



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	Institutional Blindness and Educational Justice: Reframing Ethical Leadership through a Critical Pedagogical and Sociological Reading of Gloc-9's Upuan
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

EDITOR

General Comments and Recommendations

The reviewers acknowledge the potential of the manuscript and recommend several revisions to further enhance its clarity, organization, and overall scholarly contribution. The author is advised to carefully address all comments and suggestions provided by the reviewers in preparing the revised version of the manuscript.

REVIEWER 1

Specific Comments and Recommendations

1. The title is descriptive and accurately reflects the scope of the research. However, it is quite lengthy. The authors might consider a slightly reduced title, perhaps: "Institutional Blindness and Educational Justice: A Critical Reading of Gloc-9's 'Upuan' alongside EDCOM II."

2. The abstract effectively summarizes the learning crisis, the methodological approach, and the thematic findings regarding power and stratification. The author should briefly specify which specific facets of the EDCOM II reports (Year 1, Year 2) are the primary focus of the synthesis to give the reader immediate context.

2. The introduction excellently frames the structural disadvantages in the Philippine education system, leveraging PISA 2022 and EDCOM II diagnostics. The integration of critical pedagogy and sociological criticism provides a robust lens for textual analysis. The most significant gap in the introduction is temporal. The song *Upuan* was released in 2009, yet it is being used to analyze contemporary policy documents from 2024 to 2026. The author must explicitly justify why a song that is over a decade old remains the ideal textual corpus for evaluating current EDCOM II findings.

3. In section 2.3, the author mentions thematic coding. The methodology would be more rigorous if the author specified how this coding was executed. Was it done manually, or was qualitative data analysis software utilized?

4. Section 3.4 currently reads more like a Discussion of the findings rather than a raw textual finding itself. The author even notes that the song does not directly reference EDCOM II, but rather resonates interpretively with it. Moving Section 3.4 into Section 4 (Discussion) would create a cleaner separation. Section 3 would house the pure textual and



sociological analysis of the song and Section 4 would synthesize those findings with the EDCOM II policy framework.

5. The current implications call for moral stewardship and justice-centered governance. While philosophically sound, these concepts remain highly abstract. To maximize the impact of this paper on actual institutional leaders, the author should operationalize these concepts. How does a university president or an academic dean translate the message of *Upuan* into concrete administrative practice? The author should provide examples of actionable policies.

6. The author needs to standardise the citations presumably to APA 7th edition, given the field. For instance, some titles are fully capitalized (e.g., Asiimwe K. T., 2025; Kilaton & Cezar, 2024), while others use a sentence case. Additionally, DOI links are formatted inconsistently across the entries.

General Comments and Recommendations

This is a highly compelling and innovative manuscript submitted to IJTMS. This is a fresh approach in understanding systemic issues. The foundational argument that abstract governance failures are felt and expressed culturally by the public is strong.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept the manuscript for publication.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

REVIEWER 2

Specific Comments and Recommendations

I have concerns regarding the alignment of the paper from the introduction up to the discussion. At present, the research gap says that policy reports already diagnose systemic problems but fewer studies examine how cultural texts articulate public perceptions of institutional failure and leadership detachment. This is a strong and interesting gap. But the stated aim shifts to analyzing lack of awareness and educational unfairness in the song and connecting these to EDCOM findings. Because of this, the paper starts to sound like it will do a policy-diagnostic study while the actual method is a qualitative textual analysis of one song. This is where the paper feels off. The method can support an interpretive reading very well but it cannot fully support stronger claims about public perceptions or direct policy correspondence unless there is audience data, reception analysis or a broader corpus. I suggest softening and recasting the gap and aim so they match what the study actually does. The paper will become much stronger if the



author frames the contribution as an interpretive bridge between protest music and education policy discourse rather than as a direct demonstration of policy realities. Related to that, the introduction reads partly like a policy paper and partly like a literary paper then later tries to combine both. The combination is possible but it needs cleaner framing early on. I suggest that the author clarify earlier that this is an interpretive textual study and that EDCOM II is used as a policy dialogue point or comparative frame not as something being empirically tested by the song analysis. This small clarification will help readers understand the scope and not expect a different kind of evidence.

General Comments and Recommendations

Thank you for this interesting and timely paper. The topic is important and the attempt to connect protest literature, educational justice and leadership ethics is very promising. I can see the effort in building a strong interdisciplinary discussion, and the manuscript has good potential for publication after revision. The reading of Gloc-9's "Upan" is meaningful and the paper shows a clear intention to contribute not only to literary analysis but also to current conversations on education governance in the Philippines. I appreciate that the study tries to make cultural analysis socially useful, and that is one of the strengths of the paper.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept the manuscript for publication.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			