



Abdul Saman <abdulsaman@unm.ac.id>

FW: RE: 205655101 (Cogent Psychology) A revise decision has been made on your submission #TrackingId:7206422

1 pesan

HILLMAN WIRAWAN <hwirawan@deakin.edu.au>
Kepada: "abdulsaman@unm.ac.id" <abdulsaman@unm.ac.id>

12 Agustus 2022 15.23

Berikut terlampir email komunikasi Cogent Psychology. Di sini juga dilampirkan dokumen-dokumen revisi.

Hillman

Manuscript Title: EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL ON ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND WORK PERFORMANCE: THE ROLE

Manuscript DOI: 10.1080/23311908.2021.1938853

Journal: Cogent Psychology

Date proof corrections submitted: 04 June 2021

Dear Hillman Wirawan,

This email confirms that you have submitted corrections to your proofs via the Cogent OA online proofing system. Please find attached a PDF record of your corrections.

If any of this information is incorrect, please contact the Production Editor:

Arunkumar Sivanesan
Email: OAPS-production@journals.tandf.co.uk

We would be grateful if you could answer this very short questionnaire to provide feedback on how you found the online proofing process. It should take about 1-2 minutes to complete: <http://www.surveygizmo.eu/s3/90041438/CogentOA-Online-Correction-Tool>

Thank you.

Kind regards,

Cogent OA Online Proofing Team

"In accordance with the requirement of any applicable Data Protection Laws, "By including any personal data in your response to this email, you are freely consenting to this being used and stored by the company for the purpose of service delivery. This email and any accompanying attachments is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication or received the email by mistake, please notify the sender and destroy all copies. Integra Software Services Pvt Ltd. reserves the right, subject to applicable local law, to monitor and review the content of any electronic message or information sent to or from its company allotted employee email address/ID without informing the sender or recipient of the message."

From: em.cogentpsychology.0.6d1149.5598769b@editorialmanager.com <em.cogentpsychology.0.6d1149.5598769b@editorialmanager.com> On Behalf Of Cogent Psychology
Sent: Tuesday, 4 August 2020 4:19 PM
To: HILLMAN WIRAWAN <hwirawan@deakin.edu.au>
Subject: 205655101 (Cogent Psychology) A revise decision has been made on your submission

Ref: COGENTPSYCHOLOGY-2020-0055

205655101

EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL ON ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND WORK PERFORMANCE: THE ROLES OF PROCRASTINATION AND CONSCIENTIOUSNESS Cogent Psychology

Dear Hillman Wirawan

Your manuscript entitled "EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL ON ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND WORK PERFORMANCE: THE ROLES OF PROCRASTINATION AND CONSCIENTIOUSNESS", which you submitted to Cogent Psychology, has now been reviewed.

The reviews, included at the bottom of the letter, indicate that your manuscript could be suitable for publication following revision. We hope that you will consider these suggestions, and revise your manuscript.

Please submit your revision by Sep 03, 2020, if you need additional time then please contact the Editorial Office.

To submit your revised manuscript please go to <https://rp.cogentoa.com/dashboard/> and log in. You will see an option to Revise alongside your submission record.

If you are unsure how to submit your revision, please contact us on psychology@cogentoa.com

Please ensure that you include the following elements in your revised submission:

- * public interest statement - a description of your paper of NO MORE THAN 150 words suitable for a non-specialist reader, highlighting/explaining anything which will be of interest to the general public (to find about more about how to write a good Public Interest Statement, and how it can benefit your research, you can take a look at this short article: <http://explore.cogentoa.com/author-tool-kit/public-interest-statement>)
- * about the author - a short summary of NO MORE THAN 150 WORDS, detailing either your own or your group's key research activities, including a note on how the research reported in this paper relates to wider projects or issues.

You also have the option of including the following:

- * photo of the author(s), including details of who is in the photograph - please note that we can only publish one photo
- * cover image - you are able to create a cover page for your article by supplying an image for this purpose, or nominating a figure from your article. If you supply a new image, please obtain relevant permissions to reproduce the image if you do not own the copyright.

If you require advice on language editing for your manuscript or assistance with arranging translation, please do consider using the Taylor & Francis Editing Services.

Please ensure that you clearly highlight changes made to your manuscript, as well as submitting a thorough response to reviewers.

