International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Influence of Employee Awareness on TTI Preparedness for ISO 21001:2018 Implementation: The Mediating Role of Employee Motivation
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

General Comments and Recommendations
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

General Comments and Recommendations
Your manuscript tackles a very relevant topic in educational management. You clearly try to contribute value to the academic world. The study holds promise but it needs revisions to reach the publication standards of the journal. You must fix data errors and lift up the theoretical depth.

Specific Comments and Recommendations
Title: Title gives good information but it is a bit wordy. You might want to drop the specific year of the ISO standard. A short title grabs more attention from researchers.
Abstract: You have a big data error right at the start. The abstract states you collected data from 272 respondents. Later in the methodology you mention 244 actual respondents. You must fix this error so the audience trusts your work. Also you wrote a broken sentence about the high level of motivation. Please revise the syntax so it forms a complete thought.
Introduction: You build a solid background on Quality Management Systems. However the pivot to the specific context of TESDA institutions feels sudden. You state that human elements lack exploration. To make this argument robust you should provide concrete examples of how other

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

technical education centers stumble when they ignore human elements. Rely less on generic claims and more on precise literature gaps.
Theoretical Framework: You anchor the study in multiple theories like Socio Technical Systems Theory and Self Determination Theory. This is ambitious but it feels cluttered. Pick the most dominant theory and integrate it deeply rather than present a mere list of several concepts. Show exactly how the variables interact within one cohesive model.
Methodology: Your explanation of the statistical tools reads too much like a basic statistics textbook. You do not need to define the mean or standard deviation for academic peers. Delete the basic definitions and focus purely on why you selected specific tests for your data set. Also clarify the survey validation process. You claim experts validated the questionnaire but you never specify who these experts are or their professional qualifications.
Results: The tables are helpful but your narrative just repeats the numbers found in the tables. For instance you state the exact mean scores and standard deviations over and over. Instead of a mere recital of numbers you must interpret what these metrics reveal about the workforce. Furthermore explain the practical significance of the moderate to strong correlations rather than just state they possess statistical significance.
Discussion: This section is way too brief and represents the weakest part of your manuscript. A proper academic discussion must synthesize the results with previous literature. You only offer a single short summary paragraph. Expand this drastically. Contrast your results with global studies on educational management. Explore the exact reasons why partial mediation occurred instead of full mediation.
Conclusion: Your conclusion feels like a simple echo of the abstract. A robust conclusion needs to highlight the broader implications of your results. Provide explicit recommendations for policymakers and institutional leaders based on the data. Tell the reader exactly what actionable steps TESDA should take next.
References: The format appears inconsistent across different entries. Check capitalization rules for journal titles. Some entries include issue numbers while others omit them. Meticulous attention to detail here reflects the overall rigor of your entire research endeavor.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

Decision	
	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.

Reviewer 2

General Comments and Recommendations
The paper addresses an important issue because employee readiness is indeed central when an institution moves toward ISO 21001 implementation. I can see a clear empirical direction in the study, but I remain concerned with the measurement of the central mediator. Since employee motivation carries the main contribution of this paper, any problem in how this

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

construct was formed affects not only one table but the entire mediation argument and the conclusions drawn from it.
Specific Comments and Recommendations
The manuscript uses WEIMS with six theoretically different dimensions (intrinsic motivation, integrated regulation, identified regulation, introjected regulation, external regulation, and amotivation) but these are eventually treated as one general employee motivation score and then entered as a single mediator. This is difficult to defend conceptually because amotivation is not simply another positive component of motivation; it represents absence of motivation, while the other regulations also differ in their degree of self-determination. More seriously, the results table appears to combine the high scores from the motivated dimensions with the low raw scores for amotivation to obtain the overall mean of 3.86. If this is really how the score was computed, the mediator is mathematically and theoretically questionable. The manuscript also reports one Cronbach alpha of 0.97 after combining all 70 questionnaire items, even though the instrument contains three different constructs and the motivation measure itself has six distinct dimensions. A very high alpha for the whole questionnaire does not establish that the employee motivation composite used in the mediation model is a valid and reliable construct.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

Decision	
	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.

SECOND ROUND

Decision	**Editor**	**Reviewer 1**	**Reviewer 2**
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.			