



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_13307
Title of the Manuscript:	A Focus Group Study Management and Decision Behavior: Examining Gender Differences With Management and Decision Behavior in Donald Trump's <i>The Apprentice</i>
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	See below.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	See below.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The topic is interesting. The data gathering work is time consuming and the paper is unique in terms of this. 2. The sample pool is very meaningful especially for the college students, undergraduate and graduate. 3. The conclusions are meaningful not only from the theoretical perspective but from the practical perspective. 4. The lit review is thorough and well-organized.	1) Authors agree with the reviewer's comments. 2) Authors agree with the reviewer's comments. 3) Authors agree with the reviewer's comments. 4) Authors agree with the reviewer's comments. 5) <u>Authors disagree with the reviewer's comments.</u> The authors are not sure what the reviewer is talking about. We did not publish this research study with the conference. The conference does not publish papers. Also, we are not doing a "twin version" of a prior study. If we did not think we had something to offer we would have not submitted our manuscript. Our work is original and this inference is inappropriate and offensive. We collected more data from more focus groups and wanted to examine if males and females in management think and frame decisions differently. Please respect the originality of our research. 6) <u>Authors disagree with the reviewer's comments.</u> First, if you examine focus group research, the statistical methodology is somewhat limited, but may not be



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5. The author needs to be mindful that as this is a paper that was presented in conference, the publish of this paper should be original or not a “twin version” of anything that has been published before. 6. The methodology used in this paper is not strong enough. I am not saying that the more complicated econometrics model being used, the better. In fact, the complexity of the model is irrelevant and it is the properness of the model that dictates the use of it/them. Simply comparing the differences here is not convincing. In fact, the author(s) have a very good pool of cross-sectional data, and the model fits the 0-1 type of dependent variable is PROBIT or LOGIT. Using those two (or one of them) can make the results more reliable and descriptive, as the probabilities are more straight forward than saying “more males thought the project	complicated. It is not common to see multivariate analyses in focus group research. The statistical methodologies are mostly descriptive statistics, ANOVAs, <i>t</i>-Tests, and comparative analyses. It is rare to see regressions in focus group research. We addressed this in the limitations. For example, time constraints were a factor. Another example is a limited item questionnaire that could only be used with those time constraints. It appears the reviewer is not familiar with focus group research. This is evident in the comments. Secondly, our study is comparing management decision behavior based on gender. Our study is a bit more than a mundane gender comparison. <i>Who are you to determine if our results are not convincing?</i> Isn't that subjective? We think there is something significant in our findings. We stand by our results and disagree. Third, the reviewer mentions the dependent variable being probit or logit. We did not agree with that assertion. Again, this is focus group study. There are limited analyses that can be done with a limited item survey. Lastly, we totally disagree with the last observation of the reviewer. Our critical observations and discussion were based on the results of the data. What are we supposed to say? Are we supposed to say something else
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	manager (PM) should be fired compared to females.” 7. The author(s) needs to be mindful that the gender-related topics should stick to the description of facts, instead of subjectively assert that which gender should do what. For example, “more males thought the project manager (PM) should be fired compared to females. In the focus groups, more females were more neutral compared to males. Furthermore, more females thought both the PM and a group member should be fired compared to males.” 8. A survival model fits the context as the show is an ongoing one, and following each candidate to see the survival rate at each round is interesting. 9. DT has two assistants in the show all the time, and the	other than what we found in our results? The reviewer seems to be projecting their opinions and research approaches on to our study, rather than examine our findings and conclusions from the data. An experienced and wise professors and statistician once told me this: “Let the data <i>speak</i> to you, do not <i>project</i> what you think about what’s in the data.” We feel that is what the reviewer is doing. We are NOT revising this section in our manuscript. 7) <u>Authors disagree with the reviewer’s comments.</u> This is totally wrong. We did not subjectively assert anything concerning our findings. Merely stating the results of the findings does not constitute subjectively asserting which gender should do what. This is totally absurd. If we stated something that was not in the data, then the reviewer’s argument is warranted but that is not the case. Just because you do not like the results of the findings does not imply the researchers as being subjective in the results. We do not agree and we are not revising our findings in the data. We stand by our results. 8) Authors agree with the reviewer’s comments. 9) <u>Authors disagree with the reviewer’s comments.</u> If the reviewer observes the dynamics in <i>The Apprentice</i>, the two assistants offer their opinions however, Trump makes the final decisions. That is NOT the focus of our
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	author(s) can involve their decisions too.	study. We do not care nor are we researching what his assistants' opinions are concerning the decisions. After conducting research on <i>The Apprentice</i> for two years, many times Trump makes decisions based on his gut feelings but may or may not take the assistants' opinion under consideration. The reviewer needs to stay focused on Trump, <i>not</i> his assistants because it is irrelevant to our research, methodology and findings.
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	Not detected at the current moment. <i><u>The author(s) needs to be mindful that the gender-related topics should stick to the description of facts, instead of subjectively assert that which gender should do what.</u></i>	

—