



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Gender and Culturally Responsive School Leadership: A Quantitative Study of Elementary Principals’ Florida’s Panhandle”

Submitted: 05 March 2026

Accepted: 28 July 2026

Published: 31 July 2026

Corresponding Author: Ezzeldin R. Aly

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n20p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nino Guliashvili
Ilia State University, Georgia

Reviewer 2: Austin Uchegbu
National Open University of Nigeria, Abuja, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement to the authors and editors of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published, or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Nino Guliashvili	
University, Country: Ilia State University, Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: May 7	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Gender and Culturally Responsive School Leadership: Principals' Practices in Florida's Elementary Schools	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper is available in the "review history" of the paper:	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
-----------	---

1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	5
<i>The title clearly reflects the central focus of the study, namely gender and culturally responsive school leadership practices among elementary school principals in Florida. It accurately represents the scope and content of the paper. For example, the manuscript specifically investigate “whether elementary school principals’ gender was associated with differences in their practices of culturally responsive leadership in Florida’s Panhandle”.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
<i>The abstract successfully summarizes the study’s objectives, methodology, and major findings. It clearly states that the study examined the practices of cultural responsiveness among elementary school principals in Florida’s Panhandle using CRPRS and Chi-square analysis.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are some repetitive phrases that are used consecutively in one passage, for instance “culturally responsive leadership”, “equity”, and “inclusive school environments”.</i> Punctuation mistakes could also be checked.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The methodology section is generally well organized and provides sufficient detail regarding research design, instrumentation, and statistical analysis.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
“Although gender was not found to be a significant predictor of overall practices, one hypothesis revealed a statistically significant association within a specific domain of culturally responsive practice. This finding suggests that certain leadership behaviors within that domain may vary across gender groups.” And it is followed by “The results were not significant based on an alpha value of .05, $\chi^2(2) = 2.616$, $p = 0.270$.” This occurrence requires more clarification. Additionally, some sections repeat the same findings multiple times, and the presentation of statistical tables could be clearer and more concise.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusions are generally supported by the findings and effectively connect the study to broader discussions of educational equity and culturally responsive leadership. But one aspect has to be considered. The conclusion states “Culturally responsive leadership must be understood as a practice grounded in reflection and action rather than demographic gender identity alone.” This interpretation aligns with the reported findings that show no statistically significant gender differences overall. However, some conclusions could be</i>	

stated more cautiously due to the relatively small sample size and reliance on self-reported data.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references are mostly relevant. But this source “Johnson and Fuller (2020) define culturally responsive school leadership...” is not provided in the reference list.</i> <i>DOI – has to be used consistently in the reference list.</i> <i>I would advise checking the references in relation to corresponding academic style and format.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript addresses an important topic and demonstrates potential for publication. However, it requires revision based on the above-mentioned comments.

- 1. Editing, reduction of repetitive passages**
- 2. Clarification of statistical presentation**
- 3. Referencing**

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement to the authors and editors of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published, or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Austin Uchegbu	
University, Country: National Open University of Nigeria, Abuja, Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 9/5/26	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/5/26
Manuscript Title: Gender and Culturally Responsive School Leadership: Principals' Practices in Florida's Elementary Schools	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0343/26	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result
-----------	---------------

	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> This title is emerging discourse and live experience. It will contribute to knowledge.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Check my comment on the manuscript	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	None
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Consult my comments on the manuscript	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Most references are obsolete. Current literature (2016-2026) are needed	