



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_5785
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of Employees' Stress Level: The Case of Cell Phone Industry
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. In the introduction , the author need to describe the type of research he is conducting and the level of analyses and why 2. The introduction is too brief. the importance of call centres are not explain. Evidence of problem in the company is not stated. 3. Insufficient literature on the variables discuss, the author provides only the definition of the terminology but did not discuss more about their relationships. 4. Insufficient literature on stress and what it is made up of is not discussed. 5. No literature review at all on loyalty and its relationship to all the variables measured. Please refer to 'Chiang, Flora FT, Thomas A. Birtch, and Ho Kwong Kwan. "The moderating roles of job control and work-life balance practices on employee stress in the hotel and catering industry." <i>International Journal of Hospitality Management</i> 29.1 (2010): 25-32.' and see how job stress is actually measured. 6. Line 137, why run the reliability on all items, why not do factor analysis first to determine that they all belong to the same group? Reliability of all items will definitely give a very high Cronbach alpha. 7. Argument provided in line 206 onwards is not strong enough.	Correct. Added . Correct. Added. Correct. Additional material added. It is there in the literature review. Correct. Material is added now. This was the reliability of the total scale that reflects its internal consistency. The scale was adapted and the authors have reported the sub-scales as valid and significant. Alpha values of sub-scales are given.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	8. The word your in sentence 54 to 56 and 62 should be change to one's 9. Remove “, often being called” in line 74 10. The measurement of each variable is not discussed in the methodology. 11. Line 138 should mention ...were quantified “using a 5-point Likert type scales” 12. Line 140 and 141, the means score above 03? Should be above 3. 13. Total score is not the measure of job stress unless the author provide a very strong literature review on its scales. 14. Very high correlation between total score and work performance indicate that there is high collinearity between these variables which should not be the case. It should be correlated but not very high. 15. What does the means score of the variables mean? The author did not provide an explanation of these scores in terms of the stress level. 16. Table 4 should just provide the descriptive statistics. The one sample t-test is meaningless. 17. Table 5 is not clear what are the values in the last column 18. Please elaborate what does these results mean. 19. Line 208- 209, the correlations are strong why say its weaker ?	Corrected Removed. To keep the study concise, sub-scales were measured and discussed. Corrected. Corrected. The scale was previously used by the original authors. The same stressed variables were used in this study. That is the correlation of this sub-scale with that of total scale. The correlations within the sub-scales are of lower vales as compared with their correlations with the total scale that shows that these sub-scales are not same but strongly related with the total scale. Given in methodology section. Some authors give in their work. Now cleared. It is elaborated as a comparison of companies. Weaker against those with the total scale.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 67 to 87 should be placed in the introduction as the problem statement rather than in the literature Need more discussion on the managerial implication	Optional