

**Paper: “A Study of the Relationship between Locus of Control and Self-monitoring to Resilience in Students”**

**Submitted: 14 September 2022**

**Accepted: 30 March 2023**

**Published: 31 March 2023**

Corresponding Author: Ina Shanava

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n7p137](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n7p137)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ketevan Lomsadze  
Gori State University, Georgia

Reviewer 2: Olena Kovalchuk  
Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education, Ukraine

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Olena Kovalchuk	
University/Country: Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education, Ukraine	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 05.12.2022
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0998/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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>4</b>
<i>The title is clear and adequate</i>	

<b>A STUDY OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCUS OF CONTROL AND SELF-MONITORING TO RESILIENCE IN STUDENTS</b>	
<p>However, It is desirable to change the beginning of the title, omit the word “study”. The word relationship can be replaced by correlation.</p>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>The abstract should be better structured.</i></p> <p><i>Participant – it is mentioned that the sample consists of students. However, in the paper we come to know that there several groups of students and post-graduate students in the research.</i></p> <p><i>Better make participant description more detailed.</i></p>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p><b>It is recommended to consult a native-speaker, to improve English throughout the paper.</b></p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	
<p><i>It is not clear if the study methods mentioned in the article were adapted to Georgian sample by whom and how?</i></p> <p><b>1. E.g. Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (I-E Scale) by J. Rotter</b></p> <p><b>Brief Resilience Scale; Smith, Dalen, Wiggins, Tooley, Christopher &amp; Bernard, 2008, incomplete description. In the end of the passage Kamushadze, 2021 is mentioned. Does it mean that this method was adapted by this scientist? Or it was published in his paper?</b></p>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><i>There is a huge bulk of results, described in the text that hinder the perception of the article. Several groups of respondents are mentioned. It would be better to represent data in the tables or diagrams and put the explanation below tables, to structure the information throughout this paragraph.</i></p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	

<b>The conclusions should be better structured and be more laconic.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>The references should be revised.</i></p> <p><i>The authors put Master's thesis. However, they do not refer to the works by J. Rotter, the author of Locus of Control concept or A. Bandura – self-efficacy theory.</i></p>	

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

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

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

In my opinion, the paper needs a revision. I recommend the authors consult a professional editor, to specify a research question, make more detailed participants and methods description, structure the results and represent them in tables or diagrams, add more references from international journals with impact factor.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**I think that this research makes sense and it would be interesting to a scientific community, because the topic of Locus of Control and especially resilience are burning to date. However, the paper needs a revision. In this variant, judging the structure and the way it is represented it looks like a Master's thesis. It is difficult to perceive the results description. The conclusions are too long.**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022***

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: Ketevan Lomsadze	Email: ketilomsadze@gu.edu.ge.
University/Country: Gori State University / Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: Oct 1, 5:06 PM	Date Review Report Submitted: oct 7, 2022
Manuscript Title: A STUDY OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCUS OF CONTROL AND SELF-MONITORING TO RESILIENCE IN STUDENTS	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

## **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>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</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>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**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):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**