

Paper: “Using Classical Test and Item Response Theories to Evaluate Psychometric Quality of Teacher-Made Test in Ghana”

Submitted: 19 October 2021

Accepted: 26 January 2022

Published: 31 January 2022

Corresponding Author: Paul Kwame Butakor

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n1p139](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n1p139)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Felix Senyamator
University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Reviewer 2: Ruth Keziah
University of Cape Coast, Ghana

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!

Date Manuscript Received: Date:01-11-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 10-11-2021
Manuscript Title: USING CLASSICAL TEST AND ITEM RESPONSE THEORIES TO EVALUATE PSYCHOMETRIC QUALITY OF TEACHER-MADE TEST IN GHANA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ESJ 10.11.2021	
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	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Indicate the design, the sample, and the statistical tools used in the analysis of data. This should precede the summary of findings presented in the abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are few grammatical errors. Please, follow the track changes and correct them	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Please, indicate the design, sample and sampling procedure employed in the study.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study has no summary, conclusion(s) and recommendations base on its findings. Please, based on the findings of the study, draw your conclusions and recommendations.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
The references are already arranged in an alphabetical order. <i>What you would have to do is to reorganise them by indenting each of them in line with the APA format.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This study brought to light very interesting revelations regarding Senior High Students' assessment using the multiple-choice items in the selected schools. However, the study was not guided by any research question(s) or hypotheses. Data collected and analyzed were supposed to be used to answer the research question(s) or test hypotheses. Please, provide either research questions or hypotheses that guided this study. Consider deleting some general issues covered in the introduction that do not have a direct bearing on the discussion of the results or theories covered in the study.

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: Dr. Ruth Annan-Brew	
University/Country: University of Cape Coast /Ghana	
Date Manuscript Received:24/11/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 2/12/2021
Manuscript Title: USING CLASSICAL TEST AND ITEM RESPONSE THEORIES TO EVALUATE PSYCHOMETRIC QUALITY OF TEACHER-MADE TEST IN GHANA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1110/21	
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]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>Title was clear and adequate</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
a. A statement of your main <u>topic</u> , purpose and <u>objectives</u> b. A brief description of the <u>methodology</u> c. An overview of the most significant <u>findings</u> or arguments A summary of your <u>conclusions</u> and recommendations Abstract should be rewritten to follow the suggested format and check for structural and grammatical errors.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Check the criteria for the difficulty index	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Contains a few grammatical errors</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
Take a thorough look at the reference sand follow the required format	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: