



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_14048
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>THE INFLUENCE OF PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT ON JOB STRESS AMONG SELECTED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR EMPLOYEES IN NIGERIA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Population and Sample : The sample size is reported, and in the abstract the authors indicate that participants were selected from public and private organizations. How many participants were from each type of organization? Please provide more information about the demographics of the sample to illustrate its representativeness of the total population (for example, gender, age, average time employed at the organization, etc.). Also, what was the response rate on the survey? It appears that the population was (1,973+542) 2,515, and 354 employees were randomly selected. Table 1 indicates that N=354. Does this reflect a 100% response rate on the survey with zero non-response bias?</li><li>2. Materials and Methods: Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the</li></ol>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>study.</p> <p>Instruments: (Line 153) indicates that the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS) short form was used containing 17 items. The original SPOS is a 17-item measure. The short form contains only eight items.</p> <p>Internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) refers to the scores generated by the items, not the instrument itself. To state that, "The reliability of the Survey of Perceived Organisational Support was tested..." is an incorrect use of the term. Furthermore, a value of 0.72 for internal consistency is questionably low, particularly if all 17 items were used (internal consistency increases as a function of the number of items).</p> <p>3. Results &amp; Discussion: Kindly comment on:</p> <p>1. Are the data well controlled and robust?</p> <p>The statement below Table 1 (Line 166-168) is confusing. The table does indeed show that there is an inverse relationship between POS and job stress. Hypothesis one states that there will be a "significant positive relationship." Therefore, the statement under Table 1 (line 167), that says, "Thus hypothesis one is therefore accepted" [sic] is incorrect.</p>	
--	---	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them.</li><li>5. Include a discussion of limitations of the study.</li><li>6. Include a discussion of implications for the findings.</li><li>7. Include a statement on future research questions that are informed by these findings.</li><li>8. The journal is “Advances in Research.” Please discuss how this study contributes to “advances in research” on perceived organizational support and job stress.</li><li>9. The references cited appear to be relevant and adequate in general. Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite? Yes. Please refer to: Worley, J. A., Fuqua, D. R., and Hellman, C. (2009). The survey of perceived organizational support: Which measure should we use? South African Journal of Industrial Psychology. Available online at: <a href="http://www.sajip.co.za">http://www.sajip.co.za</a></li></ol>	
--	---	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In general, the manuscript would benefit from a thorough review and correction of grammar and syntax.</li> <li>2. Introduction: Line 40-41 "It has become popular to attribute unexplainable behaviour of people to the fact that they are under stress." What does this mean? The statement is unclear.</li> <li>3. Line 68-70 is redundant. "Generally, job stress is simply stress at work. Work-related stress is recognised globally as a major challenge to workers' health, and the health of an organisation."</li> <li>4. Line 72 – "...no getting around it" is a colloquial phrase.</li> <li>5. The problem statement (lines 116-124) are redundant with statements already made in the introduction.</li> <li>6. The "Research Hypotheses" (Line 133-138) are stated as directional null hypotheses rather than the research hypothesis (or 'alternative' hypothesis) in the language of hypothesis testing approaches. A significant positive relationship between POS and job stress means that as POS increases, job stress also increases. The presumed expectation (hypothesis), however, is the inverse of this stated relationship.</li> </ol>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anonymous</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>USA</b>