

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_87575
Title of the Manuscript:	Communicative Relations in the Educational Environment: Exploration of Parents' Views on Educational Leadership
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.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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>1 Although the article has potential, it currently is still a very rough draft and needs much refinement and critical consideration.</p> <p>2 Title: The title needs to be revisited. Is the focus on parents' views on "education leadership" or parents' views on "communicative relations with the principal"?</p> <p>3 Abstract: The author writes with anthropomorphisms. Writing with an anthropomorphism means that you attribute a human action to objects that cannot take that action. For example, "The literature review states". While anthropomorphism makes for a compelling storytelling, it has no place in academic writing because academic writing should be clear, economical, without a waste of words and formal. See <a href="https://www.enago.com/academy/anthropomorphism-in-academic-writing/">https://www.enago.com/academy/anthropomorphism-in-academic-writing/</a>. Writing with anthropomorphisms resulted in several statements not making sense. For example, "literature review" cannot "provide(s) both theoretical and research dimensions" and "interview results" cannot "document and analyse the views". The author also include a footnote in the abstract, which should be moved to the content part of the article. Commonly, abstracts are not divided into paragraphs.</p> <p>4 Key words: In the title "parents' views" are indicated as the focus of the article but no mention is made thereof in the list of key words. It seems that the author(s) equate "parent-principal communicative relations" with "family-school communicative relations". The same problem exists with regard to whether the focus was on communication relations between the principal and parents or between parents and educational leadership which include more persons than just the principal. Also, the author(s) tend(s) to focus on teacher-parent relationships rather than principal-parent relationships. For example, in the section on Research Methodology the author(s) stated "An attempt is made to showcase special elements about the parent – teacher relationship in the context of educational culture." The focus of the article should be clearly stated, the title rephrased so that the focus is evident from it and the above-mentioned discrepancies should be addressed. The author(s) should consider the themes used to organize and discuss the findings such as "Frequency, reasons and ways of communication between parents and the school principal", "Quality of communication and factors of negative impact on the communication with the school principal" and "The Principal's communicative profile and distinctive features that promote or hinder communication with parents" when determining and stating the focus. The theory should support and be in line with the themes used to organize and discuss the results.</p> <p>5 Tenses used: It is not clear whether the authors report on a completed study or an ongoing study. For example, if the "aim of the study is ...", it suggests the study is not completed.</p> <p>6 The author(s) should check where they have used hyphenation to indicate that two words form a single unit of meaning. There should not be any spaces at the sides of the hyphen and a hyphen and not an "En dash" should be used. Thus not "school – family" but "school-family", not "principal – parent" but "principal-parent". The authors should also check and replace the "En dash" in combined surnames with hyphens and remove the spaces at the sides of the hyphen. Thus "Hoover-Dempsey" not "Hoover –Dempsey".</p> <p>7 The literature the authors relied on is bit dated. I suggest the authors study and incorporate a few more current sources on "communication relations". See, for example Jeynes, W.H., 2018. A practical model for school leaders to encourage parental involvement and parental engagement. School Leadership &amp; Management, 38(2), pp.147-163. Myende, P.E. and Nhlumayo, B.S., 2022. Enhancing parent-teacher collaboration in rural schools: parents' voices and implications for schools. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 25(3), pp.490-514.</p> <p>8 Section 4. Research Methodology: The organisation of this section should be reconsidered. Wouldn't it make more sense to rather begin the section with the discussion of the researchers involved in the study and their positionality? An aspect that is not clear is whether the principal of the participating school was also a researcher. The author(s) stated "The school principal's role – member of the research group - was also important, as she was able to understand issues of educational leadership and share her experience on issues for investigation." The role of the principal should be clarified. It would be irregular and affect the credibility of the findings if the principal acted as both researcher and participant. If the author (or one of the authors) acted as insider researcher, that must be indicated and the effect of that on the research spelled out. But then still he or she could not have acted as researcher and participant. A common mistake that authors make is to reference other authors when discussing the research methodology they have used. The author(s), for example, state(s): The initial step to analyze the research data was based on the combination of transcription, writing down the content of interviews (Tsiolis, 2018) and organizing the material in separate files for each interview in the computer (Creswell, 2016). The transcription of the verbal material into written was based on "speechnotes" (<a href="https://speechnotes.co/">https://speechnotes.co/</a>), a program which turns the conversation into written text. Throughout this procedure, the researchers also documented the necessary paralinguistic elements of each participant (Tsiolis, 2018). [76 words] The purpose of a text reference is to give recognition to the author of the words, phrases or ideas. These authors could not have commented on the researchers' research and on how they went about handling the data from the interviews. The author(s) should rephrase: For example: "We follow the suggestion of Creswell (2016) to organize the data. In this instance we organize the data of each interview in a separate computer file.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>Thereafter we transcribed the data, that is, according to Tsiolis (2018) the process of putting the interviews in writing. For this purpose we used the software programme, “speechnotes” (https://speechnotes.co/).” [55 words]</p> <p>The author(s) should also be careful not to waste words or to insult the readers’ intelligence by explaining obvious aspects in a repetitive manner. I indicated the word counts to illustrate how less words could have been used to convey the process followed without unnecessary repetition.</p> <p>9       Section 5. Research Results: Why the reference to “Thematic Unit” rather than just “Themes”? I saw the author(s) were consistent but I wondered why the double brackets where the author(s) indicated an insertion in the participants’ responses such as, for example, in this case “mother ((loss))...”.</p> <p>10       Section 6. Discussion and Interpretation: The author(s) should revisit this section. It makes no sense to "interpret" findings by pointing out that a different study produced different results. Take note, for example, of the extract below, which indicates that in the current study, the principal was found to collaborate with the parent body and that another researcher had a similar finding with regard to his or her study, albeit with a different research population, but both of these studies' findings are in contrast with the findings of another study. The question is what purpose does such interpretation serve?</p> <p>Moreover, our findings converge partially with those of Stravakou’s research in which it was found that the Principals often collaborate with the Parents and Guardians Association (as cited in Babalis et al., 2015). At the same time, they contrast the findings of Merkouri and&amp; Stamatis’ research (2009) who found that principals, apart from unscheduled meetings, organized monthly meetings with the Parents and Guardians Association.</p> <p>Some discussions in this section stands loose and are not linked to the findings. See, for example, the paragraph beginning with this sentence: “It is noteworthy that a case study can showcase the tension and range of the situation by taking into consideration all the viewpoints and emotions.”</p> <p>There is a disconnect between the recommendations and the findings and it seems that the recommendations are generalised while the study was case specific. The discussion of the problems in relation to the education administration, a lack of state support, insufficient training, lack of policy, etc were not argued or investigated at all. The author(s) should first make case specific recommendations before deducting possible generalised recommendations from the case-specific recommendations?</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?	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> <p>See the embedded report above and in-text comments. Note questions on whether principal was a researcher and participant.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	SA Coetzee
Department, University & Country	UNISA , South Africa