



**Paper: “Integrated Landscape Approaches: Definitions, Conceptualizations, Configurations, and Objectives through the Lens of Distributed Leadership Practices”**

**Submitted: 05 September 2024**

**Accepted: 28 August 2025**

**Published: 31 August 2025**

Corresponding Author: Edward Gerald Ndilanha

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n22p40

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Róbert Szűcs  
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Foldi Kata  
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Janet Muthimi  
Kenyatta University, Kenya

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The scope and focus are effectively conveyed by the title. It is overly lengthy and repetitious, especially the part about "four practices of distributed leadership practices." To be more succinct and steer clear of repetition, think about editing.

"Integrated Landscape Approaches: Conceptualization and Operationalization through Distributed Leadership Practices" is the suggested revision.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The study's goal, to investigate the definition and connection between distributed leadership practices and integrated landscape approaches, is explicitly stated in the abstract. It highlights the theoretical and practical ramifications of techniques like EFA and CFA.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Observations: Wordiness and frequent run-on sentences in every section. See below:

- Verb tenses that are sometimes inconsistent and repetitive.
- As an illustration, consider the following: "they draw from theoretical foundations; (ii) they are independent from one another..." (repeated several times).
- Using "the object of..." instead of more lucid expressions like "the goal of..." or "the purpose is..." breaks the flow.
- Incorrect article usage and pluralization (for example, "the four practices they are..." instead of "are," or "DL-Practice is..." instead of "are").

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methodology, which includes the longitudinal research design, sample (420 participants), data collection (stratified random sampling), and instrument (Likert scale), is clearly explained.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

- Argument Clarity: The theoretical review is well-supported by numerous citations and is comprehensive. The conversation illustrates how integrated landscape strategies relate to distributed leadership.

Structural Overlap: A number of concepts and expressions (such as the traits of the four leadership practices) are repeated in several places, especially in the introduction, discussion, and conclusion.

- Tables and Figures: Though informative, the tables—especially Tables 2 and 3—could use some improvement in terms of formatting and labeling.
- Redundancy: The narrative progression is weakened when the same authors and models are mentioned repeatedly without offering fresh perspectives (for example, "Hairon and Goh (2015)").

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

- Correct and Supported: The conclusion makes sense in light of the information presented and makes clear the theoretical and practical ramifications.
- Well-structured: It follows good academic practice by having distinct subsections for theoretical, practical, and policy implications.

- Repetition: A number of previous points are reiterated exactly.
- Language polishing is required: Steer clear of repetitious sentences such as "This paper argues that..." in a single paragraph. In conclusion

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

1. Formatting Consistency: A few formatting errors in references (e.g., incorrect punctuation, different citation styles, formatting for DOIs).

o For instance, Campion, M. A., Higgs, A. C., & Medsker, G. J. (1993a). Work groups' effectiveness and their characteristics are related. *Psychology of Personnel*, 46.

Volume and page numbers are missing from this entry, making it incomplete. Additionally, the use of (1993a) implies the existence of (1993b), which needs to be appropriately cross-referenced.

2. Alphabetic Order: The list seems to be arranged primarily, though not completely, alphabetically. Some entries are redundant or out of context (for example, Hairon & Goh, 2015 appears twice).

Over-reliance on Specific Authors: A few authors (such as Reed, Engeström, Hairon & Goh, Campion et al.) are mentioned excessively and frequently cited more than once. Diversity in supporting sources would enhance the discussion, even though they are essential to the study.

4. Missing Citations in the Body: A few references (such as Nykyforchyn (2022) and Oliver (1999)) are listed in the reference list but are not properly cited or covered in-depth in the manuscript. Citations could be eliminated or their applicability better explained.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The paper is aligned with the theoretical and empirical scope of the manuscript. However, the following improvements are needed:

- o Clean up the entire paper for formatting.
- o Verify alphabetical order.
- o Justify or remove underutilized or uncited references.
- o Avoid overcitation of certain authors unless strongly justified.

-----

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title of the article appears clear and aligned with the article's content. It accurately reflects the article's focus on exploring integrated landscape approaches and the role of distributed leadership practices. However, it could be made slightly more concise for readability, as it currently repeats the phrase "practices of distributed leadership" twice. Consider a revision like:

"Integrated Landscape Approaches: Definitions, Conceptualizations, Configurations, and Objectives through the Lens of Distributed Leadership Practices"

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract of the article clearly presents the objectives, methods, and results:

Objectives: The abstract starts by highlighting the primary aim of the study, which is to explore how integrated landscape approaches are defined, conceptualized, configured, and operationalized to achieve desired outcomes. The study also seeks to connect these approaches to distributed leadership practices.

Methods: The abstract mentions the use of Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) as the key methods for data analysis. This indicates a quantitative approach aimed at validating the relationship between integrated landscape approaches and leadership practices.

Results: The abstract provides a summary of the key findings, noting that there is a strong relationship between integrated landscape approaches and distributed leadership practices. It also mentions the existence of multiple independent practices that need to be enacted in a specific order to achieve optimal outcomes, suggesting a normative decision-making framework.

Overall, the abstract is well-structured and clearly presents the study's objectives, methods, and key results.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

In the abstract and the content there are a few grammatical issues and suggestions for improvement:

1. Repetitive phrasing:

Original: "...how are they defined, conceptualised, configured and operationalised so as to achieve the desired outcomes."

Suggested change: "...how they are defined, conceptualized, configured, and operationalized to achieve desired outcomes."

