

HISTORI KOREPONDENSI

Histori Korepondensi	Halaman
2022-06-25 14:38: Your submission	2
HASIL REVIEW EJER REVIEWER 1	4
REVIEWER 2	6
REPLIES TO THE REVIEWERS REVIEWER 1	9
REVIEWER 2	11
2022-07-06 13:40 : Accept Submission	13

[EJER] New notification from Eurasian Journal of Educational Research



From Editor EJER <editor@ejer.com.tr>
Sender <sobiuyt@business83.web-hosting.com>
To Furtasan Ali Yusuf <fay@binabangsa.ac.id>
Reply-To Şakir Çinkır <ejer.editor@gmail.com>
Date 2022-06-25 14:38

You have a new notification from Eurasian Journal of Educational Research:

There is new activity in the discussion titled "Confirmation required" regarding the submission "THE KEY SUCCESS FACTORS OF VARIOUS QUALITY ASSESSMENT INSTITUTIONS AND THE QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICES: A META-ANALYSIS STUDY".

Link: <https://ejer.info/index.php/journal/authorDashboard/submission/678>

Şakir Çinkır

[Eurasian Journal of Educational Research](https://ejer.info)

Furtasan Ali Yusuf
Bina Bangsa University
Banten, Indonesia

Şakir Çınkır
Editor-in-Chief
Ankara University, Ankara, TURKEY

I am pleased to submit an original research article entitled, “**A Meta-Analysis Study: The Effect of Key Success Factors of Various Quality Assessment Institutions on The Quality of Higher Education Services**” by Furtasan Ali Yusuf & Laksmi Evasufi Widi Fajari for consideration for publication in *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*.

This research starts from the fact that higher education needs to continue to serve education, research, and community service and at the same time develop organizations to deal with current problems and predict the future. Several studies mention that educational quality assessment institutions that are familiar and whose policies are widely applied throughout the world. But, there are no research has examined the effect of every key success factors belongs to educational quality assessment institutions to higher education quality service by comprehensively in several countries.

For this reason, this meta-analysis is the first to examine the effect of key success factors from various quality assessment institutions on the quality of higher education in various countries. Research publications were selected based on eligibility criteria, including: (1) publications that could be searched in the online international journal search database, such as Emerald, Taylor and Francis, Publons, Springer, Proquest, ERIC, SAGE, Google Scholar, and others; (2) publications written in internationally recognized languages; (3) publications indexed by Scopus, Web of Science, Index Copernicus, or at least indexed by Google Scholar; (4) publications should be related to the key success factors of institutions evaluating the quality of higher education; (5) publications should be within the year 2004-2021; (6) publications had a value of (r), (t), or (F); (7) the sample in the publications studied was $N \geq 72$. The results revealed a positive influence of key success factors of various quality assessment institutions on the quality of higher education ($p < 0.001$; $z = 7.497$; 95% CI). The effect was categorized as a strong influence ($rRE = 0.741 [0.547; 0.935]$). Hence, this meta-analysis study can be trusted because no publication bias was detected.

I want to publish this article with *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research* because it has specific link to the journal's aims & scope. Our manuscript is so useful to improve theory about management policy maker, education policy maker and higher education quality improvement. This manuscript has not been published and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. We have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely,

Furtasan Ali Yusuf

HASIL REVIEW EJER

REVIEWER 1

Your paper entitled *The Key Success Factors Of Various Quality Assessment Institutions And The Quality Of Higher Education Services: A Meta-Analysis Study* is a well-organized meta analysis study but it seems the author was very excited to write this article, and for this reason included too many eligibility criteria, 7 or 8 of them. There seems to be only the inclusion criteria and no exclusion. It is difficult to imagine the number of studies falling as per the eligibility criteria such as 7 or 8 databases, published in all world languages, and a long time frame (2004-2021), and a few others.

Above that, the author claims that “this research strengthens and enriches the theory related to the application of key success factors of various quality assessment institutions and their relation to improving quality of higher education”. It is difficult to accept this premise and the author is advised to provide more evidences.

