

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55311

**TITLE: Education as Transformation: Beyond Rankings, Metrics and Market Logic**

### 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 Name: **Dr. Anam Zehra**

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

The manuscript offers a timely and persuasive normative critique of rankings- and metrics-driven higher education, advocating for education centered on ethical, humanistic transformation. However, it reads primarily as an essay and requires stronger scholarly grounding (citations and engagement with relevant literature), clearer conceptual definitions, and more concrete evidence or cases to support its broad claims.

**Recommendation: Accept after Major Revision**

## Detailed Reviewer's Report

### Strengths

- Strong, coherent central argument**

The manuscript maintains a consistent thesis: higher education should cultivate wisdom, character, and social responsibility, and metrics/rankings must remain subordinate to human values.

- Compelling normative positioning**

The value-based framing (dignity, compassion, integrity, fairness) is persuasive and easy to follow, making the piece suitable for readers beyond a narrow academic audience.

- Links system incentives to lived institutional dynamics**

The discussion connects “market logic” to concrete consequences inside institutions

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

(dehumanized employer–employee relations, anxiety around grading, pay gaps, voice suppression), which improves relevance.

- **Constructive reform orientation**

The manuscript does not stop at critique; it proposes practical directions such as participatory decision-making, mentorship over control, curriculum balance (skills + ethical reflection), and technology/data as supportive tools rather than ends.

- **Clear moral urgency and policy resonance**

The call to “rehumanize” educational spaces is presented as timely and consequential, which can make the piece useful as a discussion or position paper for institutional leaders.

## Limitations

- **Insufficient scholarly apparatus for journal publication**

Key claims are asserted rather than demonstrated: there is minimal engagement with existing literature, no citations, and no evidence base (case examples, comparative analysis, or data) to support general statements.

- **Overgeneralization and lack of contextual boundaries**

Statements about “most institutions” and systemic conditions are not bounded by country, sector, governance model, or institutional type, which weakens analytical precision and invites counterexamples.

- **Core concepts are not defined or operationalized**

Terms such as “transformation,” “market logic,” “humanistic/holistic,” and “spiritual/ethical” are invoked but not clearly specified, making the argument harder to evaluate or translate into policy.

- **Limited engagement with strong counterarguments**

The paper acknowledges accountability and performance pressures, but it does not seriously address why metrics proliferate (funding constraints, accountability demands, information asymmetry) or what realistic alternatives look like under those constraints.

- **Organization and style need tightening**

The manuscript reads as a continuous reflective essay, with repetition and occasional language/spacing issues. Clearer sectioning (problem → drivers → impacts → evidence → recommendations), sharper topic sentences, and reduced redundancy would improve rigor and readability.