We look forward to receiving your revised article.

Best wishes,

Peter Walla

Editor-in-Chief

Cogent Psychology

Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:

Title, Abstract and Introduction – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Methodology / Materials and Methods – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Objective / Hypothesis – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Figures and Tables – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Results / Data Analysis – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Interpretation / Discussion – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Conclusions – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

References – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Compliance with Ethical Standards – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Sound

Writing – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Supplemental Information and Data – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Not applicable

Comments to the author

Reviewer 1: The study addresses an interesting topic at the interplay between positive psychology, personality psychology, and two important subfields – educational psychology and industrial and organizational psychology. The authors collected data not only from psychology students but also from employees from several organizations, which is one of the strengths of the study. Both samples were large. The findings are informative for future research regarding the importance of developing positive psychology interventions in higher education and at the workplace. Nevertheless, several major and minor issues should be addressed to improve the presentation of this research and to strengthen the hypothesis testing. To this end, a commented version of the manuscript is also attached to this review, pointing out some but not all of the aspects that need revisions, along with some suggestions.

1. The manuscript should be proofread, ideally by a native English speaker. If this is not possible, a person highly proficient in English should carefully read the text. The article contains many writing issues that strongly affected not only the reading clarity but also potentially the conceptual correctness (for example, the use of "personality type" instead of "trait").
2. The introductory section needs more references, as indicated in the attached pdf. Also, the rationale of the study and the arguments supporting the hypothesis should be presented in a more organized, solid manner. For example, the ideas should not be repeated redundantly, but in a convincing, systematic stream. To this end, the authors may find the following article useful: Grant, A. M., & Pollock, T. G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—Part 3: Setting the hook. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 873-879.
3. Also, some definitions and concepts in the introductory part need revisions/clarifications, as indicated in the attached pdf. In the same vein, the ambiguity of the text would decrease if the term "it" is used less at the beginning of a new sentence.
4. A consistent abbreviation for psychological capital (e.g., PsyCap or PC or another form, but not both) should be used throughout the paper.
5. The hypotheses need to be rewritten more precisely, according to the research methodology and statistical procedures that the authors applied.
6. The methodology section requires some important clarifications. Mentioning what method of random selection was employed for each sample would be useful. Also, authors are advised to provide more details regarding the collection procedure – they mentioned that they employed a three-wave procedure but it is not clear what they measured at each time point and how they used the three datasets. Similarly, more information regarding the translation of the questionnaires would be beneficial. Finally, the authors reported some information regarding the factorial structure and internal consistency of the questionnaires. However, it is not clear whether the indicators were extracted from the data they gathered or from the literature.
7. A potential suggestion would be to rethink the whole data analysis approach. For example, if the data was collected using a three-wave design, testing cross-lagged structural equation models might yield really interesting insights. Nevertheless, if the authors decide to keep the current approach, they are advised to add more information regarding the procedure they followed to test the moderated mediation effects. For example, it is not clear whether they used the PROCESS macro developed by Andrew Hayes. From my understanding of the results section, it appears that the authors employed a series of regressions in a fragmented manner – first the moderation segment, then the mediation segment, but not the model comprising both segments as a whole (conditional process analysis). Thus, the targeted relationship between PsyCap and performance at different levels of conscientiousness might not have been addressed. To address this comment and present the results more clearly, the

authors might find useful the following book and article:

Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. The Guilford Press
Rees, T. I. M., & Freeman, P. (2009). Social support moderates the relationship between stressors and task performance through self-efficacy. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 28(2), 244-263.

8. Tables 2 and 4 need to be edited. A sample regression table for moderation analysis could be seen at <https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/tables-figures/sample-tables#regression>
9. The authors made a good effort in discussing the results and identifying the limitations of their study. Adding potential explanations of why the two samples showed different patterns of connections between variables would be interesting. Moreover, they should stress out more clearly the novelty and contributions of their study and the practical implications of the findings.

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/cogentpsychology/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

Dari: HILLMAN WIRAWAN

Terkirim: 03 February 2021 20:06

Ke: psychology@cogentoa.com

Subjek: BLS: RE: 205655101 (Cogent Psychology) A revise decision has been made on your submission #TrackingId:7206422

Dear Dr. Cherry Roque,

Hope this email finds you happy and healthy,

I sincerely apologize if this email bugs you. I am in the middle of documenting all my publications for my promotion at my university. If you don't mind, could you please let me know if my manuscript still on hold? I do appreciate your help. Please let me know if anything we should do to expedite the process.

