondary School Teacher Education
Type of the Article	Original Research Papers

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This paper presented a survey that investigates the level of self-efficacy belief of Post Graduate Diploma in Teaching (PGDT) trainees. The paper also targets to identify the factors that affect their belief with the intention of recommending possible improvement strategies to enhance effectiveness of the pre-service teacher education in program.</p> <p>The paper contributes to the literature by presenting the empirical data. Therefore, I think the topic of the paper fits to the scope of this journal.</p> <p>The paper is organized clearly and is easy to follow. The paper also presents the literature related to the topic. However, the presentation of the research design and the analysis can be improved. To better present the arguments, I would suggest the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the subtitle <i>1.1 Background of the study</i>, as there is no other subchapter in section 1. • Why the authors chose to use a 5-point Likert scale? Please add a reference supporting this decision. • Line 389: For which reason is each statistical measure going to be used?? • Line 494: When presenting ANOVA's results, you have to add η^2 instead of R^2 and $R^2_{Adjusted}$ • Do not write significance level .000. This is what SPSS presents when the p value is less than 0.01. • Attach the questionnaire used for data collection in the Appendix. 	<p>Thank you very much for your comments. We have effected some of the changes you indicated. Thank you for bringing the issues to our concern.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for bringing this issue to our attention. We have removed the subtitle. • Thank you for this comment. We have justified the why of 5 point likert scale in the revised version in appropriate detail. • Thank you for bringing this issue to our attention. We have added the purpose of each statistical measure in the revised manuscript. • Thank you for your comment. We have made some adjustments to the way we reported the ANOVA results of the Multiple linear Regression analysis as per your request. • Thank you for this comment as well. Yet, we have reported the significance value of 0.000 as $p < .01$ in descriptive statements following each table. Do you mean the results within the tables (i.e. tables of one-sample t-test, ANOVA, Correlation and Regression Analysis)? If this is the case, we (authors) grant the editors to change the values in a way that suits the journal standard.(Because we are not sure of what this comment exactly means, we opted to grant the right to editors) <p>Thank you very much. As requested we have attached the questionnaire in the appendix.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We really appreciate your concern. As far as this study is concerned we have followed the ethical consideration guidelines suggested by scholars for conducting social science research (Particularly a survey). In this regard, in all the processes of data collection, participants were informed about the objectives of the study. And, it was only after their consent was obtained that they were given the questionnaire to fill. Moreover, all other ethical principles were properly followed to make the respondents' personal information confidential.