



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “**Adultocentrismo interiorizado: identidad, derechos y agencia infantil en México**”

Submitted: 29 April 2026

Accepted: 30 May 2026

Published: 30 June 2026

Corresponding Author: Beatriz Adriana Rodríguez-Varela

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n17p37

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oruam Cadex Marichal Guevara
University Maximo Gomes Baez, Cuba

Reviewer 2: David Perez Jorge
University of La Laguna, Spain

Reviewer 3: Diego Baez Zarabanda
Autonomous University of Bucaramanga, Colombia

Reviewer 4: Nicolas Ariel Santana
Instituto de Enseñanza Superior N° 1 – Alicia Moreau de Justo, Argentina

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: Oruam Cadex Marichal Guevara	
University, Country: Universidad de Ciego de Ávila Máximo Gómez Báez, Cuba	
Date Manuscript Received: 5-5-2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 6-5-2026
Manuscript Title: Adultocentrismo e identidad infantil: percepciones de niñas y niños de educación primaria sobre sí mismos, sus derechos y su agencia	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---08,---29.05.2026---	
You agree that 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:	
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 for the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is precise, conceptually aligned with the study, and accurately reflects its analytical focus. It integrates key constructs—adult-centrism, childhood identity, rights, and agency—providing immediate clarity about the scope and theoretical orientation. The bilingual presentation enhances accessibility for an international readership.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
<i>The abstract is well-structured and analytically dense. It clearly articulates the research problem, methodological approach (interpretive case study with thematic analysis), and principal findings. The articulation of “subjective appropriation of adult-centrism” as a central contribution is particularly strong. Minor improvement could include a more explicit statement of implications.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The manuscript demonstrates a high level of linguistic quality in both Spanish and English versions. The English abstract is generally well written, though minor stylistic refinements could improve fluency (e.g., slight adjustments in phrasing and article usage). No significant grammatical issues affecting comprehension were identified.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The methodological section is robust, coherent, and epistemologically grounded. The justification for the interpretive case study design is well articulated, aligning with constructivist and critical paradigms. Data collection procedures, instruments, and analytical strategies (Braun & Clarke thematic analysis, triangulation) are described in detail, ensuring transparency and replicability at the level appropriate for qualitative inquiry.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Findings are presented with clarity, analytical depth, and strong evidentiary support through verbatim excerpts. The categorization is coherent, and the interpretive layering is rigorous. The integration of participants’ voices strengthens credibility and aligns with the study’s epistemological stance. No inconsistencies or analytical errors were detected.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are logically derived from the findings and maintain strong internal coherence with the theoretical framework. The identification of “subjective internalization of adult-centrism” as a key contribution is well substantiated. Implications for pedagogy, curriculum design, and teacher education are relevant and clearly grounded in the data.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The reference list is extensive, current, and theoretically aligned. It integrates foundational authors (e.g., Corsaro, Freire, Qvortrup) with recent Latin American scholarship,</i>	

demonstrating strong engagement with regional and international literature. Citation practices are consistent with academic standards.

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):

This manuscript represents a significant and original contribution to the field of childhood studies and critical pedagogy. Its main strength lies in advancing the concept of adult-centrism from a structural condition to a subjectively internalized framework of self-valuation, supported by rich empirical evidence. To further strengthen the manuscript, I recommend:

1. Refinement of the English abstract: Improve stylistic fluency and precision to meet the expectations of an international journal audience.
2. Explicit articulation of practical implications: While implications are present in the conclusions, consider briefly systematizing them into categories (e.g., pedagogical practice, curriculum policy, teacher training) to enhance transferability.
3. Clarification of analytical boundaries: Although the case study design is well justified, a brief, explicit statement distinguishing *transferability* from *generalizability* in the discussion would reinforce methodological rigor for broader audiences.
4. Minor structural adjustment: The manuscript is dense and theoretically rich; consider adding brief subheadings or transitional sentences in the discussion section to improve readability without reducing depth.
5. Optional enhancement: A conceptual diagram illustrating the relationship between adult-centrism, identity construction, and inhibited agency could add value for readers.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This is a high-quality manuscript with strong theoretical grounding, methodological rigor, and original empirical contribution. It aligns well with ESJ's criteria of scientific validity and technical quality. The study is particularly relevant for international discussions on childhood, agency, and educational inequality in the Global South.

Recommendation: **Accept with minor revisions.**

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: Nicolás Ariel Santana	
University, Country: IES N° 1 – Alicia Moreau de Justo, Buenos Aires, Argentina.	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/05/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/05/2026
Manuscript Title: Adultocentrismo e identidad infantil: percepciones de niñas y niños de educación primaria sobre sí mismos, sus derechos y su agencia	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---08.---29.05.2026---	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: SI	
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: SI	

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 for the content of the article.	5
El título del artículo refleja a la perfección el contenido del mismo.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
Tanto el desarrollo de los objetivos como los métodos de análisis están claramente detallados. Las conclusiones me parecen correctas y están muy bien presentadas.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
La redacción me parece correcto, no encontré errores gramaticales.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Los métodos de estudio se encuentran claramente explicados.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Los resultados son claros y no contienen errores. Sin embargo, podrían desarrollarse de forma más extensa las entrevistas realizadas a los niños y niñas de Degollado.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Las conclusiones son muy correctas y se encuentran respaldadas por el desarrollo del trabajo.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Las referencias son correctas. En líneas generales está muy bien redactado.	

