

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_97410
Title of the Manuscript:	THE ROLE OF MANAGER ON EMPLOYEE'S SATISFACTION IN AN ORGANIZATION
Type of the Article	Short Research 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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy> )

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Overall, this is a fairly clear, concise, and fairly-written manuscript but there are no significant gaps/ questions that the researcher is addressing through the study literature</li><li>2. At the very outset the researcher has to single out the problem and the purpose of the research- which should be clearly defined.</li><li>3. Information on the previous study findings is presented although requires to be enhanced to provide an opportunity for the researcher to view the recommendations left, and thus be able to discuss them.</li><li>4. A mention of survey methodology as a design should also be corrected and a justification on why it is the most appropriate method for the study.</li></ol>	
<b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>5. The title of the article is suitable but it lacks an environment from which the problem can be attributed. E.g THE ROLE OF MANAGER ON EMPLOYEE'S SATISFACTION IN AN ORGANIZATION, A CASE OF XYZ and ABC IN ARUSHA</li></ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p>	<p>6. The abstract needs to be reviewed to include the theory that informs the study.          7. The researcher to clarify on the design used in the study to avoid confusion between the 'design' and 'methods' since it is not clear.          8. The author may review the abstract to incorporate the specific concepts of variables that will be used to measure the level of satisfaction and state the sub-constructs for both independent and dependent variables          9. Although the researcher has mentioned 'two universities', the researcher has to indicate the 'unit of analysis' and 'unit of observation'.          10. Also provide the study population          11. The abstract should include the final conclusion on whether the study question(s) was adequately answered and whether the gaps were filled as a result of the study.</p>	
<p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>12. The discussion section does not integrate the findings with relevant theory          13. The following specific areas have been noted and recommended for review as indicated:</p> <p><b>Abstract</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ p. 1, line 2: 'Survey design' has been used but it must be 'survey method'. A statement in this section or in the discussion justifying the use of this methodology is warranted.</li> <li>✓ p.1, line 4 'from the two Universities' should be specific by mentioning the institutions since its appearing the first time</li> <li>✓ p. 1, line 5 &amp; 6: review the sentence 'That data collected was examined and analyzed' to read, 'The data was collected, collated and analyzed using (<i>state how it was analyzed</i>)'</li> <li>✓ p. 1, line 8 &amp; 9: 'This is quite different from public higher learning institutions where the <b>problem</b> is not much'. This is too general and the researcher should state the actual finding to depict the 'problem'.</li> <li>✓ P.1, line 12: the words 'have discovered' should be replaced to read, 'The study findings indicated ...'</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The Introduction component is not adequate. A literature and background information on global perspective of employee satisfaction is missing.</li> <li>✓ The researcher to add literature on specific variables under consideration, the statement of the problem, and objective of the study.</li> <li>✓ p. 2, paragraph 2, line 7: The researcher should justify why 'Tanzania' is the most appropriate to represent the developing countries</li> <li>✓ p. 2, paragraph 4, line 1: Please change "is" to "was"</li> <li>✓ p. 2, paragraph 4, line 2; Please change "This" to "The"</li> <li>✓ p. 2, paragraph 4, line 2; Please change "Scrutinizes" to "examined"</li> <li>✓ p. 2, paragraph 4, line 2; The sentence 'effects of different factors of organization which affects the employee satisfaction' may be construed as being a different study from the current.</li> <li>✓ The researcher should instead mention the specific variables and sub-constructs that were used to measure the level of satisfaction by introducing a conceptual framework</li> </ul> <p><b>Critique of the existing literature, Research Gaps and Summary of the literature Review</b>          This is missing. The researcher may consider introducing this component</p> <p><b>Material and Methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Expunge the word 'Material'</li> <li>✓ The Methods should mention the research philosophy, design, study population and pilot of the study to determine the reliability of instruments used and accuracy of the study.</li> </ul> <p><b>P 9: 'Results <b>And</b> Discussion' – change to read 'Results <b>and</b> Discussion'</b></p>	
<p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p>	<p>Overall, the results are least compelling since the manuscript is not based on any theory, hence no science is underlying the main idea. That is the missing link. As mentioned herein above, without the problem or the gap that the researcher is seeking to address, there is little we can conclude from the findings.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The author has not reviewed any literature in the manuscript and there is little references Some of the references used are not appearing in the in text citation. For instance, 'Kajubi, S. (1992). 'Financing higher education in Uganda', Higher Education 3(3), 21–25' appears on the list of references but its not mentioned anywhere in the main document. Also, the inclusion of 'Kim, S. 2005. Gender differences in job satisfaction of public employees: a study of Seoul Metropolitan government, Korea. Sex Roles, 52(9/10):667-68' yet it's not used in the main document warrants an explanation.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION comments</b></p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ P 3, last paragraph, line 2: change the words 'they are strongly agree' to read, 'strongly agreed'</li> <li>✓ P 3, last paragraph, line 5 &amp; 6: 'question argued that they agree that they feel satisfied with' change to read '...question agreed that they were satisfied with...'</li> <li>✓ P 4, paragraph 1, line 1: review the sentence 'they are not sure where satisfied or not' to read 'they were not sure whether satisfied or not'</li> <li>✓ P 4, paragraph 1, line 5: consider expunging the words 'so far'</li> <li>✓ P 4, paragraph 2, line 2: Consider the grammar in 'Employees most of the time seems'</li> <li>✓ P 4, Table 3: Corporations from the Management Team – Use APA format to present the table</li> <li>✓ P 4, paragraph 3, line 4: introduce spacing in 'about31.4 %'</li> <li>✓ P 5, paragraph 1, line 1: Change the error in 'Form the statistics above', to read 'From the statistics above'</li> <li>✓ P 5, paragraph 2: Avoid sweeping statements that are not scientific such as 'Normally there are workshops organized by institutions to mentor and train their employees for effectiveness of the production and efficiency of organization itself. These opportunities are sometimes biased and some of employees never get chance for training and this leads into job dissatisfaction.'</li> <li>✓ P 6, paragraph 3, line 1: Change the error in 'Form the above view', to read 'From the above view'</li> <li>✓ P 6: It is not clear why the author used 'Safe Working Environment' without any literature accompanying it. Please review</li> <li>✓ P 9, paragraph 1, line 2: change 'they are' to 'they were'</li> <li>✓ P 9, paragraph 2, line 1 &amp; 2: the sentence 'to get to know if the salary given to employee of higher learning institutions to meet all the important expenses.' Is not clear hence recommended for review.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General comments</b></p>		

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Wilfred Muhongo Buyema</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Kenya</b></p>