



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013 BJEMT 4041
Title of the Manuscript:	HBCU Students and Career Opportunities: Self-Evaluation in the Job Market

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Need to define the terms of students, and align this usage across the entire manuscript (for example, in line 79, how will you expect a full time student to have a full time job?). Alternatively, are you interest in those newly graduates from college? There are weak links among variables. Please add substantial arguments (with citations) to support the hypothesized model (fig 1). This means you may need to strengthen the argument for the associations of the variables in the model. This is particular important for a research that adopting SEM to check the fitness of data and model, as this research does. Table 2 shows that you have a PERFECT model with index values equal or larger than 1.00, whereas, correlations and ANOVA testing shows contradictory results (tables 1, 3, 4). Will you provide more explanations for this?	We are unsure what is meant by Compulsory Comment #1 of Reviewer One because in the United States we have full time and part time students. Due to economic necessities, these students routinely work their way through the university while taking care of family responsibilities. Thus, we do not see the need to define "students" as our sample of students include both full time and part time students who may be working either full time or part time to support themselves. We were interested in all students who were attending the university during our data collection phase. We thank the reviewer for calling attention to the fact that additional theoretical support was needed to strengthen our argument and have provided such information in the revision. We thank the reviewer for catching this error in our analysis. Table 4 should only contain the two endogenous variables: Academic achievement and employment opportunities. The omnibus F-tests were non-significant for these variables, which indicate no gender differences exist. We conducted a re-analysis of our path analysis model and found the same results. That is, although our model is tight fitting it is by no means perfect (saturated). It has been our experience that path



SDI Review Form 1.6

		analysis models often fit much better than latent variable models. There is no contradiction between the results of the SEM model, the results of the ANOVA testing procedure, and the correlations because gender differences are not considered when examining the results of the SEM or correlations. To examine gender differences in a SEM, the researcher usually would first need to divide the data set into two groups: Males and Females; then run a SEM for each group, i.e., stacked models. Thereafter, Chi-square difference tests would be conducted for each structural path. However, our sample size was too small to split the sample and conduct such an analysis and that's why we opted to use the ANOVA testing procedure to examine gender differences.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Format of reference list need substantial editing.	This part has been reviewed.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		