Dear Melinda A. Hollis Thomas

Thank you very much for your feedback. We are really very thankful to you. Please find the step by step incorporation of feedback.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sr** | **Suggested Corrections**  | **Incorporation**  |
| 1 | The inclusion of a specific purpose for the study (such as suggestions forinstitutions, suggestions for families or students), along withrecommendations, would strengthen the paper. | The following paragraph has been added. The purpose of study was to analyze the effect of commitment, engagement and locus of control on academic achievement. Results of the study may suggest administrators, policy makers, curriculum planners and other stakeholders to consider the effect of commitment, engagement and locus of control on academic achievement. Parents and teachers may guide the students to be committed to their institutions, engaged in studies and have internal locus of control to improve academic achievement. The researchers may get help from the present study to do future research in the area. |

|  |
| --- |
| **2. Methodology** |
| 2 | **Suggested Corrections** | **Incorporation**  |
| 3 | The description and rationale for the methodology selected was insufficient | The description and rationale for the methodology has been described in more detail |
| 4 | The methodology section on page 4 consists of two sentences, which did not provide any insight into what the researchers did and why they did it forthe overall study.  | The methodology section has been described in more detail, |
| 5 | There is a questionable reliability and validity of the instruments, as there were so many modifications of the three instruments used, from changing questions to adding questions. How did all the changes affect theresults? That section requires major expansion and better explanation.  | The reliability and validity has been rephrased for clarity.  |
| 6 | The demographic variables were mentioned in the objectives on page 5 of the article, but what those demographics variable actually were was not listed until the conclusion of the article. All the information stated was that they did not a have an effect on commitment, engagement, and locus of control. How and why were those demographics selected?  | The demographic variables have been described.Demographic differences in commitment, engagement, locus of control and achievement have been described in detail.  |
| 7 | Beginning on page 5, the researchers began consulting experts and this panelof experts was mentioned 10 times afterwards. Who are they and what wastheir purpose concerning this study? They seemed to “check out” the instruments, how did that affect the study and results? What did they “check out?” | All the detail regarding number, nature and purpose to involve experts has been rephrased. What and how they checked the instruments has been added. The experts were ten senior faculty members of the department of education, university of Sargodha. They checked the face and content validity of the scales. They ensured that the items belong to the same construct, which the items claim to measure and the language and context suitability for respondents. The experts were competent enough to check these characteristics, as they were busy in teaching such class and were well conversant in research. This activity improved the validity of the scales. |
| 8 | Was a pilot study conducted or was the study field tested?These words were used interchangeability. Field testing and pilot testing were discussed on page 6, before the actual section was presented on page 7. | The consistency has been ensured and pilot testing is now been described before its explanation. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Discussion of Data** |
|  | **Suggested Corrections** | **Incorporation**  |
| 9 | The data presentation falls short of clarity. Moreover, the organization of the results detracts from comprehension.  | The data presentation has been rewritten for clarity. The order of results has been made logical.  |
| 10 | The analyses in the paper are not described in detail, rendering them considerably off tangent and distracting.  | The analysis has been described in detail and logic and sequence has been corrected.  |
| 11 | The discussion is thin. | More discussion has been added. |
| 12 | The table could be designed in a better structure. Improve on the design or structure of the table to contain cells or columns to enhance data presentation for better understanding. The labeling structure of the tablesmore or less requires improvement | New tables have been added to provide the missing links.More detail in the form of tables has been added. More detail has been added in cells and columns especially in equations for clarity. |
| 13 | Expand your discussion to consider implications for further studies, considering any limitations of the present study to enhance objectivity. | Discussion has been expanded to consider implications for further studies, limitations of the study  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Sentence-Level Language** |
|  | **Suggested Corrections** | **Incorporation**  |
| 14 | The use of “we” and “researchers” in proximity, more or less a deviation from the conservative rule of consistency, seems to detract from the lucidity of the abstract: “We used analytical model ... We selected 369 students using multistage sampling technique…. We found 315 responses... The researchers used three instruments... The researchers foundsignificant impact...” | The consistency has been ensured |
| 15 | It would seem that there are some different language conventions that most likely can be repaired with a good edit.There are some traditions of language that should be addressed before publication.The missing words were extremely distracting, made the document very difficult to read, and overshadowed the purpose and effectiveness of the article. Casual language was use too often. Evidence: This made the article less scholarly. Examples: Page 1, namely and likelihood; Page 2, good marks and routinewise; Page 3, bad things and that is why; Page, 4 in this way; Page 5, deals with, basically, filling up and raised up; Page 7 got it. | The paper has been edited for language consistency Language has been checked and corrections have been madeMissing words have added.Causal language has been changed with academic language.  |
| 16 | Incorrect acronym usage and incorrect capitalization usage. Page 8, the acronym, C.G.P.A. was used without explanationEvidence: Throughout the article, words were capitalized unnecessary and acronyms were used without clarification. Example: Page 4, the acronym HEC was used without explanation. Page 3,Eternal Locus of Control was capitalized unnecessary. | The use of “Incorrect acronym” has been addressed. The explanation of acronyms has been added.Unnecessary capitalization of words has been removed.  |
| 17 | Words were used interchangeably and incorrectly, particularly the wordstudent. Evidence: Throughout the document: “Student, Students, Students’ andStudent’s” were used too often and incorrectly.  | The incorrect use of words has been corrected or removed as per situation. |
| 18 | Words were left out and words were used in the incorrect tenses. Evidence: This made the article extremely difficult to read. Examples: Page 1, the study tried to explore likelihood of relationshipbetween…Page 3, the students with external locus of control tend achieve lower…Page 4, following were the major objectives… and degree awarding institutes in Pakistan as on September, 2011. Page 7, scales were got checked by…  | Language has been improved in terms of missing words and correct use of tenses.  |
| 19 | The following sentences more or less appear to contain some lack of agreement, poor parallelism or ambiguity: “The term locus of control refers to a person's basic belief system about the things that affect their actions done in the life. There are two classifications of people in this theory: internal and external locus of control. The successful people tend to be internal while those with an external locus of control consider things negative about the world (Rotter, 1966).The concept of locus of controlcovers the attitude which depicts that event in life either happens due to their own fault or they result by chance, fate or forces outside one’s control (Erdogan, 2003). The person with an internal locus of control solves their own problems and considers that the bad things happening are due to their own fault (Engaging the Shadows, 2011; Rognerud, 2011). Also the following sentences seem to carry some sense of ambiguity: “External and internal locus of control can be expressed as the way in which an individual considers the successes and failures on his own hard work and intrinsic motivation when he is exhibiting an internal locus of control while attributing his success or failure to outside forces then he is exhibiting an External Locus of Control (Demirkan, 2006; Humphrey, 2012; Rognerud, 2011).”In light of the following segment of the paper, “We adopted from the original version of Meyer and Allen (2004). The original version was comprised 24 items while the revised version was comprised 18 items on thescale”, the following segment might require revision: “As discussed above that the original scale comprised 18 statements while after modifications in the scale upon the advice of the panel of experts as well as adding more items through extensive literature review, the totalstatements raised up-to 45 items.”  | Lack of parallelism and ambiguity has been removed and this part has been rewritten, |
| 20 | APA StyleThe author(s) use hyperlinks in various sections of the paper; is this permitted? I am not aware of such use in traditional paper formatting (suchas APA, MLA, etc.). Review your citations to ensure that all sources are included in the References. | The hyperlinks have been removed. All citations have been reviewed to ensure that all sources are included in the References. ( Endnote has been used for the purpose) |
| 21 | The document needs page numbers. | Page no.s have been added |