

Review of: "Effect of Organisational Factors on Intrapreneurial Behaviour of Public University Academicians in Malaysia"

Orit Shamir Balderman¹

¹ Emeq Yizrael College

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thanks for the opportunity to review the article. I read the article carefully. The article is very important, but I found some points that must be addressed.

Literature Review

The links between the paragraphs should be tightened throughout the manuscript.

The rationale of the study should be strengthened to justify the research gaps. There is a list of research hypotheses that has no underlying rationale. For each hypothesis, the rationale underlying them must be provided.

Method

I am very concerned about the methodology of the study, both the data collection practices and, most importantly, the lack of critical information about the data collection process (e.g., participant screening and recruitment, including participant profiles).

Without such information, it is difficult to determine whether these participants and questions are appropriate for the proposed research question and context.

The one issue you need to respond to more fully concerns how you constructed the snowball sample. You must explain how you selected the first respondents.

How were the initial respondents selected? What started the "snowball?"

In conclusion, the author(s) should follow a more structured research methodology in presenting the sampling process and the tools they used.

Results

The results section is good, but the significant moderating effects should be monitored by simple slope analysis. The discussion of the results should be improved by comparing the findings with previous studies and the underlying theory. The potential reasons for the non-significant interaction effect should be explained. Propose the conclusion at the end of

the manuscript. The current explanation of the theoretical implications is relatively general and unconvincing. Based on the findings, more specific practical implications should be provided.

Discussion

The authors should recombine the discussion section because it is weak and does not make new contributions. They should tell the readers why the relationship between the variables is weak, moderate, or high and how they can improve it, and give some recommendations to these universities.

There is a poor connection between the theoretical framework and the discussion: as it is, the discussion is relatively poor. All sections are important and necessary, but the discussion section is of particular importance as it is the place where readers can understand the importance of the findings of the present study and thus its main contributions to the article, and how these are intertwined with previous studies.

The reference is to the university in general and as a single unit. But is this true for all departments? Since each department stands on its own and has different characteristics, it was correct to make a comparison among the different departments. Hence, I suggest updating references on this topic. I recommend that you refer to the following references:

Popper M., & Lipshitz R. (1998). Organizational learning mechanisms: a structural and cultural approach to organizational learning. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34, 161–179.

Shamir-Balderman, O. (2021). Factors affecting organizational learning: a case of a medical center. *Journal of Health Management*, 23(3), 425-440