



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ ARJASS_63965
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring Job Crafting: Identifying the Way Lecturers of CLCS Adjust to their Job
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



[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	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this article. The time involved in submitting your manuscript is greatly appreciated. In my humble opinion, this is a current topic and, it is important to start offer researches of job crafting in the context of Bhutan. Also, it is a clearly written paper and the tables added are very clarifying.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please describe what "Dzongkha" is because it is an international paper and some people could not know that information about Bhutan. - In all text you use "According to [number] or [number] observed" and not mention the authors but on page 8 you mention them (Slomp and Vella-Brodrick [4] stated that.... Are there any contraindication not to mention them in the rest of the document? - Why do you use that questionnaire? Are there Asian validation of the questionnaire? I understand that you use English version, Could the language affect the results? - Please, do not use 0 before the decimal point for statistical values. Revise all the tables and the text of results part. - As you can see in Author Guidelines: "where available URLs for the references have been provided". So, check if you could add all the doi and please put them at the same style (example: reference 16 and 18 have the doi in different styles) 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In page 2, the first paragraph is a bit repetitive with the last paragraph of page 1. - Methodology: You indicate "large number of people". 42 is a larger number of people? - Page 5: "introducing new approaches for enhancing job nature" is not in italics. - 3.2.1 M=3.1 appears in text although in the table is M=3.01 - In table 5 please, in the mean express two digits. - Page 6 in text there is 0.83 and in table 0.80. In text SD=0.5, in table 0.54. Please, always two digits. - You mention that with only one Phd can not generalise but with two participant who have been in the job for more than 20 years, you do generalise. - First reference: in word "Development" there is misspelling. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can you explain if the subscales have a correlation between them? If there are differences between men and women in that correlation? Maybe it is interesting to add that information. <p>Thank you.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marta Peña Ramos
Department, University & Country	Spain