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| **Reviewer’s comments** | **Changes made** | **Page (see highlights)** |
| The title does not fully reflect the issue under study | The Effect of Managerial Effectiveness, Work Environment, Teamwork, and Self-Development on Lecturer’s Work Engagement | title |
| The author needs to conclude the research results and briefly explain the implications of this research | The results of this study are expected to provide input to the college to improve lecturers' work engagement. Improving the work engagement of lecturers can be done directly through improving the work environment and self-development. While indirectly it can be done through increasing managerial effectiveness, and the work team is an effective mediating variable to increase lecturers' work engagement. | abstrack |
| The author needs to explain the relationship between work engagement and key success of colleges - Explain the interesting things from this research | The achievements of a university require lecturers who have high work engagement because their existence supports the success and performance of the organization. The creation of work engagement of lecturers will depend on the level of emotional and cognitive attachment to their work and organization. In particular, increasing the level of work engagement with lecturers will form private lecturers who are not only in college to work but furthermore build institutions and even society by carrying out their roles in institutions.  From the results of an initial survey on a number of PU managers and lecturers, it can be used as an interesting study to study with PU lecturers about the description of work engagement provided by a lecturer, which is a major factor for the development of education today. | p. 3 |
| This section is one of the most limited and, therefore, the one that requires the most modifications. The literature review is too scarce (only 3 authors are cited). Data are provided, probably from empirical articles, but the sources from which they were extracted are not cited. Hence, the theoretical basis is very weak and, consequently, the Discussion and Conclusions sections, respectively, are compromised. In view of this situation, it is suggested that the authors incorporate a much higher number of citations to the theoretical framework. On the other hand, some of the issues discussed in the manuscript are not addressed in sufficient depth. For example, “work engagement” is not sufficiently conceptualized, and other variables such as “managerial effectiveness”, “work environment”, “team work”, and “self-development” are not even alluded to. How do the authors understand these constructs? From what theoretical position is their study carried out? These are questions that are not made clear in the Introduction section. An international perspective is also lacking. While it is true that the study is contextualized in Indonesia and provides data on the situation in that region, it would be useful to review what is happening in other countries and areas. In this way, it would be possible to contrast what has happened in Indonesia and in other regions of the world, which would also add value to the results of the study. In view of the above, we suggest an in-depth modification of this section. | In Harter et. al., work engagement is described in an explanation as follows: a person's high emotional and cognitive relationship with work, co-workers, superiors and organizations which ultimately influence the person concerned to give more effort at work (Armstrong Michael, 2014, p. 194 ). Macey describes work engagement as an individual's awareness and willingness to focus all of his energy, show personal initiative, willingness to adapt, strive hard and be persistent to achieve organizational goals (Armstrong Michael, 2014, p. 194).  In a survey, five factors were found that influence employee work engagement, namely: 1) an attractive and challenging work environment, 2) learning and growth opportunities, 3) working with good and appropriate people, 4) fair salary, 5 ) supportive supervisor (Hedger, 2007). The survey results are supported by a survey conducted by Ketter (2016, pp. 45–50) with 75 questions in a questionnaire distributed online (covering six categories of engagement, namely: 1) people they work with, 2) what what they do, 3) the availability of growth opportunities, 4) rewards and recognition, 5) the company itself, and 6) the work environment.  According to Lockwood (2007, p. 4) work engagement is a complex concept and is influenced by many factors, including the culture in the workplace, organizational communication, managerial style that triggers trust and respect as well as the leadership adopted and the reputation of the company itself. Engagement is also influenced by organizational characteristics, such as a reputation for integrity, good internal communication, and cultural innovation.  The factors driving work engagement are as follows: the quality of leadership exercised by line managers is an important driver of employee engagement (Taylor, 2014, p. 196). Hakanen et. al. Proving through the research they have done, that supervisory support is positively related to employee engagement as is involvement in decision making and day to day control over tasks and schedules (Armstrong Michael, 2014, p. 197). Research conducted by Shu (2015), shows that managers effective has a positive influence on employee work engagement. Similarly, research conducted by Obuobisa-darko (2016), concluded that there is a relationship between managers and employees' work engagement.  