

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_129755
Title of the Manuscript:	Navigating Career Stagnation: The Lived Experiences Of Unpromoted Seasoned Teachers
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript contributes to the scientific community by providing valuable insights into the lived experiences of seasoned teachers facing career stagnation, a phenomenon with implications for teacher retention, motivation, and overall educational quality. By exploring the challenges, coping mechanisms, and support needs of these teachers, the study offers a nuanced understanding of the factors contributing to career stagnation within the public school system. The findings can inform the development of targeted interventions and policies aimed at fostering teacher growth, promoting career advancement opportunities, and ultimately improving the educational landscape. Furthermore, the study's qualitative approach adds depth to existing literature, offering rich, descriptive data that can be used for comparative studies in different educational contexts.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title "NAVIGATING CAREER STAGNATION: THE LIVED EXPERIENCES OF UNPROMOTED SEASONED TEACHERS" is generally suitable. It clearly and concisely conveys the core focus of the study. However, depending on the specific nuances the authors wish to emphasize, some minor adjustments could be considered:</p> <p>Here are a few alternative titles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Experience of Career Stagnation Among Unpromoted Seasoned Teachers: This is a more direct and concise option. • Stuck in Place: Exploring the Lived Experiences of Unpromoted Seasoned Teachers: This title uses more evocative language to highlight the feeling of being stuck. • Beyond the Classroom: Career Stagnation, Challenges, and Coping Strategies of Seasoned Teachers: This title broadens the scope slightly to include the challenges and coping strategies, which are key aspects of the study. • Unpromoted and Experienced: A Phenomenological Study of Career Stagnation Among Teachers: This title specifies the research methodology used. <p>Ultimately, "NAVIGATING CAREER STAGNATION: THE LIVED EXPERIENCES OF UNPROMOTED SEASONED TEACHERS" is a strong title and doesn't necessarily need changing. The suggested alternatives offer slightly different emphases, but the original title effectively captures the essence of the research.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a basic overview of the study, but it can be improved for clarity, conciseness, and impact. Here's a suggested revision:</p> <p>Key Changes and Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More Concise Language: Phrases like "The results of the study revealed that..." and "This study concludes that..." are redundant. The revised abstract states the findings and conclusions more directly. • Stronger Emphasis on Findings: The revised abstract emphasizes the key findings in a more impactful way. • Focus on Implications: The revised abstract ends with a stronger statement about the implications of the study, highlighting the need for career development programs. • Removed Redundancy: The repetition of "qualitative phenomenological research design" was removed. It is sufficient to mention it once. • Improved Flow and Readability: The revised abstract is written in a more natural and engaging style, making it easier to read and understand. <p>By implementing these changes, the abstract becomes more informative, concise, and impactful, effectively summarizing the key aspects of the study for the reader.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound in its approach. Here's a breakdown of why:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate Research Design: The use of a qualitative phenomenological research design is fitting for exploring lived experiences. Phenomenology aims to understand the essence of a phenomenon through the detailed descriptions of individuals who have experienced it. This aligns well with the study's aim of understanding the lived experiences of unpromoted teachers. • Clear Methodology: The abstract mentions data collection through the shared experiences of participants, which is a common method in phenomenological studies. The criteria for participant selection (age 40+, 7+ years in entry-level positions) are also clearly stated, adding to the methodological rigor. • Relevant Findings: The findings presented—challenges related to further education, training, rigid requirements, and emotional impact; coping mechanisms like professional development, constructive perspective, and work-life balance; and the need for leadership support—are all plausible and relevant to the topic of career stagnation. • Logical Conclusion: The conclusion that unpromoted teachers face significant career struggles and that career development programs are needed is a logical outcome of the findings. <p>However, to definitively assess the scientific correctness of the manuscript, a full review of the following aspects would be necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Collection Methods: How exactly were the "shared experiences" gathered? Were interviews conducted? If so, what type (structured, semi-structured, unstructured)? Were any other data collection methods used? • Data Analysis: How was the data analyzed to identify themes and patterns? Was a specific phenomenological analysis method used (e.g., Colaizzi, Giorgi, van Manen)? • Rigor and Validity: How did the researchers ensure the trustworthiness of the data and the findings? Were any measures taken to address potential biases? • Ethical Considerations: Were ethical guidelines followed in terms of participant consent, confidentiality, and data security? 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>We recommend authors to add "Khanchel, H. (2023). Factors affecting social network use by students in Tunisia. Human Systems Management, 42(2), 131-148. »</p>	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language and English quality seem generally appropriate for scholarly communications, with a few minor issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The sentence structure and grammar are mostly correct, with a few minor errors (e.g., missing articles, inconsistent verb tenses).2. The abstract follows a typical structure, with sections for aims, methodology, results, and conclusions.3. The writing style is formal and objective, as expected for academic writing.4. The abstract provides a clear overview of the study's purpose, design, findings, and implications. <p>However, there are a few areas where the language could be improved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Some sentences are quite long and could be broken up for better readability.2. There are a few instances of wordiness or redundancy that could be tightened up (e.g., "lived experiences," "seasoned teachers who were 40 years old and above").3. A few phrases could be rephrased for greater clarity or precision (e.g., "limited training opportunities and rigid requirements"). <p>Overall, while not perfect, the language and English quality in the abstract seem suitable for scholarly communications, with some minor areas for potential improvement. With some additional editing and polishing, it could meet the standards expected in academic publications.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hanan Khanchel-Lakhoua
Department, University & Country	IHEC, University of Carthage, Tunisia