

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEBA_115397</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Does Employee Engagement Strategy matter? An Intervention to Improve Job Embeddedness of Employees In The Private Higher Education Institutions</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>COMMENTS TO AUTHOR(S)</p> <p>Manuscript: <b>“Does Employee Engagement Strategy matter? An Intervention to Improve Job Embeddedness of Employees In The Private Higher Education Institutions”</b>.</p> <p>The paper presents a study to highlight the mediating role of job engagement between work overload and work-family conflict and job embeddedness. Below are the recommended revisions to be made.</p> <p>Some major problems are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The author(s) used 'job overload' in keywords but, throughout the manuscript, 'work overload' was mentioned. The word job and work may sound similar but different in the meaning. Being a lecturer is a job but the manuscript is measuring the work of lecturers.</li> <li>2. In introduction – 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, “According to Hernandez et al (2014), Job embeddedness will be more effective” was written. The word 'job' should be in small letter.</li> <li>3. In introduction – 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, “Moreover, many HEIs still provide remuneration and benefits considered less competitive compared to PUs.” was written which is incorrect in sentence structure. It can be 'remuneration and benefits which are considered' and so on.</li> <li>4. In part 2 – material and methods, the author(s) said private higher education institutions have unspecified number of employees. But the 10 times rule was applied for the sample size calculation and data collection. This method is good only when the population size is relatively small and if not, can lead to weak statistical power insufficient representation of the total population. Other better alternative methods were introduced in the article 'Should A Rule of Thumb be used to Calculate PLS-SEM Sample Size' written by Chanta Jhantasana.</li> <li>5. In 2.2 Leadership, four indicators were introduced: 1) decision-making, or DM; (2) communication skill, or C; (3) task and responsibility delegation skill, or TRD; and (4) positive job environment creation skill, or PJEC. However, in Table 2 under 3.1 Validity and Reliability Test Results, only three components were mentioned, and one is missing. Besides, the author(s) needs to describe the indicator name in full structure rather than coding those as Y1, Y2 or Y3. The international readers will not know what Y1 is just by looking at the table.</li> <li>6. In the titles of 3.1 and table 1 and throughout the manuscript, there are incorrect spelling or spelling written in non-English for hypothesis and descriptive respondent. The language should be in English.</li> <li>7. In table 1 – gender, the term 'men' and 'women' were used. It is recommended the author(s) male and female which are the general biological terms to describe gender. Positions are not arranged in lowest to highest or highest to lowest order. 'Assistant lecturer' should be at the top or at the bottom considering the author(s) is not arranging those demographic variables by percent ratio. In income per month, there is no need to write 'from' or 'to' after the sign. It is just ≤ IDR 2,500,000 and ≥ IDR 5,500,000. The author(s) counted 69 respondents in the description of less than 1 year. This certainly includes assistant lecturers and lecturers because there are only 36 assistant lecturers. The remaining 33 must be from the ranks higher than an assistant lecturer. Becoming a lecture needs more than 1 year of experience which makes the data suspicious.</li> <li>8. In 3.1 – 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, it should be 'Table 1', no need to write a full stop after 1.</li> <li>9. In 3.1, starting from the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, the author(s) kept describing the assumptions of demographic differences. For example, “Differences in perception and experience between men and women can lead to variations in results or data interpretation.”, “Married respondents may have different responses or priorities in the research context compared to unmarried ones.”, or “Respondents' income levels can influence their priorities, needs, and perceptions of various aspects of life.”. If the author(s) want to mention those differences, there is a need to include literature review that support those descriptions. The author(s)</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>can directly prove it with the data analysis using PLS SEM software, one way ANOVA and so on, but there was no such thing done. It is recommended to run the PLS SEM bootstrapping to know if there are gender differences in the relationship of variables.</p> <p>10. In Table 2 – variable descriptive, the standard deviation is quite high in work-family conflict, employee engagement and job embeddedness which impacts the reliability issue. But the author(s) described those as reliable. There is something wrong with the sample.</p> <p>11. In 3.2.1, the author(s) mentioned the requirement of each test result including AVE being at least 0.5, CR being 0.7, VIF being less than 5 and so on. But there is no literature supporting those. Who stated such minimum measurement?</p> <p>12. In Table 3, most of the questionnaires are TOTALLY irrelevant and not representing the component. For example, the questionnaire “I review the job carefully” as WO3 has no relationship to the work overload. Reviewing the job does not say anything about someone having more or less workload. WFC1 “I am happy with my current job” – if someone is happy with his or her job, can we just say there is not work-family conflict? If the lecturer is not happy in the work, can the author(s) assume he or she is having a conflict in his or her family?. JE10 “I and my colleagues enjoy meeting outside the institution” – if someone loves meeting someone outside work, he or she can stay at the organization longer? Meeting someone outside can simply means friendship or closedness, but it does not explain the reason why he or she can love the job. All questionnaires MUST be validated by the previous literature or restructured it into well relevant questionnaires. The validity and reliability results are highly in doubt, it is recommended the author(s) run the reliability statistics for each questionnaire, not just mentioning the value for each component.</p> <p>13. In 3.2.1 – 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, the author(s) said “loading factors are all &gt; 0.5” which is not. It is more correct to say that “loading factors after eliminating questionnaires with low outer loadings are all &gt; 0.5”.</p> <p>14. In table 5, the average value cannot be interpreted in such a way that “The R square value of 0.444 indicates that 44.4% of the variance in the endogenous constructs is explained by the exogenous constructs”. It is better to write “55.3 percent of the variance in job embeddedness can be explained by work overload, work-family conflict and employee engagement”. Each R square, F square and Q square value should be evaluated and interpreted for each relationship.</p> <p>15. References format is not aligned, and some references are mentioned twice. Please see below for the correct format. Especially, the journal name and the volume number must be italicized.</p> <p>Randikaparsa, I., Anggara, A. A., Suparno, C., &amp; Rafinda, A. (2022). Understanding the Role of Materialism on the Relationship Between Advertising and Compulsiveness. <i>Management Analysis Journal</i>, 11(3), 253-259.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Generally speaking, the manuscript needs to be well developed in terms of sample size, survey questionnaires and the interpretation and thus scientifically incorrect.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Win Naing Soe</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lincoln University College, Myanmar</b>