

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJESS_118128
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPLORING THE EXPERIENCES AND STRATEGIES OF NATIONAL QUALIFYING EXAMINATION FOR SCHOOL HEADS (NQESH) PASSERS: A MULTIPLE CASE STUDY ANALYSIS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? This manuscript is significant for the scientific community, particularly within the field of educational leadership. It offers a comprehensive analysis of the experiences and strategies of individuals who have passed the National Qualifying Examination for School Heads (NQESH). However, the manuscript could benefit from a deeper exploration of the theoretical implications of these findings. For instance, how do these strategies align with existing theories of educational leadership and professional development? The authors should also discuss the potential limitations of their findings in the broader context of educational policy and practice. 2. Is the title of the article suitable? While the title of the article is suitable, it lacks specificity and could be more engaging. An alternative title such as "Navigating the National Qualifying Examination for School Heads: Insights from a Multiple Case Study Analysis" would better capture the focus and depth of the study. This title also hints at the practical applications of the research findings, which may attract a wider readership. 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract is generally comprehensive but could be improved by explicitly stating the research questions or hypotheses. Additionally, the abstract should provide a brief mention of the methodological approach, including the number of cases studied and the data collection methods. The conclusion of the abstract should succinctly highlight the main contributions of the study to the field of educational leadership and any practical recommendations derived from the findings. 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The subsections and structure of the manuscript are logically organized, but there is room for improvement in the depth and clarity of each section. For example, the methodology section could be expanded to include more details about the sampling strategy, data collection procedures, and the analytical framework used. The results section would benefit from a more detailed presentation of the themes identified, supported by direct quotes from participants. Furthermore, the discussion section should provide a more critical analysis of the findings, comparing them with existing literature and discussing their implications for policy and practice. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, but it lacks a critical examination of the data. The authors should consider potential biases in their sample and discuss how these might have influenced the findings. Additionally, the manuscript would be strengthened by a more rigorous discussion of the validity and reliability of the qualitative data analysis. The authors should also address any ethical considerations related to the study, particularly regarding the confidentiality and consent of the participants. 	

	<p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>The references are generally sufficient and include recent literature. However, the manuscript would benefit from a broader range of sources, particularly those that address similar examinations and educational leadership challenges in other cultural contexts. Including references from recent meta-analyses and systematic reviews on educational leadership and professional development could also enhance the manuscript's scholarly depth.</p> <p>Additional Suggestions/Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Theoretical Framework: The manuscript would benefit from a stronger theoretical grounding. While the Expectancy-Value Theory is mentioned, its application throughout the study is not consistently clear. The authors should integrate the theoretical framework more thoroughly in the analysis and discussion sections. Specifically, they should explain how the theory helps to understand the experiences and strategies of NQESH passers and link the findings back to key theoretical constructs.2. Depth of Qualitative Analysis: The qualitative analysis presented in the manuscript could be more nuanced. Currently, the analysis primarily identifies themes without delving deeply into the complexities and contradictions within participants' experiences. The authors should provide a richer, more detailed account of the data, including more extensive use of direct quotes and a deeper exploration of the context surrounding the participants' experiences. This could involve discussing outlier cases or negative instances that do not fit the general patterns observed.3. Methodological Rigor: The methodology section lacks sufficient detail about the data analysis process. The authors should specify the coding procedures used, how themes were derived, and the measures taken to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings. Additionally, a discussion on the reflexivity of the researchers and how their backgrounds and biases might have influenced the study would enhance the transparency and credibility of the research.4. Generalizability and Limitations: The manuscript does not adequately address the generalizability of the findings. Given the qualitative nature of the study and the specific context of Davao del Norte, the authors should discuss the limitations of their study in terms of the transferability of the findings to other contexts. They should also suggest ways in which future research could build on their work to test the findings in different settings or with different populations.	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communications, but there are several areas where improvements could be made for clarity and readability. Here are some specific suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammar and Syntax: There are minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings throughout the manuscript. A thorough proofreading is recommended to correct these issues. For instance, sentences like "The study identified several common themes across the cases regarding the experiences of NQESH passers" can be revised for clarity to "The study identified several common themes regarding the experiences of NQESH passers across the cases." • Consistency: Ensure consistent use of terminology throughout the manuscript. For example, consistently use either "NQESH passers" or "examinees" rather than switching between different terms. • Clarity: Some sections, particularly in the results and discussion, contain lengthy and complex sentences that could be simplified. Breaking these into shorter sentences can improve readability. For example, "The experiences of teachers preparing for the NQESH exam highlight the vital role of comprehensive preparation, time management, and support systems" can be revised to "Teachers preparing for the NQESH exam emphasize the importance of comprehensive preparation, effective time management, and robust support systems." • Technical Terminology: Ensure that all technical terms are clearly defined when first introduced. For example, terms like "Rasch Model" and "SOLO taxonomy" should be briefly explained to ensure all readers understand their significance. • Paragraph Structure: Some paragraphs contain multiple ideas that can be better understood if divided. Ensure each paragraph has a clear main idea, supported by evidence or examples. • Punctuation: Review the use of punctuation marks, especially commas and periods, to enhance the flow of the text. Proper punctuation can help in breaking down complex sentences and improving comprehension. • Academic Tone: Ensure that the tone remains formal and academic throughout the manuscript. Avoid colloquial expressions and ensure that the writing style is appropriate for a scholarly audience. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy Implications: While the manuscript touches on practical recommendations, it would benefit from a more explicit discussion of the policy implications of the findings. The authors should elaborate on how their recommendations could be implemented in practice and what specific changes might be needed in the educational system to support aspiring school leaders better. They should also discuss the potential challenges and barriers to implementing these recommendations. 2. Literature Integration: The manuscript would benefit from a more critical engagement with the existing literature. While references are provided, the discussion section should more thoroughly compare the study's findings with those of previous research. This includes identifying areas of agreement and divergence and providing a critical analysis of why these differences might exist. Such an approach would situate the study more firmly within the existing body of knowledge and highlight its unique contributions. 3. Clarity and Conciseness: The manuscript occasionally lacks clarity and conciseness, particularly in the results and discussion sections. The authors should revise these sections to ensure that the key points are clearly articulated and that the text is concise and focused. Avoiding repetition and ensuring that each paragraph has a clear main idea would improve the overall readability and impact of the manuscript. 4. Use of Visual Aids: The inclusion of tables summarizing key findings is helpful, but the 	

Review Form 1.7

	manuscript could be enhanced with additional visual aids. For example, conceptual diagrams or models that illustrate the relationships between the themes or a flowchart of the preparation and coping strategies could provide readers with a clearer understanding of the findings. Visual aids can also make complex information more accessible and engaging.	
--	---	--

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:	Ahmad Syafii
Department, University & Country	UIN Sunan Kalijaga, Indonesia