

Review of: "Art and Science of Creating High-Performing Faculty Members and Retaining Them in Indian Engineering Institutions"

Alaina Doyle¹

¹ University of North Texas System

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

****This review is written from a scientific research perspective and most feedback is based on APA guidelines.****

Abstract, title and references: The aim is clear: goal is to uncover what occurs among the faculty members in Indian engineering institutions. Author attempts to present the results as what might work in institutions.

The title proposes the reader will gain knowledge of how to retain high-performing engineering faculty in an Indian context.

References are presented within the text but inconsistently cited and referenced. To demonstrate author reviewed prior research, the author could cite previous studies of the same nature that found like results or conducted a similar study.

Introduction/background: The introduction and a review of literature are covered. Author educates the reader of what higher education is like in India, specifically, the actions of the Ministry of Education. What would improve the introduction is to cite the source of the information. Further, author is missing a distinct problem in the introduction along with a research question(s). Author should include the primary research question or problem to help the reader fully grasp what follows throughout the article.

Overview of the literature section could include the studies and support for what is known about the topic *oftenure or lack thereof (problem) in high-performing faculty (who) in India (where)*. Are there prior studies that addressed the topic? Are there theories about faculty tenure based on study results? Author does not include strong support for the study through the literature review. Are the research objectives replacing the problem or research questions? If so, author could build up to that point to help the reader navigate the rest of the article.

Methods: Author included research methodology, which is good. Authors referenced Guba and Lincoln (1994), which is also a good approach. What is missing is how the population was recruited, factual background/make-up of the sample, and how data was collected and validated. The importance of including the information deems the results' credibility. The author might want to review McInnes et al. (2017). *An Exemplar of Naturalistic Inquiry in General Practice Research* The authors of that article referenced Guba and Lincoln too. It is recommended authors go back and revise this section to include the missing information mentioned. It is also recommended the author considers a case-study approach.

Results: The results were presented. However, what is missing are quotes from participants or the presenting the results

to add to the data collected and an explanation of the results. The author attempted to present the results but there was not a flow of results. In some areas, the author missed transitions from one section to the next. It is recommended the author revise the paper to include a results section and follow the approach of prior studies like this one.

Discussion and Conclusions: Author included a discussion section. The discussion area should encompass the results of the study and from multiple angles. Generally, the discussion points back to the problem and how this study addressed the problem with support of prior studies. Author may want to ensure conclusions are supported by references along with results.

Overall: Overall, if the study applies the recommendations mentioned, the study has promise and will contribute to knowledge in the field. Author has to consider how data is presented to be considered credible in social science research. What is unclear is the author's intended audience. Is the audience leaders in Indian engineering institutions, the Ministry of Education, or others? Based on the current writing, it is difficult to determine.

Author could revise and focus on continuity and flow, conciseness and clarity, removal of contractions and colloquialisms, jargon, revisit the tone, wordiness and redundancy, and implement transitions. Authors should also refrain from the use of words like, *always*, *never*, and *only*, in making recommendations or presenting results. If authors choose to apply a methodology like APA or Harvard to structure the paper, it would help author address the feedback presented.