Sincerely,

Hillman

Dari: psychology@cogentoa.com <psychology@cogentoa.com>

Terkirim: 26 November 2020 00:58

Ke: HILLMAN WIRAWAN <hwirawan@deakin.edu.au>

Subjek: BLS: RE: 205655101 (Cogent Psychology) A revise decision has been made on your submission #TrackingId:7206422

Dear Dr. Hillman,

I sincerely apologise for the delay in publication of your submission.

Your accepted submission is currently placed on hold for the completion of some necessary administrative checks. Please be assured that as soon as the checks have been completed, we shall send you a confirmation regarding the next steps.

On behalf Cogent Psychology, I would like to thank you for your patience during this process. I do hope the delay you have experienced will not discourage you from submitting any future research to Cogent Psychology in the future.

If there is anything I can do to help, please do let me know.

Best regards,

Cherry Roque -Journal Editorial Office

On behalf of Cogent Psychology

Taylor & Francis Group

4 Park Square | Milton Park | Abingdon | Oxon | OX14 4RN | UK

From: hwirawan@deakin.edu.au

Sent: 21-11-2020 09.36 AM

To: psychology@cogentoa.com

Cc:

Subject: BLS: RE: 205655101 (Cogent Psychology) A revise decision has been made on your submission

Dear Dr. Cherry Roque,

Hope this finds you well,

I am writing regarding our manuscript, I just want to make sure that we didn't miss any instructions from the journal. It has been a while since we received an "accept" decision from the journal. Please let us know if anything we should complete at this stage. I am aware that the reviewer required some minor changes to the manuscript and we still need to complete article processing charge. Could you please inform us the approximate date when the manuscript will be released for publication? We are really pleased to submit our manuscript to cogent psychology, can't wait to see our manuscript published.

best regards,

Hillman

Dari: psychology@cogentoa.com <psychology@cogentoa.com>

Terkirim: 09 October 2020 19:09

Ke: HILLMAN WIRAWAN <hwirawan@deakin.edu.au>

Subjek: BLS: RE: 205655101 (Cogent Psychology) A revise decision has been made on your submission #TrackingId:7206422

Dear Dr. Hillman,

Thank you for your email.

I can confirm that your manuscript has received an "Accept" decision, however, it is currently on hold as there is a clarification with your paper's peer review. Once this has been resolved, I will then complete the final checks on your submission to ensure we have all we need for publication and will proceed your paper to production. You will then have a chance to make minor amendments to your manuscript at proof stage. Please find attached files as requested.

If you have any further queries, don't hesitate to let me know.

Best regards,

Cherry Roque -Journal Editorial Office
On behalf of Cogent Psychology
Taylor & Francis Group
4 Park Square | Milton Park | Abingdon | Oxon | OX14 4RN | UK

From: hwirawan@deakin.edu.au
Sent: 09-10-2020 09.48 AM
To: psychology@cogentoa.com
Cc:
Subject: BLS: RE: 205655101 (Cogent Psychology) A revise decision has been made on your submission

Dear Cherry,

I writing regarding my submission to the Cogent Psychology Journal with following details:

Ref: COGENTPSYCHOLOGY-2020-0055R1

205655101

EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL ON ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND WORK PERFORMANCE: THE ROLES OF PROCRASTINATION AND CONSCIENTIOUSNESS Cogent Psychology

I have received an email from the editor saying that my manuscript has been accepted for publication but I still need to make some minor revisions. However, I am having hard time to locate the last draft I submitted to the submission system, could you please send me the revised version of my draft via this email, I really appreciate your help.

Also, when will be the revision button available on the submission system? should I just wait for the next instruction or should I send my revised manuscript through this email?

Regards,

Hillman

Dari: psychology@cogentoa.com <psychology@cogentoa.com>
Terkirim: 08 September 2020 07:34
Ke: HILLMAN WIRAWAN <hwirawan@deakin.edu.au>
Subjek: Re: RE: 205655101 (Cogent Psychology) A revise decision has been made on your submission #TrackingId:7206422

Dear Dr. Hillman,

Thank you for the request to extend your resubmission deadline.

