

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_69482
Title of the Manuscript:	The Reality of Electronic Leadership in Jordanian Schools from the Perspective of its Teachers
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>First .The idea of the study seems interesting, different and even necessary</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction doesn't flow well and needs to be more clear and straight to the point by justifying soundly why your study includes E-Leadership and E-Leadership Practices. 2. You need to differentiate the E-Leadership from ethical leadership concept . 3. The authors also need to justify the unique contributions of this paper in deep. However, the discussions are somewhat broad and general .I can't see the clear explanation about this argument. 4. The introduction section should include 4 to 6 latest references (2018 to 2021) from well known journals in the field and appropriate extracts from them in order to motivate the researchers in the subject.. <p>Literature Review</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall, the review of literature seems to be weak and lack a logical flow. The rationales supporting the formulation of Research questions are pretty weak and unclear. It needs a comprehensive review is needed to justify the proposed questions. 2. Literature section needs to be improved. While establishing the Research questions, the authors must give an extensive background .It needs a comprehensive review to justify the proposed questions.for example E-Social Practice needs more Review, I need as reader To know more about this concept <p>Methodology</p> <p>The methodology section is not clear. Lots of significant information was not provided!. For example, the sampling process is not well described. Please explain exactly where were exactly the respondents in Jordan? When the data were collected? What type of institutions and how did you persuade management to conduct your research? In how many times you have visited such places? How did you contact the employees/over (414) respondents? Explain how the survey was distributed just you gave them the questionnaire and an empty envelope that is it ? What is the response rate? Does your sample represent the population? Make sure whether your sample can represent the population. you need to justify.</p> <p>Results & Discussion: fine</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What that means "Jordanian school leaders need more support to transfer their leadership from the replacement phase to the transformational phase" need clarifications . 2. Develop the conclusions section to include the unique contributions of the paper, theoretical and managerial implications, limitations of the research and future research directions <p>Others: The paper has a critical editing issue. There are a lot of grammars and spelling issues, It needs proofreading</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">3. The references are incorrectly arranged and presented regarding the Journal Guideline, References must follow the style of Asian journal of education and social studies4. (1.3) and (1.4) are the same meaning you should unify them5. In (4,4,3) Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is found to be (≤0.60) is wrong, Researchgers should change it to (≥ 0.60)	
Optional/General comments	Introduction: includes many Subheadings: suitable for (thesis Style) ; Problem statement, Research questions, Aim & objectives, Research significance and Operational definitions I suggest rearranging all these subheadings inside the introduction	

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:	Shadi Mohammad Altahat
Department, University & Country	Jadara University, Jordan