

Review of: "Developing and Supporting High-Performing Faculty Teams in Engineering Institutions"

Christopher Amoah¹

¹ University of the Free State

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Developing and Supporting High-Performing Faculty Teams in Engineering Institutions

Abstract

- The abstract section failed to summarise the following criteria areas; methodology, finding, implication and value of the napper. This must be included
- Keywords must be arranged in alphabetical order. Some of the keywords are stated as a sentence. This is not acceptable. It should be a single word or 2.
-

Introduction

- This section is inadequate and does not cover all the necessary areas. There should have been a discussion regarding the problem at hand, what other studies have done in this research area, and the existing gap that calls for this study, including what this study intends to do about the problem.
- Section 2 should be part of Section 1

Relationship to Literature

This section was inadequate and poorly written. There must be references for the cited statements. Again appropriate areas were not discussed, justifying the current study.

Methodology:

- This section must be placed after the literature survey
- The methodology was shoddy, without any relevant information concerning the study's conduct. This portrays the author's lack of knowledge in the methodological aspect of s study, which is also the study's engine. Areas such as research approach, target population, sampling method, data collection techniques and data analysis method used for the study. Purposive sampling is hardly used in a survey. The author should explain how respondents were purposively selected for the survey and indicate its appropriateness.
- The author should justify the appropriateness of the sample size used

Results:

- The results need to be presented. This is not surprising since the methodology section needs to be done better. The author claimed to have contacted 128 people, yet their demographic data were not presented
- Table 2 was not interpreted, and it cannot be the only data collected
- The author should read published papers and improve the contents of this paper

Conclusion

This section is baseless since there was no appropriate discussion and findings of this study. The implication of the study's findings was absent.

Quality of Communication

Acceptable

The paper is a standard publishable article currently and must be rejected outright.