

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_118830
Title of the Manuscript:	HEADS OF SCHOOL AND TEACHING COMMITMENT IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KAGERA REGION, TANZANIA
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript addresses an important topic within the local and regional education context in terms of school leadership's influence on teacher commitment. 2. The title is appropriate. 3. While it is acknowledged that the abstract is comprehensive, it still needs some attention, the author should indicate to the reader the main findings and the statistical approach used in the study. The author made mention of the hypothesis in the abstract but there is no mention of any hypothesis in the main text (literature review). 4. The subsections and structure need attention, the validity of the instruments and ethical consideration should be written under the methodology section and not after discussion. The data analysis subsection should come after the 'measures subsection' 5. Scientifically the paper is appropriate, but it needs some corrections. 6. While the author made efforts to cite relevant sources, some of the sources used in the literature review are too old to provide credible support to the position of the paper. We are in 2024 and several changes have occurred within the last 5 years in society eg the education sector has seen drastic changes thus making references to documents as far back as 2004 and the 1980s to support an argument post-COVID era renders such arguments not academically sound and valid. Additionally, some references were cited in the text but did not appear in the reference list whereas some appeared in the reference list but not in the text (These have been highlighted in blue in the manuscript). 7. The reference list needs to be aligned to the specific referencing style of the journal. Eg. APA or Havard style. Currently, the referencing style does not conform to the APA format and requires the authors' attention to address the minor errors. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>There are notable grammatical errors that affect the logical flow of thoughts when one reads the manuscript. I suggest the document be sent for language editing to address these errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper addresses an important contemporary topic in the education sector. However, the following issues are noted for the authors' immediate attention to ensure the scientific rigor of the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In addition to establishing the relationship between the constructs, the authors indicated that their study aimed (1) to identify the various methods employed by school heads to supervise teaching activities in these schools and (2) to assess the levels of teacher commitment within the region. However, these objectives were not clearly outlined/discussed in the literature review as well as in the results and discussion subsections. The different methods used by school principals should have been integral part of the discussion on School Leadership (Section 2.2). 2. The authors should indicate whether a Likert scale was used as well as the ratings used. This will allow readers to understand the mean scores. 3. The study did not provide descriptive information on the respondents' demographic variables in the study. 4. The correlation or regression table is missing in the results section. Additionally, the level of teacher commitment obtained in the analysis should be mentioned and discussed in the results and discussion sections since it forms part of the objectives. 	

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:	Alex Boateng
Department, University & Country	University of South Africa, South Africa