



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7665
Title of the Manuscript:	Methodological Techniques in the Study of Relationships between Servant Leadership, Psychological Ownership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours in Nigerian Utility Organizations
Type of the Article	Review 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 (if agreed with reviewer, corrects the manuscript and highlights that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Based on the article title, I would classify this paper as a research paper. However, the finding whether psychological ownership (PO) mediates the relationship servant leadership (SL) and OCB was not disclosed and discuss. It is a must for the author(s) to present and discuss the findings. Then, the contributions of the study which is the rigorousness of the methodological aspects are justified. 2. I don't think the author(s) have adequately presented the theoretical underpinning or conceptual arguments in supporting the relationship between SL and OCB as well as the role of PO as the mediator. The possible linkage between SL and OCB and the role of PO must be clearly discussed. 3. The author (s) mentioned that "The study established that servant leadership and psychological ownership among employees have been identified as important panacea for improving employee OCB...." However, the discussions of the issue were not found. 4. The author(s) stated that The Social Exchange Theory and Social Learning Theory were used as theoretical framework. However, further discussions were not found. 5. The author(s) should remember that, this is a research paper. Hence, the author(s) should minimize elaboration of methodological concepts such as population, sample, etc.	1. I want to object to reviewer's comment (no. 1). I do not need to present findings because is not an empirical paper. What the reviewer said is not in line with the objective /focus of my paper that I clearly stated in the paper. My paper was aimed at describing the methodological techniques or aspects of my PhD work only, and not presenting results of my study. That I intend to do in a different paper. 2. Because of my argument in point one above, there is no need for me to adhere to reviewer's comment no. 2, 3, 4 & 3. The reviewer seems to have misunderstood the basic motivation of my paper. Fortunately enough all the remaining two reviewers have shown great understanding of my work and have given it good remarks with no serious suggestions for corrections.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. How stratified sampling were used in the study need further explanations. 2. Must state the sources of measures.	1. I sufficiently discussed stratified sampling as it affects my study. I do not need to go into more details because journal article is not PhD thesis. 2. No need to state sources of my measures because my paper is not empirical.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		