Explanation: "so as to" can be simplified to "to," and I adjusted the spelling of "conceptualised" and "operationalised" to "conceptualized" and "operationalized" to maintain consistency with American English.

2. Verb agreement:

Original: "...the four principles of integrated landscape approaches (1) Landscape Partnership (2) Shared Understanding (3) Vision and Planning and (4) Taking Actions need to be seen as strategic management..."

Suggested change: "...the four principles of integrated landscape approaches (1) Landscape Partnership, (2) Shared Understanding, (3) Vision and Planning, and (4) Taking Action, need to be seen as strategic management..."

Explanation: "Taking Actions" should be singular ("Taking Action") for consistency.

Additionally, a comma was added after each item for better readability.

3. Redundant phrasing:

Original: "...distributed leadership practices: engaging leadership practice, developing leadership practice, enabling leadership practice and the empowering leadership practice."

Suggested change: "...distributed leadership practices: engaging, developing, enabling, and empowering leadership practices."

Explanation: The phrase "leadership practice" is redundant after each of the leadership types, so I removed it to streamline the sentence.

4. Punctuation:

Original: "...the integrated landscape approaches and the four practices of distributed leadership."

Suggested change: "...the integrated landscape approaches and the four practices of distributed leadership."

Explanation: No actual change is required, but ensuring the correct comma placements in complex lists would make reading smoother.

Numerous unnecessary or missing spaces in sentences and in the reference brackets.

Incorrect typing: in the abstract: „decisio- making” instead of decision-making, on 11. th page „decisio,n” instead of decision

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methods are explained clearly in the abstract, but they could benefit from a bit more detail for clarity.

Explanation of Methods: The abstract mentions the use of Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), which are appropriate statistical methods to examine the relationships between integrated landscape approaches and distributed leadership practices. EFA is used to explore the underlying structure of the data, identifying patterns or groupings among the variables.

CFA is employed to test the validity of the conceptual framework and confirm whether the data fits the expected structure.

Clarity: While the methods are mentioned clearly, there's no mention of how the data was collected (e.g., survey, interviews, observation), which could be helpful for fully understanding the research approach. You could add a sentence such as:

"Data were collected through a survey instrument distributed to relevant stakeholders, followed by statistical analysis using EFA and CFA to validate the model."

Sample Size or Participant Details: The abstract doesn't provide specifics on the sample size or characteristics of the participants, which could strengthen the explanation. A brief reference to the sample would improve the understanding of the context.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the paper is fairly clear, but there are some minor issues with sentence structure, punctuation, and consistency in spelling and phrasing. These can be easily fixed by revising sentences for clarity and coherence.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion is accurate and well-supported by the content of the article. It encapsulates the main points and results, offering a solid summary. However, a bit of tightening up and more specific results could enhance clarity.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list of references is comprehensive, covering both theoretical and empirical sources across multiple disciplines, and it appropriately supports the paper's focus on integrated landscapes and distributed leadership. However, improving consistency in formatting and potentially adding a few more recent or methodological references could further enhance its robustness.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

### **Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The title is clear but can be streamlined for brevity. Consider removing the repetition of "practices of distributed leadership" to make it more concise.

The abstract is generally well-written, but it could benefit from mentioning the sample size and data collection methods for greater clarity. Ensure consistent spelling (e.g., "conceptualized" instead of "conceptualised") and sentence structure, particularly in long sentences, to improve readability. Some sentences are long and complex. Consider breaking them into smaller, clearer sentences to enhance comprehension. Review the punctuation, especially in lists and around complex sentences. For example, ensure commas are consistently placed for better readability.

The reference list is comprehensive but should be formatted consistently in APA style. Ensure italics for journal and book titles, and check for proper inclusion of DOIs and volume numbers where necessary. While the methods are mentioned, consider adding more detail on the data collection process (e.g., survey, interviews) to provide a clearer understanding of the methodology. The conclusion accurately reflects the paper's results but could be more concise. Including more specific results or examples could strengthen the conclusion. Ensure that the paper references the latest studies in both the theoretical and empirical fields to keep the research current and well-supported.

By addressing these points, the paper could be made clearer, more concise, and better aligned with academic writing standards

-----

-----  
Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

### **The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title focuses on integrated landscape approaches and distributed leadership practices, matching the paper's content. However, it is overly long and could be made more concise for clarity.

### **The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract outlines the objectives, theoretical background, and results (relationship between integrated landscape approaches and distributed leadership practices). The methods (EFA, CFA) are mentioned, though briefly. Greater detail on the methodology would enhance completeness.

### **There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The paper contains several grammatical inconsistencies, awkward sentence constructions, and minor spelling mistakes (e.g., "decisio-making" instead of "decision-making"). These errors do not hinder understanding but reduce overall polish.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methodology section describes the longitudinal study, sampling, data collection, and statistical analyses (EFA, CFA, SEM). The explanation is comprehensive and appropriate for a scientific paper.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The results are presented with tables and figures, supported by statistical analysis. They are generally clear, but some sections are dense and could benefit from more concise interpretation for easier comprehension.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusions accurately reflect the findings and theoretical implications discussed in the paper. They are logically derived from the results and provide clear practical and policy implications.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The reference list is extensive, current, and relevant to the research topic. It includes a wide range of scholarly sources, strengthening the academic foundation of the study.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed



**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The paper is strong regarding methodology, theoretical grounding, and references. Minor weaknesses include grammatical errors and an overly complex title.

---