

# **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.

### Asım 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?   |     |             |    |  |
| Does the abstract summarize the article clearly and effectively?   |     |             |    |  |
| Are the objectives set clearly?  |     |             |    |  |
| Is the issue stated clearly?   |     | $\boxtimes$ |    |  |
| Is the literature review adequate?   |     | $\boxtimes$ |    |  |
| Is the design of the research appropriate, and the exemplary, if any, suitable?  |     |             |    |  |
| Is the methodology consistent with the practice?   |     | $\boxtimes$ |    |  |
| Are the findings expressed clearly?  |     |             |    |  |
| Is the presentation of the findings adequate and consistent?   |     |             |    |  |
| Are the tables, if any, arranged well?   |     |             |    |  |
| Are the conclusions and generalizations based on the findings?   |     | $\boxtimes$ |    |  |
| Are the suggestions meaningful, valid, and based on the findings?  |     | $\boxtimes$ |    |  |
| Are the references adequate?   |     |             |    |  |
| Is the language clear and understandable?  |     | $\boxtimes$ |    |  |
| Is cohesion achieved throughout the article?   |     | $\boxtimes$ |    |  |
| Is the work contributing to the field?   |     | $\boxtimes$ |    |  |
| 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    | Comments and Notes  |  |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Manuscript        |   |  |
| Title- Abstract-  | Title and abstract are considered adequate.   |  |
| Summary           |   |  |
| Introduction and  | Although the author(s) of the manuscript have made significant improvements in the              |  |
| Literature Review | 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       |  |

|                               | this regard, the author(s) are actively encouraged to incorporate such citations into the manuscript. There are certain paragraphs in the Introduction where it is appropriate to include more quotations, for example: "The results of interviews with several absorption indicators" or "The achievements of a university roles in institutions".   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Research Methods              | Despite the recommendations made in the two previous reviews, the Method section still lacks basic information. What were they like the questionnaire (E.g. number of question, etc.)? 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. |
| Research Findings             | The results are adequately described.   |
| Discussion                    |   |
| Conclusion and<br>Suggestions | It is recommended to include limitations and future lines of research.  |
| References and<br>Citation    |   |
| Language                      |   |
| Other issues                  |   |