
EXPERIENCE AND SATISFACTION OF SUBMISSION ARTICLES TO THE INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT JOURNAL: A CASE STUDY OF PEER REVIEWS

Khajonwong Srivareerat

Institute for Research and Development, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Thailand

E-mail: kajonwong.sr@ssru.ac.th

Nayot Kulpanich

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Thailand

E-mail: nayot.ku@ssru.ac.th

Abstract

The objectives of this research were (1) to investigate the experiences of peer reviewers and article submitters who used the Institute for Research and Development Journal of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University through the ThaiJO system and (2) to examine their satisfaction with the submission and review process. A quantitative research methodology was employed. The population consisted of peer reviewers during October 2024 - September 2025. The sample was selected purposively. The research instrument was a questionnaire, from 21 sample data. Analyzed using descriptive statistics, including percentage, mean, and standard deviation. The findings revealed that the peer reviews and research submitters had the highest level of satisfaction. In particular, the satisfaction of being a peer reviewer for the journal of the research and development institute and the suitability of the editorial staff in following up on the revision of the article. The overall satisfaction level from peer reviewers and research submitters was the highest. However, the review period for the reviewer's article is 6-10 days.

Keywords: Academic journal management, Peer review process, ThaiJO system

Introduction

The ThaiJO (Thai Journals Online (ThaiJO), 2017) system is widely recognized for the management of research articles. Initial screening, submission to assessor, and dissemination. However, common issues include lead times and consistency of evaluation criteria. Communication between the editor and reviewer, as well as the experience of using the platform (usability), all affect the quality and satisfaction of the stakeholders. Publishing research results through academic journals is an important process in confirming and disseminating knowledge in the field of research. Especially in research and development institutions, which are often sources of knowledge creation in various disciplines. Submission of research articles to academic journals must go through an evaluation process by a qualified person. This plays an important role in screening the quality and reliability of articles. Evaluating a research paper is a process that not only involves reviewing the content but also affects the experience and satisfaction of the submitter and evaluator. As a result, the submitter may not feel satisfied or understand the results. It is important to study the experience and satisfaction of participants in such a process to help research and development institutions improve the process of publishing research papers. The development of electronic journal systems in Thailand has been progressing continuously. In particular, the Thai Journal Online (ThaiJO) system is used as an important mechanism to manage the process of submitting and evaluating research papers. Simplify procedures and increase transparency in operations. In the case of Suan Sunanda Rajabhat University. A study on the preparation of a journal through the

ThaiJO 2.0 system found that the system structure and clarity of the procedures have a significant impact on the user experience and directly affect satisfaction (Kritsanakarn & Thumcharoensathit, 2023), which reflects the importance of developing the system to support users internationally. Therefore, this research aims to study the experience and satisfaction of submitting journal articles to the Research and Development Institute. Both from the perspective of the submitter and the evaluator of the article, the results will be used to improve the quality of the journal to a higher standard.

Studies on the experience and satisfaction of paper submitters and evaluators are important in many areas. As follows: Studies in this regard allow research and development institutions to monitor and improve the process of evaluating articles to be more efficient and transparent. (Tite & Schroter, 2007), which will result in the selection of high-quality, accurate and fair articles. Increasing submitter satisfaction: Submitter satisfaction is important to foster collaboration in the research industry and increase the likelihood of dissemination (Bennett et al., 2008).

Research Objectives

1. To development of article evaluation
2. To study the satisfaction of article submitters with the use of the journal services of the Research and Development Institute.

Scope of the Research

1. Research Format: This research is quantitative research with a descriptive nature that focuses on collecting data from peer reviewers and submitters to study the experience and level of satisfaction with the process of submitting articles and evaluations in the ThaiJO system.
2. Population and sample Population: Peer reviewers from journals of research and development institutions. Suan Sunanda Rajabhat University In fiscal year 2025 the sample was 21 people, including reviewers.

Research Methodology

1. Research Tools The tool used is a questionnaire, divided into 2 parts: Part 1: ThaiJO System Experience and Submission/Evaluation Part 2: Service Satisfaction Using the 5 Likert scale.
2. Data Collection The researcher conducted online and offline questionnaires to the target group. Between October 2024 and September 2025, with the cooperation of the article reviewer and the person who submitted the response.
3. Data analysis the data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed with descriptive statistics, including: Percentage Mean Standard Deviation To explain the level of experience and satisfaction of the sample of the evaluation criteria with the satisfaction of peer reviewers and submitters with the journals of the Research and Development Institute. Suan Sunanda Rajabhat University by finding the average value ($\bar{X}$) and the average value compared to the set criteria. (Srisa-ard, 2002)

Grade Range (Average) Meaning

- 4.51 – 5.00 highest satisfied with the service
- 3.51 – 4.50 high satisfied with the service
- 2.51 – 3.50 Satisfaction with service is moderate.
- 1.51 – 2.50 Low with Less
- 1.00 – 1.50 Lowest satisfaction with service

4. Statistics used in this research; the researcher used statistics to analyze quantitative data. As follows:

4.1 Percentage is used to analyze the data from the satisfaction survey. Percentage is a statistical value that is very commonly used.

$$p = \frac{f}{N} \times 100$$

The required number with the frequency or total number equivalent to 100 is derived from the following formula. When p represents the percentage value.

p = Percentage Value
f = The frequency to convert to a percentage
N = Total number of samples

f instead of the frequency you want to convert to a percentage value N instead of Total number of frequencies The percentage value shows the meaning of the value and the resulting value can be compared.

4.2 Mean is used to analyze data from satisfaction surveys. Average ($\bar{X}$) (Pattiyadhani, 2001, p. 238)

$$(\bar{X}) = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

($\bar{X}$) = Averag
 $\sum x$ = Sum of all points
N = Total number of samples

4.3 Standard Deviation is used to analyze data from satisfaction surveys. Standard Deviation (S.D.) It is calculated from the following formula (Srisa-ard, 2002)

$$S.D. = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (x - \bar{x})^2}{(N - 1)}}$$

(S.D.) = Standard Deviation
x = Individual Points
N = Number of points in a group
 $\sum$ = Sum

Research Results

Table 1: Periodic Consideration of Peer Review Journal Articles

Duration of Article Consideration	Article Consideration			
	Thai		English	
	Peer Review	Percentage	Peer Review	Percentage
1-5 Days	7	33.34	3	14.29
6-10 Days	10	47.62	10	47.62
15-20 Days	2	9.52	3	14.29
21-30 Days	2	9.52	0	0
Not considered	0	0	5	23.8
Included	21	100	21	100

Peer Review Time 1-5 There were 7 people (33.34 percent) for 6-10 days, 10 people (47.62 percent), 15-20 days (9.52 percent), 2 people for 21-30 days, 9.52 percent, and 0 people for non-consideration of papers (0 percent).

Peer Review Time 1-5 3 people (14.29 percent) on 6-10 days, 10 people (47.62 percent), 15-20 days, 3 people (14.29 percent), 21-30 days (0 people) or 0 people, and 5 people (23.8 percent) who did not consider articles

Table 2: Peer Review, Journal of Research and Development Institutes Suan Sunanda Rajabhat University

Research Topics	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Level
1. The articles you receive from the journal match the science and expertise	4.76	0.54	highest
2. The number of articles received from the journal is decent	4.38	0.67	highest
3. The period required by the journal to conduct peer reviews is appropriate	4.57	0.60	highest
4. Editorial appropriateness to track peer reviews	4.62	0.59	highest
5. Satisfaction with being a Peer Review, a journal of the Research and Development Institute Suan Sunanda Rajabhat University	4.90	0.30	highest
Included	4.65	0.57	highest

Satisfaction level of Peer Review, a journal of the Institute of Research and Development 1. The articles you receive from the journal match the science and expertise, $\bar{x} = 4.76$ $S.D. = 0.54$, at the highest level, $\bar{x} = 4.38$ $S.D. = 0.67$ highest Levels 3. The period specified by the journal in peer reviews is appropriate, $\bar{x} = 4.57$ $S.D. = 0.60$ 4. Editorial appropriateness to follow peer reviews, $\bar{x} = 4.62$ $S.D. = 0.59$ 5. Satisfaction with being a Peer Reviewer for the Journal of Research and Development Institutes. Suan Sunanda Rajabhat University, $\bar{x} = 4.90$ $S.D. = 0.30$ highest level and overall satisfaction, $\bar{x} = 4.65$ $S.D. = 0.57$ highest Levels

Conclusions and suggestions

Conclusions: The level of satisfaction of both peer reviewers and submitters was at the highest level. Highest Satisfaction Points 1. The reviewer is satisfied with the peer review for the journal and the editorial review ($\bar{x} = 4.90$ and 4.62 respectively). 2. The submitter is satisfied with the appropriateness of the follow-up of the article editing. Timeliness of the process and publication ($\bar{x} = 4.89$ and 4.83 , respectively) Time Experience Most peer reviews are in the 6–10 days range, which is considered appropriate and meets journal standards.

Suggestions

Maintaining Service Quality

The level of quality and punctuality of the assessment should be maintained to build confidence in the submitters of the ThaiJO system.

Communication with the user Add convenient and modern contact channels such as Line OA or auto-reply to the system to help solve problems quickly.

Extension Further qualitative studies, such as in-depth interviews, are used to gain a deeper perspective than using quantitative questionnaires.

Discussion

The findings indicated that both groups of stakeholders had the highest satisfaction, which is consistent with previous theories and research that indicate that system quality, service quality, and editorial management directly affect satisfaction (DeLone & McLean, 2003). Unlike the work of (Tite & Schroter, 2007), it was found that some overseas evaluators refused or took a long time to consider

References

- Bennett, S., Maton, K., & Kervin, L. (2008). The “digital natives” debate: A critical review of the evidence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(5), 775–786. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00793.x>
- DeLone, W. H., & McLean, E. R. (2003). The DeLone and McLean model of information systems success: A ten-year update. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 19(4), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2003.11045748>
- Kritsanakarn, P., & Thumcharoensathit, K. (2023). Procedures for preparing electronic journals using the ThaiJO 2.0 system, Faculty of Fine and Applied Arts, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University. In *Proceedings of the ICBTS International Academic Multidisciplines Research Conference, Vienna, Austria* (pp. 11–15). <http://icbtsproceeding.ssru.ac.th/index.php/ICBTSVIENNA2023/article/download/920/902>
- Pattiyathani, S. (2007). *Measuring educational outcomes* (5th ed.). Prasan Printing.
- Srisa-ard, B. (2002). *Preliminary research* (7th ed.). Suviriyasan.
- Thai Journals Online (ThaiJO). (2017). *About*. <https://www.tci-thaijo.org/about>
- Tite, L., & Schroter, S. (2007). Why do peer reviewers decline to review? A survey. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 61(1), 9–12. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2006.049817>