In the work engagement model proposed by Bakker (2011) showed that work resources (social support from peers and supervisors, performance feedback, skill range, and autonomy) had a positive impact on engagement. Jenkins and Delbridge proposed that apart from hardware needed in human resource management, software was also needed to maintain employee engagement. In their case studies of two companies, one adopted a soft approach that is centered on work design and promoting positive workplace conditions and relationships between management and employee (Taylor, 2014, p. 197).  Employee work engagement both emotionally and behaviorally is largely determined by the climate of a high-performing work environment, which in turn affects the performance of a company or organization (Macey, Schneider, Barbera, & Young, 2009, p. 8). This is also supported by the opinion of Jack W. Wiley, Brenda J. Kowske (2011, p. 3) which states that a pleasant work environment and opportunities to improve skills are one of the drivers of employee work engagement, including in this factor is the relationship with co-workers.  One of the characteristics of employees who have work engagement is that they feel they are part of a team and something bigger than themselves (Federman, 2009, p. 32). This is in line with Hedger (2007) which suggests about five factors that influence employee work engagement, which include working with people who good and right. Furthermore, it is also reinforced by Ketter (2016) which states that work engagement is influenced by the people who work with them. Ravikumar (2013) has proven in research that teamwork has a positive effect on employee work engagement. Marpaung (2014) has proven that teamwork has an effect on employee performance. And Agarwal and Adjirackor (2016) have also proven through research that teamwork has a direct effect on productivity.  Alfes et. al., shows that engaged employees can be seen in 3 dimensions (Armstrong Michael, 2014, p. 197), namely: 1). Intellectual engagement, which is always thinking about tasks and work and how to do them well. 2). Affective engagement, having positive feelings towards work. 3). Social engagement, which is actively involved in discussing how to improve work with other employees. From these three dimensions, it can be concluded that employees who have work engagement will always think about how to develop themselves so they can do the job well. As also stated by Ueda (2012) that self-development is associated with an individual's contribution to the organization through increasing work-related skills and knowledge. Self-development is effective in improving employee task performance and organizational effectiveness.  Research on work engagement has been carried out by several previous researchers, namely Luthans and Peterson (2002) who examined the theoretical understanding of employee work engagement. Then an empirical investigation of the relationship between employee work engagement and manager effectiveness with self-efficacy as a partial mediator on 170 managers in the USA using regression analysis techniques. Mendes and Stander (2011) also conducted research on work engagement related to the variables of manager empowerment, job clarity, empowerment, and retention intention on 240 employees in South African chemical organizations using path analysis. Shu (2015) with the aim of research to determine the effect of authoritarian leadership and effective leadership on the work engagement of Chinese workers in Taiwan using path analysis techniques.  Work engagement research was also conducted by Ravikumar (2013) with the aim of knowing the effect of teamwork, work culture, leadership and compensation on work engagement in small and medium business employees in India using regression analysis techniques. Mohd, Mohd Shah, & Zailan (2016) did this study aims to explore the relationship between work engagement and rewards, work environment and work-life balance among employees in Klang Valley Malaysia using regression analysis techniques. Stanley (2016) did literature study of the relationship between work environment, creative behavior and work engagement. Biggs, Brough, & Barbour (2014) with the aim of research to determine the effect of leadership development interventions on the work environment, job satisfaction and employee engagement in Australia using multiple regression analysis techniques.  Research on work engagement in education has also been carried out by Pham-thai et al. (2018) aims to examine the relationship between work engagement, transformational leadership, high-performance human resource practices, climate for innovation, and contextual performance in academics using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis techniques. Dan Aliyah (2017) which examines the effect of the work environment, work status and workload on work engagement on 46 private university lecturers at Way Jepara Subdistrict, Lampung with path analysis techniques. | p. 3-5 |
