



## International Journal of Instruction Article Evaluation Form

Mr. /Mrs.

It is to acknowledge you that the Executive Committee of *International Journal of Instruction* has decided that the article mentioned below would be reviewed by you. Thank you very much for your contributions.

**Asim ARI**  
**Editor in Chief**

**Name of the article:** Lecturer's Work Engagement: The Key Success of Colleges

After reviewing the attached article, please read each item carefully and select the response that best reflects your opinion. To register your response, please **mark** or **type in** the appropriate block.

	Yes	Partially	No
Do you think the title is appropriate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the abstract summarize the article clearly and effectively?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the objectives set clearly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the issue stated clearly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the literature review adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the design of the research appropriate, and the exemplary, if any, suitable?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the methodology consistent with the practice?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the findings expressed clearly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the presentation of the findings adequate and consistent?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the tables, if any, arranged well?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the conclusions and generalizations based on the findings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the suggestions meaningful, valid, and based on the findings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the references adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the language clear and understandable?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is cohesion achieved throughout the article?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the work contributing to the field?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- Evaluation:**
- The article can be published as it is.
  - The article can be published after some revision.
  - The article must undergo a major revision before it can be resubmitted to the journal.
  - The article cannot be published.

Would you like to see the revised article if you have suggested any revisions?  Yes  No

**Please write your report either on this paper or on a spare paper.**

### REPORT

Section of the Manuscript	Comments and Notes
Title- Abstract- Summary	After the modifications carried out, the title and abstract are considered adequate.
Introduction and Literature Review	Although the author(s) of the manuscript have made significant improvements in the Introduction and in the Literature Review, there are still some aspects that need to be modified. There are still data whose sources have not been cited. For example, where were the data for Figure 1 taken from? Something similar happens in the first part of the Introduction. The results of a series of interviews and questionnaires are referred to, but the source is not mentioned. In fact, at the end of this section it is stated: "From the results of the survey that has been conducted", but the source of such a survey is not indicated. In

	<p>this regard, the author(s) are actively encouraged to incorporate such citations into the manuscript. On the other hand, it is appreciated that several citations have been extracted from Taylor (2014), such as Harter et al., Macey or Alfes et al. A greater variety of citations is suggested; and to try to avoid, as much as possible, citation of secondary sources.</p>
Research Methods	<p>Despite the recommendations made in the previous review, the Method section still lacks basic information. 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? The section on methodology should be greatly expanded and should describe in detail the instrument (questionnaire) and the procedure followed.</p>
Research Findings	<p>The results are adequately described.</p>
Discussion	<p>Although the discussion section has been greatly improved, a more in-depth analysis is lacking. In some sections, the discussion is limited to indicating whether or not the results are consistent with other studies, but the possible reasons for this are not explored. For example, on page 14: These results confirm the results of Tohidi (2011) and Schmidt-Wilk (2017) research, and refute the statements of (Moorhead &amp; W.Griffin, 2013) and Stephen (2015). Why do the findings not align with those of Moorhead &amp; W.Griffin (2013) and Stephen (2015)? It would be interesting to discuss with a greater degree of depth the findings of the study. In addition, it is suggested that the author(s) include some of the new citations collected in the Introduction. This would serve to support some of the ideas that have been incorporated after the first review.</p>
Conclusion and Suggestions	<p>It is recommended to include limitations and future lines of research.</p>
References and Citation	<p>Even if a reference manager, such as Mendeley, is used, it is always advisable to check the citation and reference styles, because there are often errors. For example, “and refute the statements of (Moorhead &amp; W.Griffin, 2013)” or “Ketter, P. (2016). What's The Big Deal About Employee Engagement?, Journal Assosiation For Talent Developmeny, V62 N1, 44–49.” Therefore, the author(s) are encouraged to review and proofread citations and references and adapt them to APA 7th ed. standards.</p>
Language	
Other issues	