



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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The current manuscript investigates the stress level of call center employees. The authors find that the stress levels are minor at best. This is against previous findings that suggest call center employees are under a great deal of stress. The major problem I find with the manuscript is the lack of contribution. The authors offer three research questions, (1) what is the stress level of employees of cellular companies in terms of work related...(2) is there any difference in the stress level of employees of cellular companies ...(3) Is there any difference in the stress level of employees of cellular companies in terms of	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	independent variables. These research questions are more for a consulting job with the cellular companies than they are for social science research. So if there is a difference between the companies, what is the construct that makes one environment more stressful than the other environment? Instead of addressing the findings in a manner of how each company is doing, the authors should look at what leads to stress and what are the outcomes of this stress. The authors have an outcome variable of attrition, but they fail to test it against the stress variables. To make a contribution to the social sciences, researchers are interested in what leads to the stress and further, what happens as a result of this stress. Analysis: The authors present a Cronbach alpha of .98. Is there only one Cronbach alpha despite the fact there are a number of scales used in the study?	
--	---	--

Note: Anonymous Reviewer