| Basic information is missing. What were the instruments? What were they like? Since they were prepared by the authors, were they previously validated? In what way? How were they administered? It would even be convenient to attach them at the end of the manuscript. Were ethical aspects considered in the research? Nor is the sample described in sufficient detail (sex, age, years of professional experience, years of seniority in the institution, etc.). The section on methodology should be greatly expanded and should describe in detail the sample, the instrument and the procedure followed. | The indicator variables in this study are:  Table 1. Research indicators   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Variable** | **Indicators** | | Work Engagement | Spirit at work  work dedication  Absorption | | Effectiveness of Managerial | Manage and lead  Interpersonal relations  Knowledge and initiative  Success orientation  Contextual independence | | Work Environment | Physical  Non Physical | | Team Work | Cooperation  Interaction  Help each other | | Self- Development | Self-assessment  Reflection activities  Self-development action |   Data on the characteristics of respondents is shown in the following table:  Table 2. Characteristics of respondents   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Characteristics of respondents** | **percentage** | | Gender  Man  Woman | 52.5%  47.5% | | Age  < 30 years  30 – 40 years  41 – 50 years  51 – 60 tahun  › 60 years | 0.5%  26.5%  39%  26%  8% | | Years of professional experience  < 3 years  3 – 10 years  11 – 20 years  21 – 30 years  › 31 years | 7.5%  19%  38%  19.5%  16% | | Education  Master Degree  Doctoral Degree | 92%  8% | | p. 6-7 |
| Data validity techniques (explain in detail) | Convergent validity is the value of factor loading on latent variables with indicators with rule of thumb ≥ 0.5. In this study, there are some invalid manifest variable, so the manifest variable must be excluded from the model. Besides looking at the loading factor, convergent validity also sees AVE with a rule of thumb ≥ 0.5. From the results of the AVE value all constructs have a value of ≥ 0.5, so it can be concluded that the construct is valid.  Tablel 3.  Average Variance Extracted   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Variable | AVE | | Work Engagement (Y)  Effectiveness Managerial (X1)  Work Environment (X2)  Team Work (X3)  Self-Development (X4) | 0.5948  0.5395  0.5694  0.5906  0.5968 | | p. 8 |
| The Discussion section is vague and generic. This is where the substance of the study and recommendations should be presented in a consistent manner. Analysis is superficial and mostly reporting on the findings, a repetition of the previous section. Opportunities for deeper analysis are missed. For example, p. 10 indicates that the results are contrary to the findings of Stanley (2016), Mendes & Stander (2011), and Ravikumar (2013). But the discussion generated between the results of the present research and the cited studies is minimal. Therefore, it is recommended that a more in-depth analysis of the entire section be carried out | Managerial effectiveness has not been empirically tested to have a direct effect on work engagement because in the management of STIE, decision making especially relating to the development of lecturers and tertiary institutions is at the top of the leaders, namely the head of the tertiary institution or foundation. In addition STIE lecturers have a tendency to teach not only in one institution, this is because the dominant compensation of lecturers is still on semester credit units or teaching fees, in universities where the number of students is not large so the acquisition of teaching classes is not that much too. This has caused lecturers to feel that they still need to teach in other tertiary institutions to obtain compensation as expected.  The work of the lecturer team has not been empirically tested to affect work engagement due to the ineffectiveness of the implementation of teamwork at STIE lecturers. This is due to the lack of specialization of lecturer courses, because a lecturer can teach more than three or four subjects. This relates to the division of lecturer classes. In addition, there is also a lack of encouragement and internal funding from the college for teamwork, such as the preparation of lecture materials or textbooks, research and community service that should be routinely carried out by lecturers.  Managerial effectiveness has not been empirically tested to influence self-development because strategic decision makers are at the head of the tertiary institution or foundation including decisions for the development of tertiary institutions and lecturers. In addition, the self-development of lecturers has a dominant indicator of self-development actions, namely by actively following the development of knowledge relating to the task of lecturers. That is, lecturers develop themselves based on their own initiative. | p. 13, 14, 15 |
| Only the most significant results of the study are highlighted, but the implications, limitations and future lines of research are not addressed. Therefore, it is suggested that these aspects be considered | From the results of this study, it can be suggested for universities to be able to increase work engagement directly by improving the work environment, both non-physical and motivating and providing opportunities for lecturers to develop themselves. Managerial effectiveness is still needed to increase lecturer's self-engagement, because effective managerial will be able to improve a solid work environment and motivate lecturers to carry out self-development, and finally it will increase work engagement. | p. 16 |
| Review in depth the citation and reference styles, since there are numerous errors and APA 7th edition standards are not followed in all cases. | I use mendelay for refence | p. 16 |
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