

# Paper Submission #1017: IJICC Submission Centre

**IJICC <editor@ijicc.net>**

submit

Min, 13 Okt 21.37

## **Submission Confirmation.**

**Your paper has been successfully submitted.** Please note your 'Paper Submission #' and quote it in all correspondence ---in the email subject line--with this Journal  
email: [enquiries@ijicc.net](mailto:enquiries@ijicc.net)

Allow 6 to 8 weeks for the review process to be completed. You will be notified via email.

Lead Author: Fauzi

Enter your email: [fauzi.iainpurwokerto@gmail.com](mailto:fauzi.iainpurwokerto@gmail.com)

Your Country: Indonesia

Title of Your paper: STUDY CORRELATION OF THE IMPACT FACTORS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF EARLY CHILDHOOD'S COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE

Original Contribution : My article aims to obtain empirical information about the influence of vocabulary mastery, sentence mastery, and social intelligence on early childhood communication skills; and to know the variables with the greatest impact on early childhood communication skills that done in Islamic education institute for early childhood.

Affiliation : State Islamic Institute of Purwokerto, Indonesia

Suggested Reviewer (title/name/email): Andhyka Tyaz Nugraha

Ethical Clearance: no

Ethical Clearance details: This research is about learning process that focussed on communication competence of student. The correlation methods of analysis was done ethically.

Upload your Paper: [https://www.ijicc.net/media/com\\_convertforms/uploads/c914922d00\\_FAUZI\\_Artikel\\_IAIN\\_PURWOKERTO.docx](https://www.ijicc.net/media/com_convertforms/uploads/c914922d00_FAUZI_Artikel_IAIN_PURWOKERTO.docx)

Declaration: the paper submitted is an original unpublished piece of work by the authors. Further the requirements of the journal, its terms and conditions have been met. I declare this statement to be true

CHECK: English Language Standards: This paper has a High English standard

## REVIEW REPORT

<b>Title Manuscript</b>	Study Correlation of The Impact Factors In The Development Of Early Childhood's Communication Competence		
<b>Date Submission</b>	October 13, 2019	<b>Period of Review process</b>	23/10/2019 – 28/12/2019

Evaluation Criteria	Score	
	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
<i>Journal Relevance Rating:</i> 10/09 = Highly relevant 08/07 = Mostly 06/05 = Some 04/03 = Marginal 02/01 = Not relevant	6	5.5
Originality/Novelty Rating 10/09 = Trailblazing, Significant contribution 08/07 = Pioneering work, important contribution 06/05 = One step ahead of similar work, minor contribution 04/03 = Yet another paper about this idea, questionable contribution 02/01 = It has been said many time before, no contribution	6.5	6
Paper Objective(s) and Justification Rating : 10/09 = Objectives very clear, excellent justification 08/07 = Objectives are clear, good justification 06/05 = More clarification needed 04/03 = Unclear or too many objectives 02/01 = Unacceptable	6	6

Continue...

Evaluation Criteria	Score	
	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
<p>Theoretical Foundations/ Literature Review Rating :</p> <p>10/09 = Excellent analysis &amp; critique of relevant theory/literature and seminal works</p> <p>08/07 = Good analysis/critique, a couple of missing works to add and/or minor improvements</p> <p>06/05 = A number of important works missing and/or further literature analysis/critique is needed</p> <p>04/03 = Minimal analysis/critique, key seminal literature/theory omitted</p> <p>02/01 = Unacceptable</p>	5	5
<p>Research Methodology/Approach Rating :</p> <p>10/09 = Excellent, among best I have seen, appropriate approach used, limitation acknowledged</p> <p>08/07 = Good justification/description, appropriate approach used limitation acknowledge</p> <p>06/05 = Okay, but needs elaboration/more justification/improved acknowledgement of limitations</p> <p>04/03 = Minimal justification/description, more limitation acknowledgement, concern about approach</p> <p>02/01 = Unacceptable, NA = Not Applicable (conceptual paper)</p>	5	5.5
<p>Findings/Discussion Rating:</p> <p>10/09 = Excellent discussion, compares findings with existing knowledge, among best I have seen</p> <p>08/07 = Good discussion, consistent with limitations of research approach, minor improvements</p> <p>06/05 = Okay, but some concerns about discussion inconsistencies with findings and/or limitations</p> <p>04/03 = Little comparison with existing knowledge, some major concerns about discussion</p> <p>02/01 = Unacceptable, NA = Not Applicable (conceptual paper)</p>	5.5	6
<p>Theoretical Implications Rating:</p> <p>10/09 = Significant implications</p> <p>08/07 = Sound implications</p> <p>06/05 = Apparent, needs elaboration</p> <p>04/03 = Implication unclear, covered minimally</p> <p>02/01 = No implications apparent or discussed</p>	4.5	5.5

Continue...

Evaluation Criteria	Score	
	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
Practical Implications Rating 10/09 = Significant implications 08/07 = Sound implications 06/05 = Apparent, needs elaboration 04/03 = Implication unclear, covered minimally 02/01 = No implications apparent or discussed	6	5.5
Conclusions/Future Research Rating 10/09 = Conclusion consistent with empirical findings & raises essential, new future research paths 08/07 = Good defensible conclusions & raises useful, important, fairly new future research directions 06/05 = Some inconsistencies with empirical findings and/or future research needs elaboration 04/03 = Conclusions and future research needs considerable work 02/01 = Unacceptable	5.5	6
Paper Structure Rating: 10/09 = Excellent structure, logical argument flow 08/07 = Good structure, logical argument flow 06/05 = Structure/flows needs work 04/03 = Needs considerable work 02/01 = Unacceptable	6	6
Writing Clarity Rating: 10/09 = Excellent, no typos/grammars error 08/07 = Well written, minor typos/grammars error 06/05 = Readable but requires some work 04/03 = Needs considerable work 02/01 = Unacceptable	5	5

Continue...

**Recommendation from Reviewers:**

Recommendation	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
Accept without content changes		
Accept with minor content changes		
Accept with major content changes	X	X
Reject – unsuitable for publications		

**Recommendation to authors (for revision):**

Please make necessary improvement accordingly :

1. please revise grammar in this article (proofread required).
2. improve abstract. it should consist of: i) purpose of study, ii) design/methodology/approach, iii) findings, iv) research limitation/implications, v) originality/value.
3. issues, problem, and objectives of study should be clearly highlighted.
4. theoretical foundation should be clearly highlighted and justified.
5. discussion is ok, but need more elaborations and justifications.
6. conclusions and future research should be clearly highlighted. this will add the value of this paper.

Overall, this is a good idea of study and could give valuable impact in theoretical and practical implications. Those improvements could add the value of this paper and give significant impact to the body of knowledge and practical applications.



# International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change

(Print) ISSN 2201-1315  
(Online) ISSN 2201-1323



Date: 11 Feb 2020

Ref.: Regular\_ May- 2020\_1105

Dear authors,

**Fauzi**

State Islamic Institute of Purwokerto, Indonesia

Email: [fauzi@iainpurwokerto.ac.id](mailto:fauzi@iainpurwokerto.ac.id)

It's my pleasure to inform you that, after the peer review, your paper "*Study Correlation of the Impact Factors in the Development of Early Childhood's Communication Competence*" has been ACCEPTED to publish in our journal namely *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, ISSN: 2201-1315. It will be published in the **Regular Issue of May 2020**. You will need to pay the publication fee within 3 working days. I believe that our collaboration will help to accelerate the global knowledge creation and sharing one step further. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

Managing Editor

**International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change**

