

Manuscript: “**Albania: Motivation Factors Among 15-Year-Old Students, Especially Disadvantaged Ones**”

**Submitted: 21 April 2021**

**Accepted: 12 May 2021**

**Published: 31 May 2021**

Corresponding Author: Gentiana Sula

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n15p57

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Merita Poni, University of Tirana / Albania

**Reviewer 2:** Ojewola, Florence Olubunmi, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria

**Reviewer 3:** Fiona Todhri, Tirana University/ Albania

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Merita Poni	
University/Country: University of Tirana / Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 26.04.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 27.04.2021
Manuscript Title: Albania – Some aspects of learning motivation vis-à-vis the PEER factor	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ?	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The title is clearly formulated but need to be more related with the content of the article which is more about differences of students access to schools by geographical division and employment rate.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The abstract lacks the objective of the study, methodology employed for data collection and results.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>There are some grammatical errors, addressed by me in comments.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The study method should be made clear by explaining the use of secondary data for the article instead of use of empirical research that would yield primary data.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The results do not relate with the title of the article which is about peer impact on learning</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>There are some efforts to draw conclusions based on the sources used at literature review.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>There are few references for the article, especially academic sources authored by the scholars in the field of peer impact on motivation for learning.</b>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The article should follow a clear path: introduction/literature review, methodology, findings and conclusions. The title should be consistent with the content of the article. There should be more explanation on how peers exert pressure for learning and how are they a source of external motivation for learning. The data should reflect the answer to the above questions. The methodology should be based on data related to the topic of the article: motivation for learning as result of peer pressure. The findings should reflect the answers to the central question of the study: how are peers a source

of inspiration for learning? Where in the data this answer pops out? The conclusions should be a recap of what did the study intended to do, what it did, and what did it find out about peer pressure for learning. The conclusions should state the study limitations and the utility of the study, how will it be useful for policy and practice of education.



## ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Ojewola, Florence Olubunmi	
University/Country: Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 26 <sup>th</sup> April 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 2 <sup>nd</sup> May, 2021
Manuscript Title: Albania – Some aspects of learning motivation vis-à-vis the PEER factor.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0520\21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The title is appropriate with the written content.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Satisfactory</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Properly presented</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Clearly written</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	

Reject	
--------	--

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): I observed that the write up is too long, I guess the researcher should try to reduce the pages. But in all, the write is properly and carefully written.**

## ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Fiona Todhri	
University/Country: Tirana University/ Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 26.04.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 03.05.2021
Manuscript Title: Albania – Some aspects of learning motivation vis-à-vis the PEER factor.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0520/21</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

### **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The title is completely adapted to the context.</p>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The article has a methodology that adapts to the type of study. The combination of quantitative methods with qualitative methods corresponds to the purpose and objectives of the study.</p>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The data presented in graphs and tables, present a very interesting situation of motivating factors to increase scholastic performance among young Albanians. Exactly this is the result of the combination of quantitative and qualitative data.</p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The results of the study yielded valuable conclusions. The conclusions express during the obstacles that young Albanians, especially marginalized groups, achieve high results in school.</p>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The article has a large number of references, which are in full compliance with the content and objectives of the study.</p>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

