

Cultural Management

Science and Education

Logos Verlag Berlin

Comeniushof, Gubener street No. 47
10243 Berlin
Germany
tel.: +49 030 42 85 10 90

University of Dąbrowa Górnicza

Cieplaka street No. 1c
41-300 Dąbrowa Górnicza
Poland
tel.: +48 32 295 93 59

DOUBLE-BLIND REVIEW FORM

Thank you for agreeing to be a reviewer. Please complete the table below and rate the paper on the issues described. As with all double-blind reviewing, any comments you make will be passed to the authors on an anonymous basis. As we strive to feedback comments to authors within 3 weeks of their paper submission please try to complete the review within that time.

Reviewer: **professor**

Title of the paper: **Organizational Culture and Teacher Performance on the Quality of Learning Processes**

A. Meeting the evaluation criteria

No.	Please rate the following: (5 - excellent, 4 - good, 3 - average, 2 - poor, 1 - very poor)	5	4	3	2	1
1.	Relevance to the aim and scope of the journal			x		
2.	Contribution to academic debate				x	
3.	Structure of the paper		x			
4.	Definition and fulfilling of the study objectives			x		
5.	Appropriateness of the research/study method		x			
6.	Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables			x		
7.	Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper			x		
8.	Standard of English - Is the language of the paper correct?				x	
9.	Discussion and conclusions			x		
10.	Reference list, adequate and correctly cited				x	

40-50 points Accept

30-39 points Accept with minor revisions

21-29 points The text requires major revision and new external review

<20 points Reject

B. Final recommendation (please put a sign X on the line next to your decision)

Thank you for your help. Please return this form to lwroblewski@wsb.edu.pl

Accept	
Accept with minor revisions	
The text requires major revision and new external review	x
Reject	

C. Justification for disposition

1. Additional comments or suggestions to be sent to the author (s)

Dear author, thank for occasion to review your text and learn something new. I came to a conclusion that your text needs a major revision. Its biggest weakness is a weak theoretical framework: you should involve much more references covering theoretical background to study organization culture of schools. Moreover, your text needs a language revision too, as some of the sentences are not understandable.

The design of the research, structure of the paper and presented results are generally OK. Improving the weak points should be enough to have your valuable work published. In yellow colour I highlighted the sentences, which need to be rephrased/don't make sense. The last reference should be corrected, as Viera, Zdenka and Dagmar are first names - which you mentioned, but you have not mentioned their surnames - as you did for Tirpáková (Slovak female surnames end mostly with - ová).

Good luck with revisions!

2. Comments to the editors (these comments will not be sent to the authors)

Data: 12 NOV 2020

Reviewer signature:

Cultural Management

Science and Education

Logos Verlag Berlin

Comeniushof, Gubener street No. 47
10243 Berlin
Germany
tel.: +49 030 42 85 10 90

University of Dąbrowa Górnicza

Cieplaka street No. 1c
41-300 Dąbrowa Górnicza
Poland
tel.: +48 32 295 93 59

DOUBLE-BLIND REVIEW FORM

Thank you for agreeing to be a reviewer. Please complete the table below and rate the paper on the issues described. As with all double-blind reviewing, any comments you make will be passed to the authors on an anonymous basis. As we strive to feedback comments to authors within 3 weeks of their paper submission please try to complete the review within that time.

Reviewer: **professor**

Title of the paper: Organizational Culture and Teacher Performance on the Quality of Learning Processes

A. Meeting the evaluation criteria

No.	Please rate the following: (5 - excellent, 4 - good, 3 - average, 2 - poor, 1 - very poor)	5	4	3	2	1
1.	Relevance to the aim and scope of the journal				X	
2.	Contribution to academic debate			X		
3.	Structure of the paper				X	
4.	Definition and fulfilling of the study objectives			X		
5.	Appropriateness of the research/study method			X		
6.	Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables			X		
7.	Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper				X	
8.	Standard of English - Is the language of the paper correct?				X	
9.	Discussion and conclusions				X	
10.	Reference list, adequate and correctly cited			X		

40-50 points Accept

30-39 points Accept with minor revisions

21-29 points The text requires major revision and new external review

<20 points Reject

B. Final recommendation (please put a sign X on the line next to your decision)

Thank you for your help. Please return this form to lwroblewski@wsb.edu.pl

Accept	
Accept with minor revisions	
The text requires major revision and new external review	X
Reject	

C. Justification for disposition

1. Additional comments or suggestions to be sent to the author (s)

When reviewing scientific papers for publication, I usually start with a general overview in terms of a structure, abstract, literature review, methodology, findings of the research, discussion, conclusions, as well as limitations of the study and future directions of the research. I also pay attention to the language level, especially if the paper is written in English, and English is not the native language.

The topic can be considered as actual and valuable from the point of view of further research in the area. Taking into account the journal profile and the paper goal, it is recommended to present wider the Islamic Indonesia culture background to explain better its big impact on the Organizational Culture and Teacher Performance on the Quality of Learning Processes. Thanks to this the paper conclusions will be better understandable, among others for the European readers and they will fits better to the journal topic.

The main problem with the paper is that its structure is inappropriate; though it includes most of the parts that should be presented in the scientific paper, their order as well as to some extent the contents are not correct. It should follow the IMRAD structure, i.e. Introduction – Literature review – Methods – Results – Discussion and – Conclusions.

Abstract is generally too long. It should be done acc. to the 'from general to details' rule, so first 1-2 introductory sentences, then the purpose of the paper, methodology and finally main findings. The results should be presented more synthetically without going too far into aspects of statistical analysis.

Introduction is underdeveloped. Where is the research gap and its justification? There are some general information only in this part. Sections 1, 2 and 3 should be merged into one "Introduction". The content in section 2 is incomprehensible - it needs to be improved.

I suggest to separate the Results section from the Discussion section. The Discussion section should be more extensive. Discussion section should discuss the results achieved; In addition, there should be references to the results of other scholars. Unfortunately there is almost nothing in this part, and the second aspect is missing at all.

The Conclusion section lacks research limitations and future directions for further research.

And finally, the literature used for preparation of the paper is very poor, there are only 14 references totally. I suggest adding more recent literature from SCOPUS and Web of Science databases.

I also recommend a final proofreading of the paper to be done by the native speaker.

Date:
16.11.2020

Reviewer signature: -----