Later, again the author mentions more than 10 educational quality assessment institutions e.g. FIBAA, ASIIN, ABEST21 and AQA etc. and writes that this meta-analysis will examine the effect of key success factors of all these quality assessment institutions in various countries. The major challenge of this study is the quantity and huge number of criteria and too many institutions, which will rather make it a very voluminous study and involving a larger team of researchers. The current study is obviously not so voluminous nor a team effort is visible. It is suggested that the author minimizes the eligibility criteria and also the accreditation agencies so that the process of data coding, analyzing the sample characteristic other procedures are manageable and the conclusion drawn by the author become plausible. Currently, it is difficult to believe how could the author identify the 27 research publications out of thousands of which fulfilled the criteria.

This reviewer is not concerned about the results and discussion section as the author has done them effectively, but how did the author reach that stage is the main issue. Please revise.

It is also necessary to justify the Indonesian context mentioned in the beginning of this paper. Is this study based on a specific research locale? Are the implications significant to a specific country, Indonesia? If yes, the eligibility criteria do not mention Indonesia anywhere.

Since it is a meta-analysis study, where research methods like PRISMA are very popular, the author needs to mention whether such a research procedure was adopted in this study.

Please revise the paper in the light of these points and resubmit.

Makalah Anda yang berjudul Faktor-Faktor Kunci Keberhasilan Berbagai Lembaga Pengkajian Mutu Dan Mutu Layanan Perguruan Tinggi: Sebuah Studi Meta-Analisis adalah studi meta analisis yang terorganisir dengan baik tetapi tampaknya penulis sangat bersemangat untuk menulis artikel ini, dan untuk alasan ini memasukkan terlalu banyak kriteria kelayakan, 7 atau 8 di antaranya. tampaknya hanya ada kriteria inklusi dan tidak ada pengecualian. Sulit untuk membayangkan jumlah studi yang jatuh sesuai dengan kriteria kelayakan seperti 7 atau 8 database, diterbitkan dalam semua bahasa dunia, dan kerangka waktu yang lama (2004-2021), dan beberapa lainnya.

Di atas itu, penulis mengklaim bahwa “penelitian ini memperkuat dan memperkaya teori terkait penerapan faktor kunci keberhasilan berbagai lembaga penilaian mutu dan kaitannya dengan peningkatan mutu pendidikan tinggi”. Sulit untuk menerima premis ini dan penulis disarankan untuk memberikan lebih banyak bukti.

Kemudian, lagi-lagi penulis menyebutkan lebih dari 10 lembaga penilaian mutu pendidikan mis. FIBAA, ASIIN, ABEST21 dan AQA dll. dan menulis bahwa meta-analisis ini akan menguji pengaruh faktor-faktor kunci sukses dari semua lembaga penilaian kualitas ini di berbagai negara. Tantangan utama dari penelitian ini adalah kuantitas dan jumlah kriteria yang besar dan terlalu banyak institusi, yang akan membuatnya menjadi studi yang sangat produktif dan melibatkan tim peneliti yang lebih besar. Studi saat ini jelas tidak begitu banyak atau upaya tim yang terlihat. Disarankan agar penulis meminimalkan kriteria kelayakan dan juga lembaga akreditasi agar proses pengkodean data, analisis karakteristik sampel prosedur lainnya dapat dikelola dan kesimpulan yang ditarik oleh penulis menjadi masuk akal. Saat ini, sulit dipercaya bagaimana penulis bisa mengidentifikasi 27 publikasi penelitian dari ribuan yang memenuhi kriteria.

Jawab: Kami sudah menambahkan kriteria inklusi dengan mengikuti pedoman *Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)* sehingga alur pencarian dan seleksi artikel lebih jelas dan mudah dipahami. Selain itu, kami juga sudah memperbaiki kriteria inklusi kami dengan berpedoman kepada JBI critical appraisal checklist for systematic reviews and research synthesis yang ditetapkan oleh The Joanna Briggs Institute (2020).

Kami juga berharap reviewer dan pembaca pada umumnya bisa mengerti klaim kami yang menyatakan bahwa “penelitian ini memperkuat dan memperkaya teori” berdasarkan penjelasan kriteria kami yang semakin rinci. Kami percaya bahwa usaha kami dalam menyeleksi dari ribuan artikel menjadi 27 artikel dengan kriteria yang tinggi akan berdampak pada kualitas penelitian kami.

