

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_106838
Title of the Manuscript:	Improving Teacher Performance Through Strengthening Learning Organization, Transformational Leadership and Achievement Motivation
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript considers the important topic for effective teacher performance in relation to learning organization, transformational leadership, and achievement motivation. It was good to see different the investigation of relevant factors in improving teacher performance. Having said that, there are major problems that requires more clarity. 2. The word "improving" implies a longitudinal or an intervention study, yet this study is a cross-sectional correlational study. I would emphasize the "relational" aspect of the relevant factors. 3. The abstract summarizes the study well. 4. The introduction requires rewriting because there are many repetitions, even there are the same sentences in different paragraphs. For example, the 5th and 6th paragraphs are repetitive. Similarly, the three variables were explained twice in the introduction (both in 7th paragraph and in separate paragraphs later). More subsections could be included in the introduction to separate the sections. Also, the results and discussion sections could be separated. 5. The study needs revision to increase the quality. Please see my general comments. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	-	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The material and methods section needs more clarification. Although the authors refer to the research questions several times, these questions were not stated clearly.</p> <p>It was mentioned that the study includes questionnaires, interview data, and secondary data, however, they have to be explained clearly. There should more information about these data: which questionnaire, how many items, what kind of an interview, etc. Basically, you have be clear about how each variable was measured. Also, there is no information about the participants of the study and how the data was collected. Why and how was the secondary data used? It was mentioned that the secondary data will support the analysis and interpretation of the results, but it was not clear how this data was used for the interpretation. The authors refer to the theoretical framework, but they have never mentioned about this framework. They only refer to the preliminary research as the literature review. So, the theoretical background and literature review are missing.</p> <p>In the correlation tables, how can be the Pearson Correation values different? For example, the correlation between learning organization vs. teacher performance was .642, but the correlation between teacher performance vs. learning organization was .442. How can the matrix have different values?</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bilge Gencoglu
Department, University & Country	University of Groningen, Netherlands