

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_103130
Title of the Manuscript:	TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF OCCUPATIONAL STRESS CAUSES IN TANZANIA'S SECONDARY SCHOOLS
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 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community. Teachers and their well-being are significant to effective development of education of members of any society, whose education level cannot rise above the quality of teachers. Stress is one of the major factor challenging quality service delivery in various occupation, and classroom stress is a crucial one.</p> <p>The title is good but will appear better if the country location come last and reads thus: "Teachers' Perception of Causes of Occupational Stress among Secondary Schools teachers in Tanzania"</p> <p>The Abstract should be in one block paragraph without sub-titles. The information under the heading "methodology" suffices for the Abstract. But there some salient information missing, such as what guided the study (number of objectives/Research questions/Hypothesis), instrument response format, was the instrument validated, reliability determined? Data analysis tools. The reported counter- strategies, should not be part of this study, considering the title.</p> <p>The manuscript structure reflected excellently, main sections and sub-sections appropriately</p> <p>The manuscript to a high extent is scientifically correct</p> <p>The currency of the work is excellent as it covers 2023 reference assuring. Currency ranges from 2015 to 2023 (under 10 years)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The major issue in this manuscript is clarification of the Population of study/ Participants and Respondents. The study population may not be the respondents! The title, purpose/aim, scope and population/sample should agree and addressing common issues. <p><i>What about different status of participants/ RESPONDENTS? What one word can you use to describe Participants in Table 1 that experience occupational stress: TEACHERS or STAFF?</i></p> <p>Issues raised above is resolved by the INFORMATION TABLE 1.</p> <p>These demographic details are pertinent to the study focus of exploring the causes of occupational stress among secondary school teachers in Tanzania. So reshape your POPULATION, SAMPLE AND SAMPLING PROCEDURES.</p> <p>The 460 should teachers (classroom teachers, head-teachers and teachers in Zonal Education Offices)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The Language is okay</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The work is good if the participants/ population /sample composition issue is resolved as guided</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Melody N. Modebelu
Department, University & Country	Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria