Presenting the Pathology Model of Descriptive Evaluation System in Primary Education (Case Study: Alborz Province)

Roya. Najarian[1], Amirhossein. Mehdizadeh[2*], Nahid. Shafiee[2], Nader. Barzegar[2], Batoul. Faghiharam[2]

[1] PhD Student, Department of Educational Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Islamshahr Branch, Islamshahr, Iran
[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Islamshahr Branch, Islamshahr, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Amir.hMehdizadeh@yahoo.com

Editor	Reviewers
Florence DiGennaro Reed Professor in the Department of Applied Behavioral Science, University of Kansas, US fdreed@ku.edu	**Reviewer 1:** Hamid Rezaiefar Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Birjand Branch, Islamic Azad University, Birjand, Iran. Email: h.rezaiefar@iaubir.ac.ir **Reviewer 2:** Alinaghi Amiri Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran. Email: anamiri@ut.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introductory section could be expanded to include a more detailed discussion of the historical context and evolution of the descriptive evaluation system in Iran, particularly focusing on the legislative and educational policy changes that precipitated the current models.

Clarify the selection criteria for the experienced teachers and doctorate-level educators included in the study. Include more details about the demographic breakdown of these participants to ensure the reader can understand the representativeness of the sample.

Provide additional details on the statistical methods used in the confirmatory factor analysis in the 'Data Analysis' section. It would be beneficial to include information about the fit indices thresholds that were considered acceptable, as this would strengthen the credibility of the analysis.

In the 'Findings and Results' section, consider adding comparative data or a benchmarking analysis to show how the findings from Alborz Province align or differ from other regions with similar educational reforms.

The limitations discussed are somewhat generic. A more detailed discussion on how the specific geographic focus might limit the generalizability of the findings and suggestions for future research could provide deeper insights.

Expand on the theoretical implications of your findings. How does this study contribute to the existing body of knowledge about descriptive evaluation systems? How can this model be integrated into broader educational theory?

Offer more concrete and detailed recommendations for practitioners and policymakers based on the research findings. How exactly can these stakeholders utilize the findings to improve descriptive evaluation practices in primary education?

Authors revised the manuscript.

1.2.   Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Increase the depth of the literature review to include a critical analysis of recent studies that have evaluated similar descriptive evaluation systems globally. This can provide a comparative perspective that enriches the context of the current study.

Justify the use of a Likert scale in your questionnaire more thoroughly. Discuss the rationale behind the chosen scale points and how they align with the objectives of measuring the pathology of descriptive evaluation.

While the reliability is stated as acceptable, providing a deeper examination of the methodological rigor behind the validity tests (convergent and divergent) could enhance the trustworthiness of your questionnaire's results.

Include more graphical representations of data to help illustrate the relationships between different variables in the model. This could include scatter plots, histograms, or box plots where applicable.

The categories of damages (social, individual, organizational) identified in the findings need a more detailed analysis. Discuss the interconnections between these damages and their implications for educational practice.

The 'Discussion and Conclusion' section should more explicitly connect the study's findings to practical strategies for improving educational outcomes in primary education through better descriptive evaluations.

Ensure that all references are up-to-date and include recent studies published in the last 2-3 years. This will demonstrate a thorough engagement with current research in the field of educational evaluation.

Authors revised the manuscript.

2.   Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.