

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_93411
Title of the Manuscript:	MENTORING PRACTICES AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY, TANZANIA.
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Introduction part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The objectives are not specific; hence they challenge a research to measure them. - There is no clear hypotheses stated that tested - There is definition of the variables such as acceptance, role modelling..... in the conceptual framework <p>Methodology part</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No definition of the variables - No clearly elaboration of how the variables were measured and tested for data quality, for example how the reliability and validity the questionnaire, normality and other data quality measures were not done. - The use of correlation analysis, regression model of ordinal or categorised data without indexing is methodological flaw. This result tells nothing about the research problem. The proper analytic tech was chi-square, although the research stated that the study use chi-square, there is no chi-square results found in the document. - The sample of 368 employees has no clear sampling frame that was coming from which sectors? Experiences? Skill? Gender? No justification on the sample size. Why 368 instead of other number - If the employee performance is measured by Service delivery, Satisfaction, Motivation, Accountability, Anti-corruption, Engagement, Confidence, Directives, and Altitudes as dependent variables and the mentoring practice is measured by Role Model, Acceptance, Companionship, Sponsorship, Delegation and Relationship: how scientifically can you establish the quantitative analysis or regression/correlation analysis for multiple un-equal variables (the dependent variables are more than independent variables?) . For example how can you detect or measure the influence of role model on your dependent variable? <p>Results and interpretation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The results are presented in a manner that it is confusing; there is no clear flow of the specific objective. The statistic description shows the means of scale to be range from 4...., this is the response from the Likert scale “? If so how these mean when you say the ... acceptance have 4.6 ? - In the presentation of the results, the two tails test was used, was it relevant? Do you research problem allow to use two –tailed test of the correlation analysis? Even though, there is no clear hypothesis to be tested <p>- $EP = \beta_0 + \beta_1MP1 + \beta_2MP2 + \beta_3MP3 + \beta_4MP4 + \beta_5MP5 + \beta_6MP6 + \epsilon_i$, -- this regression, how is EP is measured? Is it index or average score of all indicators? Moreover, how MP1 differ from MP2, and how was measured? It is till to confusing and not ease to follow.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Title : -Title is not descriptive , it is presented as the chapter title Abstract - No clear conclusion	
Optional/General comments	The research topic is very impressive and need but lacks a strong methodological support. A research should improve the methodology. I suggest using qualitative approach. If the research what to use the quantitative approach should clear state the research hypotheses and specification model. Moreover, if possible the appropriate analytic model is the PLS structural equation modelling.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ntogwa N. Bundala
Department, University & Country	United Republic of Tanzania