I am pleased to confirm that your request has been granted, and the online submission system has now been updated, to reflect this change.

Your new due date is September 21, 2020.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Best regards,

Cherry Roque -Journal Editorial Office
On behalf of Cogent Psychology
Taylor & Francis Group
4 Park Square | Milton Park | Abingdon | Oxon | OX14 4RN | UK

From: hwirawan@deakin.edu.au
Sent: 05-09-2020 08:17 AM
To: psychology@cogentoa.com
Cc:
Subject: Re: RE: 205655101 (Cogent Psychology) A revise decision has been made on your submission

Dear Ricks,

We expect the revised manuscript will be ready by 21st of September, thank you for your support, we really appreciate it.

Best,

Hillman

On Sep 4, 2020 16:47, psychology@cogentoa.com wrote:

Dear Dr Hillman,

Thank you for your email.

With this, may we know when is the most suitable time for you to submit your revision?

Many thanks in advance, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Best Regards,

Ricks Dalida - Journal Editorial Office

On behalf of **Cherry Roque**

On behalf of Cogent Psychology
Taylor & Francis Group
4 Park Square | Milton Park | Abingdon | Oxon | OX14 4RN | UK

From: hwirawan@deakin.edu.au
Sent: 04-09-2020 03:57
To: Ricky.Dalida@spi-global.com
Cc:
Subject: Re: RE: 205655101 (Cogent Psychology) A revise decision has been made on your submission

Hi,
Thanks for the reminder, I have informed Cherry regarding my request to extend the deadline.

Regards,
Hillman

-----Original Message-----

From: em.cogentpsychology.0.6d1149.5598769b@editorialmanager.com <em.cogentpsychology.0.6d1149.5598769b@editorialmanager.com> On Behalf Of Cogent Psychology
Sent: Tuesday, 4 August 2020 4:19 PM

To: HILLMAN WIRAWAN <hwirawan@deakin.edu.au>

Subject: 205655101 (Cogent Psychology) A revise decision has been made on your submission

Ref: COGENTPSYCHOLOGY-2020-0055

205655101

EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL ON ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND WORK PERFORMANCE: THE ROLES OF PROCRASTINATION AND CONSCIENTIOUSNESS Cogent Psychology

Dear Hillman Wirawan

Your manuscript entitled "EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL ON ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND WORK PERFORMANCE: THE ROLES OF PROCRASTINATION AND CONSCIENTIOUSNESS", which you submitted to Cogent Psychology, has now been reviewed.

The reviews, included at the bottom of the letter, indicate that your manuscript could be suitable for publication following revision. We hope that you will consider these suggestions, and revise your manuscript.

Please submit your revision by Sep 03, 2020, if you need additional time then please contact the Editorial Office.

To submit your revised manuscript please go to <https://rp.cogentoa.com/dashboard/> and log in. You will see an option to Revise alongside your submission record.

If you are unsure how to submit your revision, please contact us on psychology@cogentoa.com

Please ensure that you include the following elements in your revised submission:

* public interest statement - a description of your paper of NO MORE THAN 150 words suitable for a non-specialist reader, highlighting/explaining anything which will be of interest to the general public (to find about more about how to write a good Public Interest Statement, and how it can benefit your research, you can take a look at this short article: <http://explore.cogentoa.com/author-tool-kit/public-interest-statement>)

* about the author - a short summary of NO MORE THAN 150 WORDS, detailing either your own or your group's key research activities, including a note on how the research reported in this paper relates to wider projects or issues.

You also have the option of including the following:

* photo of the author(s), including details of who is in the photograph - please note that we can only publish one photo

* cover image - you are able to create a cover page for your article by supplying an image for this purpose, or nominating a figure from your article. If you supply a new image, please obtain relevant permissions to reproduce the image if you do not own the copyright.

If you require advice on language editing for your manuscript or assistance with arranging translation, please do consider using the Taylor & Francis Editing Services.

Please ensure that you clearly highlight changes made to your manuscript, as well as submitting a thorough response to reviewers.

We look forward to receiving your revised article.

Best wishes,

Peter Walla
Editor-in-Chief
Cogent Psychology

Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:

Title, Abstract and Introduction – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Methodology / Materials and Methods – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Objective / Hypothesis – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Figures and Tables – overall evaluation
Reviewer 1: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Results / Data Analysis – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Interpretation / Discussion – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Conclusions – overall evaluation
Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

References – overall evaluation
Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Compliance with Ethical Standards – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Sound

Writing – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Supplemental Information and Data – overall evaluation Reviewer 1: Not applicable


Comments to the author


Reviewer 1: The study addresses an interesting topic at the interplay between positive psychology, personality psychology, and two important subfields – educational psychology and industrial and organizational psychology. The authors collected data not only from psychology students but also from employees from several organizations, which is one of the strengths of the study. Both samples were large. The findings are informative for future research regarding the importance of developing positive psychology interventions in higher education and at the workplace. Nevertheless, several major and minor issues should be addressed to improve the presentation of this research and to strengthen the hypothesis testing. To this end, a commented version of the manuscript is also attached to this review, pointing out some but not all of the aspects that need revisions, along with some suggestions.

1. The manuscript should be proofread, ideally by a native English speaker. If this is not possible, a person highly proficient in English should carefully read the text. The article contains many writing issues that strongly affected not only the reading clarity but also potentially the conceptual correctness (for example, the use of “personality type” instead of “trait”).
2. The introductory section needs more references, as indicated in the attached pdf. Also, the rationale of the study and the arguments supporting the hypothesis should be presented in a more organized, solid manner. For example, the ideas should not be repeated redundantly, but in a convincing, systematic stream. To this end, the authors may find the following article useful: Grant, A. M., & Pollock, T. G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—Part 3: Setting the hook. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 873-879.
3. Also, some definitions and concepts in the introductory part need revisions/clarifications, as indicated in the attached pdf. In the same vein, the ambiguity of the text would decrease if the term “it” is used less at the beginning of a new sentence.
4. A consistent abbreviation for psychological capital (e.g., PsyCap or PC or another form, but not both) should be used throughout the paper.
5. The hypotheses need to be rewritten more precisely, according to the research methodology and statistical procedures that the authors applied.
6. The methodology section requires some important clarifications. Mentioning what method of random selection was employed for each sample would be useful. Also, authors are advised to provide more details regarding the collection procedure – they mentioned that they employed a three-wave procedure but it is not clear what they measured at each time point and how they used the three datasets. Similarly, more information regarding the translation of the questionnaires would be beneficial. Finally, the authors reported some information regarding the factorial structure and internal consistency of the questionnaires. However, it is not clear whether the indicators were extracted from the data they gathered or from the literature.
7. A potential suggestion would be to rethink the whole data analysis approach. For example, if the data was collected using a three-wave design, testing cross-lagged structural equation models might yield really interesting insights. Nevertheless, if the authors decide to keep the current approach, they are advised to add more information regarding the procedure they followed to test the moderated mediation effects. For example, it is not clear whether they used the PROCESS macro developed by Andrew Hayes. From my understanding of the results section, it appears that the authors employed a series of regressions in a fragmented manner – first the moderation segment, then the mediation segment, but not the model comprising both segments as a whole (conditional process analysis). Thus, the targeted relationship between PsyCap and performance at different levels of conscientiousness might not have been addressed. To address this comment and present the results more clearly, the authors might find useful the following book and article:
Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. The Guilford Press
Rees, T. I. M., & Freeman, P. (2009). Social support moderates the relationship between stressors and task performance through self-efficacy. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 28(2), 244-263.
8. Tables 2 and 4 need to be edited. A sample regression table for moderation analysis could be seen at <https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/tables-figures/sample-tables#regression>
9. The authors made a good effort in discussing the results and identifying the limitations of their study. Adding potential explanations of why the two samples showed different patterns of connections between variables would be interesting. Moreover, they should stress out more clearly the novelty and contributions of their study and the practical implications of the findings.

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/cogentpsychology/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.


6 lampiran


 **2_21092020.Rev3.docx**
25K


 **3_21092020.Rev3.docx**
49K

 **AcceptedAuthorPublishingAgreement.pdf**

42K

 **COGENTPSYCHOLOGY-2020-0055_reviewer (1)_Comments.pdf**
1555K

 **1_21032020[1254]_first draft.docx**
152K

 **1_21092020.Rev3.docx**
249K