

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_88788
Title of the Manuscript:	Organizational Culture and Learning Organization: An Empirical Study of the Colleges in Bhutan
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 1.6

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>	<p>Page 2 Line 42 – “Geus [19] coined the term “learning organization.” Was this accurate? Peter Senge wrote about it in 1990. I do not think Geus (1997) coined the term.</p> <p>Page 3 Line 41 - It would be best to have a hypothesis for the correlation. Based on your literature review, perhaps, you were expecting some correlation between OC and LO. Line 52 – “correlational design” – See my comment above. For exploratory or descriptive studies, it is acceptable to use research questions; however, for research that involve hypothesis testing, it would be best to also include hypotheses.</p> <p>Page 6 Figure 2 – left axis should read “Internal Focus and Integration.”</p> <p>Page 8 Line 20 – Figure 3 - I do not see a narrative for this figure. Please elaborate and explain in the text. Line 32 – Sample - How many people were selected to participate? What was the sample size? How were the participants selected? Did you use a census or a sample? Did you get the staff's contact information from human resources? Did you invite everyone to participate and see who would answer? In that case, "opportunity sampling," which is based on convenience sampling" may be more descriptive. Did you have inclusion or exclusion criteria? Did you include all full and part-time staff? Did you include remote workers? What was the composition of your sample? Please define "teaching" and "non-teaching" staff. Were "teaching staff" faculty? Readers may find the information useful when applying the research findings to their own facilities. Line 35 - How did “travel restriction” affect sampling? Please explain.</p> <p>Page 9 Instrument - You also collected demographic information from the sample, right? Please describe your instrument in addition to the OCAI and DLOQ. Line 22 - Please elaborate on the data analysis procedures. For example, describe the type of correlation statistics that was used. Also, the distribution of data plays a role on the estimation of correlations and covariances. The same applies to multiple linear regression. Should the normality of the data be tested beforehand? Results - What was the response rate? It looks like the non-teaching staff response rate was very low. Based on my calculation, the overall response rate was 15.3%; however, teaching staff response rate was 24.6%, and the non-teaching staff response rate was 6.08%. How might the difference response rates affect the overall results, given that the numbers of teaching and non-teaching staff in the target population were relatively even (655 and 658)? I wonder if you can confidently generalize your findings to your target population. I wish you have done analysis between the two groups. Table 2 - Please also describe the respondents in the text. Tables and figures should be described in the text.</p> <p>Page 10 Results – 4.1 Learning Organization - Only the internal consistency of the instrument was reported here. How about the mean score of each learning levels? Did you find any differences at the three learning levels (individual, department, and college)?</p>	<p>T</p>

Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 15 – “The average of the DLOQ dimensions’ ratings by the staff of the colleges is 4.051, which is higher than the DLOQ scale average.” What was the “DLOQ scale average”? Please provide reference and citation. According to Yaman (2020), the regional and sectional benchmark DLOQ score was 4.82. The education sector benchmark was 5.43. Yaman, T. T. (2020). A sectoral and regional benchmarking study with the dimensions of learning organization questionnaire (DLOQ) scale measurements. <i>Elektronik sosyal bilimler dergisi</i>, 19(76), 1905-1915.</p> <p>Page 11 Table 5 – One of the LO dimensions was missing! Missing (10)</p> <p>Page 13 Discussion - Please include limitations of the study and potential biases. Line 24 – 25 – “ Like the present study, Mababu and Revilla [52] found no significant gender differences for DLOQ dimensions. . . “ I don’t think the gender differences finding was presented in your article. Please include the results and talk about them in the corresponding section of the report.</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.6

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Page 1 Abstract – “Study design:” should be “Study Design:” Abstract – “LO characteristics the colleges.” should be “LO characteristics of the colleges.”</p> <p>Line 12 – An organization that has a greater. . . (APA – <i>that vs. which. Use that to introduce restrictive elements</i>). Line 13 – remove unnecessary comma after learn (to continuously learn and change. . .) Line 15 – creates (APA – Parallelism)</p> <p>Page 2 Line 2 – establishes (APA – Parallelism); scans (APA – Parallelism) Line 4 – “to influence” change to “in influencing” Line 5 – “it’s” should be “its” Line 11 – “like an increase of. . . “ Line 13 – “, an increase in. . . “ Line 18 – “to not” should be “believed not to learn effectively” Line 36 - Avoid start a sentence with an acronym (APA). Line 45 – the internal (parallelism) Line 49 – Add a comma before which (APA – use a comma to set off non-restrictive elements).</p> <p>Page 3 Line 1 – remove the unnecessary comma after resilience. Line 30 – “to influence” should be “in influencing” Line 34 – “individuals and groups and contribute. . .” Line 34 - society (use the society for a specific "society" or organization). Line 36 – transform into Line 39 - Remove the unnecessary comma after colleges.</p> <p>Page 4 Line 14 – missing a comma before “a cross-section survey. . . “</p> <p>Page 7 Line 20 – “strategic emphases, and criteria of success. . . “</p> <p>Page 13 Line 13 – “requires” Line 23 – “the potential global effects. . . “ Additional comments - It is interesting to note that both clan and hierarchy cultures scored the highest among the respondents. Both of these cultures have internal organization as priority either with people-focus or well-defined processes.</p> <p>Page 14 Line 25 – “insight into” Line 26 – “to promote” should be “in promoting” Line 28 – “needs”</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Page 12 Line 5 - Can you explain why multicollinearity was detected in Market and Adhocracy cultures? Based on the DLOQ, they don't seem to be closely related theoretically.</p> <p>Page 13 Additional comments - It is interesting to note that both clan and hierarchy cultures scored the highest among the respondents. Both of these cultures have internal organization as priority either with people-focus or well-defined processes.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Tan Fung Ivan Chan
Department, University & Country	Barry University, USA