

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JESBS_89468 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Socio-Cultural Factors and Competencies of Senior Staff in Public Universities: The Hierarchical Mediation Role of Staff Satisfaction and Sense of Belonging |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There are typos and grammatical mistakes throughout the manuscript that should be corrected; Double check the in-text citations; Based on the CFW as provided in Figure 1 is confusing. Although, the author has provided the supporting theory the hypothesis development is still not clear. According to the CFW, the author could formulate 14 hypotheses as I see through the arrows linking the predictors with the outcome. But only two hypotheses were formulated that need correction; Linking one predictor with DV need empirical support from the past related literature which is missing. This manuscript doesn't tell how these constructs were linked; The author must provide discussion with supporting previous literature for each variable to support the CFW; The results in Table 3 are not matching with the CFW- The CFW doesn't show the DV and parameters. Also, these are not parameters. The author should use the dimension or indicators. Also what type of sample techniques were used; In Table 2: explain what are the M, F, T, etc. As the author has conducted the pretesting, thus providing the scale reliability value before and after the actual survey. Could be better if provided both individual and integrated values; The revised model is incorrect and missing multiple values; Table 5 results are not comprehensible; several strange symbols have been used that need correction and more explanation; No need to write recommendations in the conclusion; Conclusion must be revised as it looks like a summary of this study; Instead of recommendation I would suggest that the author should provide implications in terms of theory, practicality, methodology, and social perspectives; Reference list consist of multiple errors and needs to be revised; Provide a questionnaire as an appendix for more understanding Correct the mistakes in the original manuscript. For reference I have highlighted a few yellow colours; | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The indicated typos and grammatical mistakes throughout the manuscript were corrected as suggested. However, the words, malfunctional (positive but weak consequences) and eufunctional (positive consequences) are not typos mistakes. Nonetheless, they were replaced as suggested. Also, the word, staff, is a collective noun and can take either a singular or plural verb depending on the context. So, therefore, 'staff are' is correct for UK spelling but wrong for USA spelling. The language of the paper was based on UK spelling. The in-text citations were doubled checked as recommended. The stated hypotheses were revised from two to four based on the argument of the study. Based on the existing literature, the dimensions of sociocultural factors were treated as composite variable in the mediation model. However, regarding their individual contribution, the hierarchical regression presented the influences separately. Also, the needed empirical supports were provided as recommended. It is true that the results in Table 3 are not matching with the conceptual framework of the study. This is so because the framework treated staff competencies as a variable with three dimensions. These dimensions were pooled together to form the composite variable called staff competencies. However, the analysis treated the dependent variable as multivariate. The table was deleted and the discussion were merged with the hierarchical regression table which is consistent with the framework. Clarification on sample techniques used has been highlighted under the sub-header, population and sampling procedure, in paragraph 2 line 1-5. The sample used was based on the recommendations of Yamane (1967) and Kelly (2016) who indicated that a sample of 5 – 10 percent of an accessible population in a survey is appropriate. In Table 2, the letters (M, F & T) used were explain under the table as suggested. The tested model was revised as suggested by ensuring that only socio-cultural factors that predicted staff competencies significantly were considered. Staff competencies were made up of three indicators: innovativeness, proactiveness and risk-taking ability. These indicators were pooled together to form the composite variable called staff competencies, which was used in the analysis. The results in Table 5, now Table 4, are able to provide the needed information to test the second, third and fourth hypotheses. The 'symbols' are not generated by me. The results are the total, direct and indirect effects results when one runs PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Version 3.5.3 written by Andrew F. Hayes for mediation analysis. However, the interpretation of what the results mean has been presented logically. The conclusion was revised as suggested. Instead of recommendation, implications of the study with regard to theory, practice, and policy were presented as suggested. The indicated mistakes were corrected in the original manuscript as suggested. Also, the in-text citations were rearranged chronologically instead of alphabetically as done earlier based on APA style. The questionnaire was provided as an appendix for more understanding as suggested. Also, the reference list was revised based on the author's guide or template to deal with the multiple indicated errors. |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | 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) |
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |