



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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the abstract summarize the article clearly and effectively?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the literature review adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the presentation of the findings adequate and consistent?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the suggestions meaningful, valid, and based on the findings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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	The title does not fully reflect the issue under study ("determine the effect of managerial effectiveness, work environment, teamwork, and self-development on work engagement"). Therefore, it is suggested that the authors of the manuscript consider modifying it. Regarding the Abstract, it would be convenient to include the conclusions of the study, since only the results found are listed.
Introduction and Literature Review	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

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Research Methods	<p>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.</p>
Research Findings	<p>The results could be described in greater detail.</p>
Discussion	<p>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.</p>
Conclusion and Suggestions	<p>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.</p>
References and Citation	<p>Review in depth the citation and reference styles, since there are numerous errors and APA 7th edition standards are not followed in all cases.</p>
Language	<p>Some errors are noted, so additional reading and review is required.</p>
Other issues	