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):

El trabajo me parece muy interesante. El tema analizado resulta fundamental para incorporar en las escuelas nuevos conceptos que permitan ampliar el marco teórico para la realización de diseños curriculares y para que los docentes tengan en consideración el adultocentrismo como problemática al momento de realizar la planificación de sus clases y el trabajo didáctico. Se encuentran muy bien planteados los objetivos, el marco teórico, la bibliografía trabajada y las conclusiones.

Mi sugerencia sería darle mayor presencia en el trabajo a los diálogos con los niños y niñas entrevistados. Si bien las conclusiones a las que se llegan son, en mi criterio, correctas podría ser más extenso el recorte de la conversación con ellos. Me resultaría interesante leer más sobre la opinión de otros niños y niñas,

especialmente sobre la frase *"A veces me pregunto si soy importante ahora o solo cuando sea grande y pueda trabajar y ayudar a mi familia. Creo que más cuando sea grande."*

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: David Pérez Jorge	
University, Country: University of La Laguna, Spain	
Date Manuscript Received: 2026-05-06	Date Review Report Submitted: 2026-05-08
Manuscript Title: Adultocentrismo e identidad infantil: percepciones de niñas y niños de educación primaria sobre sí mismos, sus derechos y su agencia	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0529/26	
You agree that 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 for the content of the article.	4
<p>The title is clear, coherent, and accurately reflects the central themes of the manuscript: adult-centrism, childhood identity, children’s rights, and agency. It adequately represents both the conceptual orientation and empirical focus of the study. However, the title is somewhat long and could benefit from slight condensation to improve readability and impact.</p>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
<p>The abstract clearly presents the study objective, methodological approach, and principal findings. The inclusion of context and analytical contribution is valuable. The writing is fluid and conceptually strong. However, the abstract occasionally adopts a narrative, interpretive tone that exceeds the concise, structured style usually expected in scientific abstracts. Some statements could be more precise and less rhetorical.</p>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<p>The manuscript is generally well written and stylistically mature. The academic language is sophisticated and coherent with the qualitative and critical orientation of the study. Nevertheless, some sections are excessively dense and contain long sentences that affect readability. Minor editorial revisions are recommended to improve fluency and reduce repetition, especially in the Discussion section.</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p>The methodology is described in considerable detail and demonstrates coherence with the interpretive qualitative design. The use of thematic analysis, triangulation, field notes, and reflexive positioning are strengths of the study.</p> <p>However, several methodological concerns remain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the sample is very small and selected by convenience; • there is limited discussion regarding transferability criteria; • the role of researcher influence remains substantial despite reflexive acknowledgment; • the process of coding refinement and category saturation could be explained more rigorously; • and the documentary analysis procedure would benefit from greater methodological specification. <p>In addition, some interpretative claims appear stronger than what the empirical design can robustly support.</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<p>The findings are clearly organized and supported by rich qualitative excerpts. The categories are coherent and analytically connected to the theoretical framework. Particularly strong is the identification of the distinction between “discursive reproduction” and “subjective appropriation” of adult-centrism.</p>	

However, there is occasionally a tendency toward overinterpretation, where isolated participant statements are elevated to broader structural conclusions without sufficient analytical caution. Greater differentiation between participant discourse and researcher interpretation would strengthen the credibility of the findings.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions are generally consistent with the presented findings and theoretical orientation. The manuscript successfully connects empirical material with broader debates in childhood studies and decolonial pedagogy. Nonetheless, some conclusions occasionally exceed the evidentiary scope of a small qualitative case study. Terms suggesting generalized structural processes should be moderated or contextualized more carefully.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Additionally, the bibliographic framework would benefit from further expansion and updating. Although the manuscript demonstrates strong engagement with Latin American scholarship, the dialogue with recent international literature in Childhood Studies and child agency research remains relatively limited. Incorporating a broader range of contemporary authors and empirical studies would strengthen the theoretical positioning and international relevance of the manuscript. Furthermore, several citation and formatting inconsistencies should be carefully revised according to the journal guidelines.	

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 manuscript addresses a highly relevant and underexplored issue within the field of childhood studies and critical pedagogy. The study presents an original and conceptually ambitious attempt to examine adult-centrism not merely as an external social structure, but as a subjectively internalized framework through which children interpret themselves, their rights, and their social value.

The manuscript is theoretically rich and demonstrates a strong engagement with Latin American scholarship on childhood, agency, decoloniality, and pedagogy. The integration of children's voices with curricular analysis constitutes one of the most valuable aspects of the study, and the contextualization within a community marked by migration and insecurity provides important social depth.

At the same time, several aspects would benefit from further refinement before publication.

First, although the qualitative design is coherent with the research aims, some interpretative claims appear stronger than the empirical scope of the study fully supports. The distinction between

“discursive reproduction” and “subjective appropriation” is conceptually interesting, but at times the manuscript presents this interpretation with a level of certainty that may exceed what can be concluded from a small interpretive case study. Greater analytical caution would strengthen the credibility of the argument.

Second, while reflexivity is explicitly acknowledged, the manuscript could further elaborate on how researcher positionality may have influenced participants’ responses, especially considering the adult-child power asymmetry discussed throughout the paper.

Third, the Discussion section, although intellectually rich, is excessively long and somewhat repetitive in certain passages. Condensing some interpretative sections would improve readability and overall coherence.

Additionally, the documentary analysis component would benefit from slightly greater methodological specification regarding coding criteria and analytical procedures.

Finally, although the manuscript successfully avoids positivist language in most sections, some formulations still occasionally generalize findings beyond the limits of the case study design. Moderating these expressions would improve methodological consistency.

Overall, this is a thoughtful, theoretically grounded, and potentially valuable contribution to the field, particularly within Latin American debates on childhood and adult-centrism.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: