



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_43713
Title of the Manuscript:	ATTITUDES OF UNDERGRADUATE TOWARDS TEACHERS AND THE TEACHING PROFESSION :A Case Study of A Few Selected Departments of Management Faulty, Usman Danfodiyo University Sokoto State
Type of the Article	Case study

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	The title of the paper is good for the Nigerian citizens because of their attitude towards the teaching profession. However, the results of this study may not be reliable due to some problems. 1. The abstract need to be revised 2. The introduction is not adequately written as regards the text of the manuscript and also the title. 3. The methodology section contained irrelevant information not required for the study. Some tables need not be included but mention the information in them at the preamble of the section. For instance, the number of students and lecturers need no particular table; also the age group and marital status. 4. The author(s) should have used Chi-square which who have been more appropriate. 5. The author(s) seem not to know the difference between the research hypothesis and research question. 6. The study had no discussion section. The finding cannot be valid without the discussion. 7. The paper did not cite any current literature. The most recent literature cited was 1991. Teacher education is evolving and had gone beyond what the author(s) cited here. 8. There are language, grammar and spelling errors. Ethical issue: The paper should tell the readers how the consent of the participants was obtained.	
Minor REVISION comments	The instrument is based on a questionnaire of Yes or No. I suggest Chi-square could be used to analyse the data. It will be direct and straightforward.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aina, Jacob Kola
Department, University & Country	University of the Western Cape, South Africa