



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57253

Title: Managerial Cognitive Capability, Emotional Intelligence, Cognitive Bias Awareness, Analytical Reasoning Competence, and Experience Depth as Predictors of Strategic Decision-Making Effectiveness in the Ghana Education Service.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality			√	
Clarity		√		
Significance		√		

Reviewer's ID: JPR-212

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Overall Assessment:

This manuscript presents a well-structured conceptual review that addresses an important and underexplored topic: the integrated cognitive, emotional, and experiential capabilities required for strategic decision-making within the Ghana Education Service (GES). The author successfully synthesizes a dispersed body of literature across educational leadership, organizational behavior, and decision science. The proposed integrated capability model (Figure 1) and the decision process model (Figure 2) are valuable contributions. However, the manuscript requires **major revisions** before it can be accepted, primarily concerning methodological transparency, conceptual clarity (especially around "predictors" vs. "interacting capabilities"), and the gap between the review's claims and the evidence presented.

Major Required Revisions:

- Misalignment Between Title/Abstract and Actual Methodology:**
 - The title and abstract use causal language ("predictors of... effectiveness"). However, the manuscript is a **conceptual review**, not an empirical study. A review can identify associations, propose relationships, or synthesize constructs, but it cannot empirically establish predictive validity.
 - Action required:** Revise the title and throughout the manuscript to use more precise language such as "interacting determinants," "interrelated capabilities," or "conceptual framework for understanding" rather than "predictors." The abstract should clearly state that this is a conceptual synthesis, not a predictive empirical study.
- Methodological Transparency Is Insufficient:**
 - The review methodology (Section 4) lacks critical details for replicability or credibility. There is no mention of: specific search strings used in each database, the number of articles retrieved at each stage, inclusion/exclusion criteria applied to titles/abstracts vs. full texts, or a PRISMA-style flow diagram.
 - Action required:** Provide a detailed search protocol, including exact search terms, databases, date ranges, number of hits, screening process, and final number of sources included. Clarify how thematic synthesis was conducted (e.g., number of reviewers, how disagreements were handled, how themes were derived).
- Overclaiming Beyond the Evidence Presented:**
 - The manuscript frequently states that certain capabilities "improve" or "predict" outcomes (e.g., "emotional intelligence improves the social quality of decisions"). While plausible, the cited literature is largely from Western or generic organizational contexts. Very few empirical studies from the Ghana Education Service are cited that directly test these causal links.
 - Action required:** Temper causal claims. Use phrases like "suggests that," "may contribute to," or "is associated with." Explicitly acknowledge the limited direct GES-based empirical evidence as a limitation and a call for future research.
- Conceptual Redundancy and Operational Ambiguity:**
 - The distinction between "managerial cognitive capability" and "analytical reasoning competence" is unclear. Both involve information processing, interpretation, and judgement. Similarly, "cognitive bias awareness" is often treated as a subcomponent of analytical reasoning or metacognition in the literature.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Action required:** Provide a clear, side-by-side conceptual table that defines each capability, distinguishes it from the others, and gives concrete behavioral examples *specific to a GES leader* (e.g., a circuit supervisor or district director). Explain why five separate constructs are necessary rather than a three-factor model.
- 5. **Lack of Critical Engagement with Limitations of the Review Itself:**
 - The manuscript does not discuss potential biases in the review process (e.g., publication bias, language bias, or the author's own theoretical preferences). It also does not address the quality assessment of included studies—were weak studies given the same weight as strong ones?
 - **Action required:** Add a "Limitations" subsection in the Discussion or Methodology, addressing potential selection bias, the reliance on peer-reviewed literature over gray literature (e.g., GES internal reports), and the lack of empirical validation for the proposed model.

Minor Revisions / Suggestions:

6. **Figures and Referencing:**
 - Figure 1 and Figure 2 are mentioned but not included in the provided manuscript file. If they exist, they must be inserted and explicitly discussed. If not, remove the references.
 - Some references are missing DOIs or have incomplete page ranges (e.g., Fasolo et al., 2025). Verify all references against a standard format (e.g., APA 7th).
7. **Repetition and Redundancy:**
 - Sections 6 (Discussion) and 7 (Implications for Policy and Practice) are largely identical. For example, the paragraph beginning "The Ghana Education Service has already signalled movement..." appears verbatim in both sections.
 - **Action required:** Merge or clearly differentiate these sections. Discussion should interpret findings and compare to prior theory. Implications should focus on actionable recommendations for policy, training, and future research.
8. **Contextual Specificity:**
 - While the GES context is invoked, the manuscript often reverts to generic leadership statements. Provide more concrete, realistic scenarios faced by GES leaders (e.g., posting a teacher against community preference, allocating scarce resources among circuits, responding to a district-level exam scandal) to illustrate how each capability would operate in practice.
9. **Language and Clarity:**
 - The writing is generally clear but occasionally verbose. For instance, the sentence "This article addresses a straightforward but important question..." (lines 41-44) could be more direct. Shorten some theoretical discussions without losing nuance.

Recommendation Justification:

This manuscript has strong potential to inform leadership development and policy within the Ghana Education Service. The integrated capability model is timely and relevant. However, in its current form, the methodological weakness (lack of transparency), conceptual overlap among constructs, and overclaiming of causal prediction from a conceptual review significantly undermine its scholarly rigor. After **major revision** specifically to clarify methodology, reframe predictive claims as synthesized associations, and distinguish overlapping constructs the manuscript would be suitable for publication