



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19255
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Temporary Staffing Agency Employment (TSAE) on Employee Performance in China
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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The author mentions the random choice of respondents, but does not mention the size of the population to be sampled and number of randomly selected. 2. Regarding the measuring instrument, the principal questions or concepts that were considered to measure the variables are not described. Was it a single question by variable? Were several? How many for each variable? 3. The criterion to limit maximum VIF 10 is	The authors agree with the reviewers' comments and observations. We have subsequently made the suggested revisions to the manuscript. The revised parts are highlighted in yellow in the manuscript. Below are the authors' specific feedback on the reviewer's comments/observations: 1. Officially, there is a general lack of statistics and reports on Temporary agency workers from the 31 provinces in China. Furthermore, discrepancies are also observed in the estimated total number of agency workers in China even when reported. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, Temporary workers from 13 temporary work/employment agencies within the city of Chengdu were invited into the study. <i>Further details are</i>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	not justified. 4. The explanation for the correlation between satisfaction and performance is not very convincing, especially the first part that is justified by the stress variable. Why not think to eliminate the variable satisfaction of the model, since it contradicts the empirical evidence? 5. The conclusions are a summary, I recommend improvement them.	<i>provided in the manuscript.</i> 2. Regarding the measuring instrument, overall, there were 10 items that measure the level of employee's commitment to the TSA, 8 items that measure employee's commitment to the user firm and 7 items that measure the level of employee's perception on their job security. Additionally, there were 11 items that aimed to measure the extent to which the employee is satisfied with both the intrinsic and extrinsic features of their Job life and 14 items measured the level of job stress on the employee. Finally, employee's overall job performance was measured with the aid of a 10-items self-appraisal scale which examines different aspects of the employee's Performance. <i>Further details have been provided in the manuscript.</i> 3. The criterion to limit maximum VIF to 10 has been justified (<i>See D. N. Gujarati and D. C. Porter, Basic Econometrics, 4th Ed. New York: The McGraw-Hill Series, 2004</i>) 4. The explanation of the correlation
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

		between satisfaction and Performance has been revised. In particular to the findings, the negative relationship observed between job satisfaction and performance (<i>contrary to H4</i>) is rather unique and a curious one that requires further tests to admit a causative factor. 5. The conclusion of the study has been revised.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Figure 1 is difficult to read in the pdf; and it seems to contain the same information as Figure 2. 2. The table of coefficients (between Tables 2 and 3) has no title. 3. Figure 3 is difficult to read in the pdf.	1. Figure 1(in original manuscript) has been removed from the manuscript. 2. The tables in the manuscripts have been labelled appropriately 3. Figure 3(now figure 2) has been remade.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	To include the questionnaire used; or a version summary.	