



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	The Bayanihan Spirit: Assessing Key Values Among Master Teachers in Bacarra District 1
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

General Comments and Recommendations

The reviewers acknowledge the merit of your manuscript and suggest revisions to improve its clarity, structure, and overall quality. In addition, you are required to conduct a thorough inventory of the references in your manuscript. Please ensure that only the sources cited within the text are included in the References section, and likewise, that all references listed in the References section are properly cited in the manuscript. For example, if you have 20 cited references in the manuscript, then only 20 references should be included in the References section. However, please note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single entry in the References list; therefore, the total number of entries in the References section may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

General Comments and Recommendations

This paper has a timely and meaningful topic because bayanihan as a Filipino value is very relevant in school leadership and community building. The study also has practical value, especially in showing the role of master teachers in promoting unity, support, and service in school settings. However, my main concern is on the methodological rigor and how the mixed-methods design was carried out and reported. At present, the paper gives results that are too strong and too certain, but the methodological details are still not enough to fully support these claims. Because of this, the validity of the findings and the strength of the conclusion become less convincing.

Specific Comments and Recommendations

The manuscript needs to clarify much better how the mixed-methods design was actually implemented. It says the study used quantitative and qualitative approaches, but the integration of the two strands is still weak. The paper should explain what specific mixed-methods design was used, how the quantitative and qualitative parts were connected, and at what stage the integration happened. Also, the quantitative part used only 17 respondents, yet the paper reports inferential tests like t-test and ANOVA without explaining whether the assumptions for these tests were checked or whether such analysis is appropriate for such a very small group. Related to this, the instrument is researcher-made, but the paper only mentions expert validation and pilot testing in a very general way. It needs to report how validity was established,



how many validators were involved, what reliability result was obtained, and what dimensions or items exactly measured each bayanihan value. On the qualitative side, the paper mentions interviews, FGD, and open-ended responses, but it is not clear how many joined each, how the participants were selected for each activity, how coding was done, and how themes were generated. Because of these gaps, the findings look more descriptive than rigorously established. I suggest the author strengthen the methodology section first, because once this part becomes clearer and more transparent, the contribution of the paper will also become much stronger and easier to trust.

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

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The author is commended for conceptualizing a study that highlights our Filipino core value of Bayanihan. The topic is very relevant and close to home, especially in the context of our current educational system and the demands placed on our teachers. The paper is well-written generally and flows logically.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
You mentioned using a mixed-methods design with 17 Master Teachers through total enumeration. While an N=17 is completely fine and actually good for qualitative interviews or focus group discussions, running inferential statistics like t-tests and ANOVA on such a small population is highly problematic. The sample is simply too small to produce reliable or meaningful F-values and t-values. I highly suggest you remove the inferential parametric tests and stick purely to descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and percentages) for the quantitative part. Alternatively, lean even heavier into the qualitative framework to anchor the study.
In Table 1, all variables are rated "Very High," ranging from 4.65 to 4.93. Since the respondents are Master Teachers self-evaluating their own ethical values, there is a very obvious risk of social desirability bias, meaning, they naturally answered in a way that makes them look like good leaders. The paper fails to critically discuss this. You need to explicitly address this bias in your limitations and explain how your interviews and focus group discussions controlled for or validated these perfect self-ratings.
Right now, the paper feels like a quantitative survey and a qualitative interview pasted together, rather than a true mixed-methods research design. You need to triangulate the data better in the Discussion section. For instance, you can directly use the qualitative theme of "Time



Constraints and Heavy Workload" to explain why "Adaptability and Resilience" got the lowest mean score (4.65) among the values. Use the qualitative narratives to explain the "why" and "how" behind the quantitative numbers.

The conclusion mostly confirms that Bayanihan is practiced by teachers and is a good cultural foundation. To be frank, this is already an expected outcome in the Philippine setting. To elevate the paper for a national journal, you need to highlight the new knowledge. Dig deeper into the friction you found - how is traditional Bayanihan being challenged or reshaped by modern DepEd administrative workloads and resource limitations? Focusing on that tension will make your theoretical contribution much stronger than just proving the value still exists.

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.			