

Review of: "Effect of Employees' Commitment on Customer Satisfaction of Banks in Africa"

Hanan AlMazrouei¹

¹ United Arab Emirates University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Recommendation: Reject

-

Originality

The topic, while not original, has some merit. The premise of the paper is somewhat simplistic, however, as evidenced by the simple nature of Figure 1 on page 6 (which needs a title).

Relationship to literature

The literature review is, at times, superficial. For example, on page five, first line, there is a reference to a study by Bhattacharjee (2017). This needs more detail to make it more relevant to the discussion of the literature.

The literature review, generally, needs more depth to support the contents of the paper and the research.

Methodology

The selection of study participants is appropriate, given the research topic, although there needs to be a justification for why purposive sampling was used. The description of the questionnaire is also quite perfunctory. Much more detail is needed about this. Also, the statement that a quantitative approach was used due to the data being quantitative is insufficient as an explanation.

The paper mentions a second model, without mentioning a first model. How many models were used, and why? Also, the discussion of the second model needs to be a lot more detailed and include the reason for the use of two different models. More detail regarding how the data was collected is needed.

-

Results

The results are reasonable enough, however more discussion is needed. At one point, the paper mentions TVET colleges. What is the relationship with TVET colleges?

The discussion on page 9 mentions that all the responses were near the middle of the range. A discussion of central

tendency would have been useful here.

-

Implications for research, practice and/or society

The directions for future research are reasonable and provide guidance for a more comprehensive investigation of the topic.

-

Quality of communication

The introduction is, at times, repetitive. It needs to be rewritten in such a way that it is tighter and more cohesive so as to present the ideas, which are ok in themselves, in a more interesting way. For example, a number of the paragraphs deliver the same message using different references. Also, the literature review section on continuance commitment and customer satisfaction is repetitive and somewhat superficial.

The paper is in need of proof reading, with a number of errors evident. This is particularly so in relation to the abstract. The abstract is the 'hook' that should provoke readers' interest. A poorly written abstract will have the opposite effect. The whole paper needs to be proof read. For example, on page 4, the term 'deamination' is used. A Google search revealed that this relates to the removal of an amino group from a molecule. On page 8, near the end of section 3.7, Content Validity Indenx is mentioned, as is Cornbrash's Alpha. This should have been Cronbach's Alpha.

On page 10, the text mentions three 'dominations', presumably meaning something else, and on page 12, under Future Research, the word 'thru' is used, rather than 'through'.

Finally, the references need rearranging as some of these are out of order.