

## CACTUS REVIEW FORM

Paper ID#: 2021-11

Paper Title: SELF-EFFICACY, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT, AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE - IS THERE A RELATIONSHIP?

Reviewer XXX Review Round #: 1

Date sent: (Please enter the date indicated in the e-mail): 8 February

Date due: (Please enter the date indicated in the e-mail): 6 March

PLEASE EVALUATE THE MANUSCRIPT BASED ON THE FOLLOWING SCALE:

1 = Poor

2 = Below average

3 = Average

4 = Good

5 = Excellent

N/a = Not applicable

(Please assign the score for each item below.)

	Poor			Excellent		N/a
	1	2	3	4	5	N/a
A. This paper is based on rigorous academic standards.						
B. This paper is presented in a format which is accessible by practitioners. It focuses on justification, results and implementation; has readable style.				X		
C. The paper has clarity of presentation. It is well organised, clearly written.				X		
D. The paper makes a significant contribution to the body of knowledge related to this Journal. It is highly significant, breaks new ground, and provides a foundation for future research.				X		
E. The topic of this paper is relevant, timely, and of interest to the audience of this journal.				X		
F. The rationale for the paper is well grounded. It is based on a known theory or on an interesting issue.				X		
G. The research methodology for the study is appropriate and applied properly.			X			
H. The content of this paper is technically accurate and sound.				X		
I. The supporting evidence in this paper is strongly reliable and properly validated.				X		
J. Discussion of the results is based on analysis of data; results are not overstated or overgeneralized.				X		
K. Implications and recommendations for management are relevant and useful.				X		
L. The paper is easy to read and free from grammatical or spelling errors.				X		

M. What is your recommendation? **3 Accept with minor revisions**

1	2	3	4
Clear reject	Reconsider after major revisions	Accept with minor revisions	Accept as is

N. Does this paper need a professional editing assistance? \_\_\_ Yes  No

O. Does this paper contain graphics of which the resolution needs to be improved? \_\_\_ Yes  No

P. Does this paper cite any related work published in this journal?  Yes \_\_\_ No

Q. Comments for the author: (Please present specific details using the following categories.)

SUMMARY:

Congratulations! Your paper is accepted, there are no major weaknesses that would generate declining the paper. A few suggestions for small revisions are made below.

STRENGTHES:

The method used to analyze the data (SEM).

MINOR WEAKNESSES AND SUGGESTIONS:

The measurement instrument is not described in detail.

The sample size is only 100 and it might be too small. Even if SEM techniques can be applied to smaller samples in comparison with other methods, the number of research parameters might imply a bigger sample. Hair et al. (2010) suggest a number of 15 responses for each parameter estimated in the model for data with normality issues. Since authors do not address the topic of normality of data, I cannot say exactly if the sample is too small or not.

I do not think that the paper needs professional editing, but there are some mistakes throughout the text that need to be corrected.

Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E. & Tatham, R.L., 2010. Multivariate data analysis (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Suggestions:

- Authors should, at least, mention the content of all items in the methodology section. An appendix in which the items are described, accompanied by the coding and relevant citations, might be a solution.
- In addition, a small section discussing the normality of the data would add value to the paper.
- The thresholds used in the paper should be accompanied by a relevant citation (e.g. for factor loadings, AVE etc.).

MAJOR WEAKNESSES AND SUGGESTIONS:

N/A