Peninjau ini tidak mempermasalahkan bagian hasil dan pembahasan sebagaimana penulis telah melakukannya secara efektif, tetapi bagaimana penulis mencapai tahap itu adalah masalah utama. Mohon direvisi.

Jawab: Kami sudah merevisinya.

Konteks Indonesia yang disebutkan di awal tulisan ini juga perlu dijustifikasi. Apakah penelitian ini didasarkan pada lokasi penelitian tertentu? Apakah implikasinya signifikan bagi negara tertentu, Indonesia? Jika ya, kriteria kelayakan tidak menyebutkan Indonesia dimanapun.

Jawab: Konteks Indonesia yang saya angkat pada bagian introduction merupakan salah satu contoh kasus yang diangkat pada permasalahan penelitian ini. Indonesia memiliki 210 juta penduduk dengan tingkat partisipasi pendidikan tinggi baru menginjak angka 14% sehingga perguruan tinggi asing memandang Indonesia sebagai pasar potensial dan menyebabkan perguruan tinggi di Indonesia perlu perbaikan. Salah satu upaya perbaikan kualitas tersebut dengan menerapkan key success factors yang ditetapkan oleh lembaga penilai kualitas. Beranjak dari kasus tersebut, kami meneliti pengaruh key success factors yang ditetapkan oleh lembaga penilai kualitas terhadap perguruan tinggi di dunia. Oleh karena itu, pada kriteria kelayakan kami tidak menyebutkan apapun perihal Indonesia.

Karena ini adalah studi meta-analisis, di mana metode penelitian seperti PRISMA sangat populer, penulis perlu menyebutkan apakah prosedur penelitian seperti itu diadopsi dalam penelitian ini.

Jawab: Kami sudah memperbaiki bagian metode penelitian seperti yang saya jelaskan sebelumnya di poin komentar pertama reviewer.

REVIEWER 2

Abstract: divide it into Purpose, Methodology, Findings and Implications for Research and Practice, adding recommendations, limitations, in the end

Introduction: should contain a brief background information about the topic (why you mention Indonesia? Is this meta-analysis study biased? Please add a few previous meta studies or systematic reviews as a rationale to support your objective. Please check if you can add a statement about rationale, purpose and research objectives along with the eligibility criteria. You may also state that there exists a research/ literature gap which shall be filled up with this meta-analysis. This section then immediately be followed by the methodology section

Methodology: The journal format requires the method section to contain Research design, meta-analysis method or procedure, and analysis. Please present your data accordingly.

Results and Discussion: These are two separate sections.. Results section contains the outcomes which may be presented in tabular form. Discussion section must contain summary of main results and brief references to previous researches.

Conclusion, Recommendations and Implications. It must include a brief conclusion of the research completed, limitations, recommendations for future research and implications for research and practice.

Abstrak: membaginya menjadi Tujuan, Metodologi, Temuan dan Implikasi untuk Penelitian dan Praktek, menambahkan rekomendasi, keterbatasan, pada akhirnya.

Jawaban: Kami telah membagi pejelasan abstrak menjadi tujuan, metodologi, hasil dan implikasi penelitian serta menambahkan limitasi dan rekomendasi bagi peneliti selanjutnya.

Pendahuluan: harus berisi informasi latar belakang singkat tentang topik (mengapa Anda menyebutkan Indonesia? Apakah studi meta-analisis ini bias? Harap tambahkan beberapa studi meta sebelumnya atau tinjauan sistematis sebagai alasan untuk mendukung tujuan Anda. Silakan periksa jika Anda dapat menambahkan a pernyataan tentang alasan, maksud dan tujuan penelitian beserta kriteria kelayakannya. Anda juga dapat menyatakan bahwa ada kesenjangan penelitian / literatur yang harus diisi dengan meta-analisis ini. Bagian ini kemudian segera diikuti oleh bagian metodologi.

Jawaban: Kami menyebutkan Indonesia di bagian pendahuluan hanya untuk mengangkat sebuah kasus saja di negara Indonesia dimana terdapat 210 juta penduduk dengan tingkat partisipasi pendidikan tinggi baru menginjak angka 14% sehingga perguruan tinggi asing memandang Indonesia sebagai pasar potensial dan menyebabkan perguruan tinggi di Indonesia perlu

perbaikan. Salah satu upaya perbaikan kualitas tersebut dengan menerapkan key success factors yang ditetapkan oleh lembaga penilai kualitas. Kami juga sudah menambahkan beberapa penelitian terdahulu dalam introduction dan alasan kami melakukan penelitian meta analisis ini. Di bagian metodologi, kami sudah menjelaskan maksud, tujuan penelitian beserta eligibility kriteria yang jelas.

Metodologi: Format jurnal memerlukan bagian metode yang memuat desain penelitian, metode atau prosedur meta-analisis, dan analisis. Harap tunjukkan data Anda sebagaimana mestinya.

Jawab: Kami sudah memperbaiki metodologi penelitian kami agar lebih mudah dipahami.

Hasil dan Diskusi: Ini adalah dua bagian yang terpisah. Bagian hasil berisi hasil yang dapat disajikan dalam bentuk tabel. Bagian diskusi harus berisi ringkasan hasil utama dan referensi singkat untuk penelitian sebelumnya.

Jawab: Kami sudah menyajikan seluruh data kami menggunakan tabel pada bagian result dan mengulas masing-masing data di bagian discussion dengan rinci.

Kesimpulan, Rekomendasi dan Implikasi. Itu harus mencakup kesimpulan singkat dari penelitian yang diselesaikan, keterbatasan, rekomendasi untuk penelitian masa depan dan implikasi untuk penelitian dan praktik.

Jawab: Kami sudah menulis simpulan penelitian dari penelitian yang diselesaikan, limitasi hingga rekomendasi penelitian untuk penelitian mendatang maupun untuk praktik pendidikan.

REPLIES TO THE REVIEWERS

REVIEWER 1

Comment 1:

Your paper entitled *The Key Success Factors Of Various Quality Assessment Institutions And The Quality Of Higher Education Services: A Meta-Analysis Study* is a well-organized meta analysis study but it seems the author was very excited to write this article, and for this reason included too many eligibility criteria, 7 or 8 of them. There seems to be only the inclusion criteria and no exclusion. It is difficult to imagine the number of studies falling as per the eligibility criteria such as 7 or 8 databases, published in all world languages, and a long time frame (2004-2021), and a few others.

Above that, the author claims that “this research strengthens and enriches the theory related to the application of key success factors of various quality assessment institutions and their relation to improving quality of higher education”. It is difficult to accept this premise and the author is advised to provide more evidences.

Later, again the author mentions more than 10 educational quality assessment institutions e.g. FIBAA, ASIIN, ABEST21 and AQA etc. and writes that this meta-analysis will examine the effect of key success factors of all these quality assessment institutions in various countries. The major challenge of this study is the quantity and huge number of criteria and too many institutions, which will rather make it a very voluminous study and involving a larger team of researchers. The current study is obviously not so voluminous nor a team effort is visible. It is suggested that the author minimizes the eligibility criteria and also the accreditation agencies so that the process of data coding, analyzing the sample characteristic other procedures are manageable and the conclusion drawn by the author become plausible. Currently, it is difficult to believe how could the author identify the 27 research publications out of thousands of which fulfilled the criteria.

Answer 1:

We have improved the research method by following the Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines so that the search and selection flow of articles is clearer and easier to understand. In addition, we have also improved our inclusion criteria by referring to the JBI critical appraisal checklist for systematic reviews and research synthesis set by The Joanna Briggs Institute (2020).

We also hope that reviewers and readers in general will understand our claim that “*this research strengthens and enriches the theory*” based on our increasingly detailed explanation of our criteria in research method. We believe that our efforts in selecting from 1330 articles to 27 articles with high criteria will have an impact on the quality of our research.

Comment 2:

This reviewer is not concerned about the results and discussion section as the author has done them effectively, but how did the author reach that stage is the main issue. Please revise.

Answer 2:

We've revised it.

Comment 3:

It is also necessary to justify the Indonesian context mentioned in the beginning of this paper. Is this study based on a specific research locale? Are the implications significant to a specific country, Indonesia? If yes, the eligibility criteria do not mention Indonesia anywhere.

Answer 3:

The Indonesian context that I raised in the introduction section is one example of a case raised in this research problem. Indonesia has 210 million people with a higher education participation rate of just 14%, so foreign universities see Indonesia as a potential market and make Indonesian universities need improvements to deal with competition. One of the quality improvement efforts is by applying the key success factors set by the quality assessment agency. Starting from this case, we examine the effect of key success factors set by quality assessment institutions on universities in the world. Therefore, in the eligibility criteria we do not mention anything about Indonesia.

Comment 4:

Since it is a meta-analysis study, where research methods like PRISMA are very popular, the author needs to mention whether such a research procedure was adopted in this study.

Answer 4:

We have improved the research methods section as I explained earlier in the reviewer's first comment point.

REVIEWER 2**Comment 1:**

Abstract: divide it into Purpose, Methodology, Findings and Implications for Research and Practice, adding recommendations, limitations, in the end

Answer 1:

We have divided the description of the abstract into the objectives, methodology, results and implications of the study and added limitations and recommendations for further researchers.

Comment 2:

Introduction: should contain a brief background information about the topic (why you mention Indonesia? Is this meta-analysis study biased? Please add a few previous meta studies or systematic reviews as a rationale to support your objective. Please check if you can add a statement about rationale, purpose and research objectives along with the eligibility criteria. You may also state that there exists a research/ literature gap which shall be filled up with this meta-analysis. This section then immediately be followed by the methodology section

Answer 2:

We mentioned Indonesia in the introduction only to raise a case in Indonesia where there are 210 million people with a higher education participation rate which has just reached 14% so that foreign universities view Indonesia as a potential market and cause Indonesian universities to need improvement. One of the quality improvement efforts is by applying the key success factors set by the quality assessment agency. We have also added some previous research in the introduction and the reasons for doing this meta-analysis. In the methodology section, we have explained the purpose, research objectives along with clear eligibility criteria.

Comment 3:

Methodology: The journal format requires the method section to contain Research design, meta-analysis method or procedure, and analysis. Please present your data accordingly.

Answer 3:

We have improved our research methodology to make it easier to understand.

Comment 4:

Results and Discussion: These are two separate sections.. Results section contains the outcomes which may be presented in tabular form. Discussion section must contain summary of main results and brief references to previous researches.

Answer 4:

We have presented all our data using tables in the results section and reviewed each data in the discussion section in detail.

Comment 5:

Conclusion, Recommendations and Implications. It must include a brief conclusion of the research completed, limitations, recommendations for future research and implications for research and practice.

Answer 5:

We have written research conclusions from the research completed, limitations to research recommendations for future research and for educational practice.



From Editor EJER <editor@ejer.com.tr>

Sender <sobiuyt@business83.web-hosting.com>

To Furtasan Ali Yusuf <fay@binabangsa.ac.id>, Laksmi Evasufi Widi Fajari <laksmievasufi@binabangsa.ac.id>

Date 2022-07-06 13:40

Furtasan Ali Yusuf, Laksmi Evasufi Widi Fajari:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, "THE KEY SUCCESS FACTORS OF VARIOUS QUALITY ASSESSMENT INSTITUTIONS AND THE QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICES: A META-ANALYSIS STUDY".

Our decision is to: Accept Submission

[Eurasian Journal of Educational Research](#)

Manuscript ID: EJER-678-2022

Date: 06th Jul 2022

Name and Surname*	:	Furtasan Ali Yusuf
University-Department*		Bina Bangsa University, Serang, Indonesia.
e-mail address*	:	fay@binabangsa.ac.id
Name and Surname*	:	Laksmi Evasufi Widi Fajari
University-Department*		Bina Bangsa University, Serang, Indonesia.
e-mail address*	:	laksmievasufi@binabangsa.ac.id
Name	:	
University-Department*		
e-mail address	:	
Name	:	
University-Department	:	
e-mail address	:	
Name		
University-Department		
e-mail address		
Name		
University-Department		
e-mail address		

It is to confirm that your paper entitled “**THE KEY SUCCESS FACTORS OF VARIOUS QUALITY ASSESSMENT INSTITUTIONS AND THE QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICES: A META-ANALYSIS STUDY**” is accepted for the publication in our journal namely “Eurasian Journal of Educational Research” Your paper will be published in Volume 99 (2022).

Regards

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şakir ÇINKIR

Editor-in-Chief

Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER)

Abstracted and Indexed in:

ESCI, SCOPUS, ERIC