



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_13525
Title of the Manuscript:	AN ASSESSMENT OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND THE LEVEL OF JOB SATISFACTION OF SENIOR UNIVERSITY STAFF
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:

(<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	You write: "Senior University Staff level of job satisfaction was obtained utilizing a modified version of the Job Diagnostic Survey developed by Hackman and Oldham (1980). However, the Job diagnostic Survey was modified such that only three of its seven sections were used in this study. Demographic information were elicited through additional section containing 10 questions created by the researcher to the instrument." You need to explain in detail why you modified the original instrument. How did you validate this "new" version?	The reason for the use of the modified version of the instrument was already indicated in the body of the study. Only three of the seven sections in the original instrument is related to the study. The modified version had already been validated by other researchers in earlier study. The instrument was first administered in a nearby University before use for the study.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Delete all parts referring to work cited from the 1950's and 1970's. Discuss RECENT work.	Efforts have now been made to update the literature by addition of recent studies especially from 2000 to even 2014.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is too long	
ethical issues in this manuscript	YES. There is no mention of study approval by an ethical committee. There is no mention of informed consent	It was mentioned that the subjects were addressed during their union congress to explain the purpose of the study and their support solicited before the questionnaires were distributed to them.