



Paper: “Perceived Counseling Support as a Predictor of Young Adults’ Participation in Adult Literacy Programs in Amuwo-Odofin, Lagos State: A Descriptive Survey Study”

Submitted: 14 January 2026

Accepted: 03 March 2026

Published: 31 March 2026

Corresponding Author: Ajayi Rachael Adejoke

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n7p178

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Don Martin
Youngstown State University, USA

Reviewer 2: Tilahun Achaw Messaria
Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

Reviewer 3: Er-razine Soufiane
Regional Centre for Education and Training Professions, Morocco

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: 1/22/26	Date Review Report Submitted: 1/25/26
Manuscript Title: Assessment of Counselling Interventions for Enhancing Effective Participation of Young Adults in Adult Literacy Programmes	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0166/26	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The title is clear, descriptive, and accurately reflects the core variables (counselling interventions and participation) and population (young adults in adult literacy programmes). It appropriately signals the study's applied, evaluative nature. However, it is somewhat lengthy and generic. The title could be strengthened by specifying the study design (e.g., “A Descriptive Survey Study”) or the context (Nigeria or Lagos State) to enhance precision and scholarly specificity.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
<i>The abstract is well structured and comprehensive. It clearly states the research problem, objectives, methodology, sample size, analytical techniques, and key findings, including effect sizes and statistical significance. The inclusion of Cronbach’s alpha values and regression statistics strengthens transparency. The abstract meets international standards and is suitable for indexing and academic dissemination.</i>	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<p><i>While the manuscript is generally readable and professionally written, there are noticeable grammatical and stylistic issues, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Redundant phrasing and repetition across sections (especially Introduction and Literature Review)</i> • <i>Occasional subject–verb agreement issues</i> • <i>Minor typographical errors and inconsistent spacing</i> • <i>Inconsistent formatting of hypotheses (H_{01} vs H_{02})</i> • <i>Overuse of evaluative language in results (for example, “large effect,” “greatly enhances”) rather than neutral reporting</i> <p><i>These issues do not invalidate the study but require editorial revision to meet journal publication standards.</i></p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p><i>The methodology section is detailed and logically organized. The research design, population, sampling procedure, instrument development, validity, reliability, data collection, and analysis are clearly described. The proportional sampling table adds methodological rigor. However, there are some limitations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The operationalization of “participation” relies entirely on self-report measures without behavioral validation.</i> • <i>The rationale for selecting specific statistical tests (for example, when ANOVA or t-tests were used) is stated broadly but not always linked to specific research questions.</i> • <i>Ethical approval details (IRB or institutional review) are implied but not explicitly stated.</i> <p><i>Overall, the methods are sound but could benefit from tighter methodological justification.</i></p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<p><i>Results are clearly presented, logically sequenced, and supported by tables. The statistical values are internally consistent, and the interpretations align with the data presented. The use of correlations and regression is appropriate for research questions. That said:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Some interpretations verge on causal language, which is not fully supported by the descriptive survey design.</i> • <i>Effect sizes are described narratively but not consistently contextualized within existing literature benchmarks.</i> • <i>Minor redundancy exists between tables and narrative explanations.</i> <p><i>Despite these issues, the results section is largely accurate and interpretable.</i></p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<p><i>The conclusions accurately reflect the findings and remain consistent with the data presented. The link between counseling interventions and participation is supported by statistical evidence. However:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The conclusions occasionally overgeneralize beyond the local context.</i> • <i>Claims about “necessity” and “fundamental elements” would benefit from more cautious phrasing, given the non-experimental design.</i> • <i>Limitations are not explicitly acknowledged, which weakens interpretive balance.</i> 	

<i>Still, conclusions are largely evidence-based and coherent.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The reference list is extensive, relevant, and appropriately grounded in the literature on adult education, counseling, and participation. Both classical and recent sources are included, and most citations align with claims made.</i>	
<i>Areas for improvement:</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Some references lack complete bibliographic detail (journal volume, issue, or DOI).</i> • <i>Heavy reliance on regional and applied sources limits theoretical depth.</i> • <i>A clearer integration of theory-driven counselling frameworks would strengthen scholarly positioning.</i> 	
<i>Overall, references are adequate and relevant, though they could be refined.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author:

This study addresses an important and underexplored issue in adult literacy education and demonstrates strong empirical effort, clear objectives, and appropriate statistical analysis. The manuscript shows promise and contributes meaningfully to applied counselling and adult education literature.

However, before acceptance, major revisions are required, specifically to:

1. Reduce redundancy and tighten academic language throughout the manuscript.
2. Address grammatical, formatting, and stylistic inconsistencies.
3. Moderate causal and evaluative language to align with the descriptive survey design.
4. Explicitly acknowledge study limitations and contextual boundaries.
5. Strengthen theoretical integration and methodological justification.
6. Ensure full compliance with journal formatting and referencing standards.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Tilahun Achaw Messaria (PhD)	
University/Country: Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia	
Date Manuscript Received: 30 Jan 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 06 Feb 2026
Manuscript Title: Assessment of Counselling Interventions for Enhancing Effective Participation of Young Adults in Adult Literacy Programmes	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Not given	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Agree	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Okay	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>I think the title needs to be rephrased ('the impact or effectiveness of counselling interventions on young adults' involvement in adult literacy programmes at/in...') to concisely agree with the purpose and contents of the study. It should also indicate the study site.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
<i>More or less the abstract highlighted the major objective, method and results. But, it should be clearly and briefly presented in a single paragraph.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

<i>Though there are no serious grammatical and spelling errors and the manuscript is somehow communicate the issues, I recommend the author(s) to proofread before final submission as there are writing style and formatting errors. Sections and sub-sections are not also properly organized and sectioned (e.g., method section).</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
As compared with other components, the method section looks shallow and inadequate for average readers. However, the message is more or less clearly addressed.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are clear, but they lack focus. The findings should be clearly and adequately compared and contrasted with previous works under the discussion section. I also recommend the authors to follow the APA style or any other proper formats in the organization and analyses of tables and texts. For the sake of parsimony and economy, avoid redundancy too.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusion looks precise, but there is a failure to relate the limitations while making conclusions. The conclusions should be clearly written in probable than in definite terms to leave room for verification.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Most references are not completely and clearly presented (e.g., volume, numbers, publishers, etc are missing).	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

There are writing style and formatting errors. I recommend you to follow APA style. For the sake of parsimony and economy, avoid redundancy (E.g., no need of statement of the problem and literature review sections as they can be treated and discussed under the introduction section). The information provided under each section is more or less similar. If statement section is needed, it's expected to address the research gaps. I also do not understand having purpose of the study, research questions and research hypotheses sections or sub-sections for descriptive survey research design. They have d/t purposes.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: