Webmail
Univ. Bung Hatta

fivi anggraini <fivianggraini@bunghatta.ac.id>

KJSS: Decision on Manuscript ID KJSS-2020-0183

1 message

Weerachat Soopunyo <onbehalfof@manuscriptcentral.com>
Reply-To: drpaw@hotmail.com
To: fivianggraini@bunghatta.ac.id
Cc: kjss@ku.th

Fri, Dec 4, 2020 at 9:39 PM

04-Dec-2020

Dear Dr. Anggraini:

Manuscript ID KJSS-2020-0183 entitled "Perception of Lecturers of Public and Private Universities on the Importance of University's Intellectual Capital: The case study in West Sumatra Province of Indonesia" which you submitted to the Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into https://mc03.manuscriptcentral.com/kjss and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You may also click the below link to start the revision process (or continue the process if you have already started your revision) for your manuscript. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.

*** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc03.manuscriptcentral.com/kjss?URL_MASK=f67372790b204b629215ea8a3a95ac31

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also mark the changes to your manuscript within the document to clearly indicate each change made by using the track changes mode (Preferred) in MS Word or by or highlight all changes.
You can find how to use track changes function and show mark up at
https://support.office.com/en-gb/article/Video-Track-changes-and-show-markup-3faf8a07-26ed-4b76-b6a0-43cca013e6d3?ui=en-US&rs=en-GB&ad=GB

To re-submit your revised manuscript, you will need the following Microsoft Word (.doc/.docx) files: 1) Cover letter, 2) Title page, 3) Revised manuscript, and 4) Response to reviewer form(download at the journal website).

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences, your revised manuscript should be returned to KJSS within 2 weeks for further processing. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,
Dr. Weerachat Soopunyo
Section Editor
Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author
In this work: Perception of lecturers of public and private universities on the importance of university's intellectual capital: the case study in West Sumatra province of Indonesia
Some interesting studies have been carried out and the results support the claims. However, there are still some problems in the text that need to be solved. I suggest the authors to address the following comments:
1.   The Abstract needs to be rewritten to include the following:
a-   A more concise background to allow a better understanding of the issue being investigated
b-   A well-constructed research problem/question,
c-   The research timeframe,
d-   The aim of the study

2.   Author should add the grand theory of this work in the literature review
3.   In line 29 on page 2; It "Sanchez & Elena, 2006" was cited but does appear in reference page
4.   In the reference list , some initial sentences do not start with capital letters, but in the middle of a few sentences use capital letters, such as:
Meihami, B & Karimi, J. (2014). The relationship between intellectual capital reporting and universities performance. MAGNT Research Report, 2 (5), 748-754.

Naidu, P & Derani, N.E.S., (2016). A Comparative study on Quality of Education Received by Students of Private Universities Versus Public Universities. Procedia Economic and Finance., 35(2), 639-666.

5.   More updated in references should be added,
6.   Elaborate more on the elements cited in the "Result hypothesis" (H1 Supported, H1 Rejected, H1b Rejected and H1 c Supported) in Table 1 in relation with the research theory.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author
Interesting topic to explore.

Reviewer: 3

Comments to the Author
General comments:
1. Introduction
a. Provide arguments to support the research objectives.
b. Provide research gaps and problem
c. Provide a significant of the study at the end of the introduction part.
2. Literature review.
a. The first paragraph of the literature review should be moved to the
introduction part.
b. Provide a comprehensive explanation of the definition of intellectual capital.
c. Provide a solid argument of why there is a significant
the difference in the perception between private and public universities on intellectual capital (H1).
d. H1a-H1c, arguments to support each hypothesis is
required.
3. Methods
a. Explain how the questionnaires were distributed to the respondents.
b. What was the type of sampling technique employed?
c. How many questionnaires were distributed and responded rate?
d. Provide a reference on how the instruments were developed.
4. Data analysis. Provide an argument about why t-test is used to analyse the data. Please run multiple group data analysis to get a robust result.
5. Discussion and conclusion, The resulting study does not provide new insights and very limited to theoretical and managerial implications. More specifically, hypothesis
testing analysis (H1) was not-well explained and described. The author is not able to explain the results finding accordingly. More specifically, the result
finding is not able to justify the meaning of supporting the hypothesis. Limitation and future research directions are

missing.

Section Editor's Comments to Author:

Section Editor: 1
Confidential Comments to the Author:
(There are no comments.)

📄 **Reviewer-2---KJSS-2020-0183.pdf**
96K