

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_129678
Title of the Manuscript:	How the Presence of an Authority Figure Influences Individual Choices and Stress Levels: a One-Time Experimental Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p><b>General Comments:</b> This study appears original and well-designed.</p> <p><b>Specific Comments:</b> Overall, this scientific study, like many of its kind, has strengths and weaknesses that can always be improved to make the manuscript even better.</p> <p><b>1) Study Objective</b> The author addresses an engaging topic with a clear and concise focus on the influence of authority figures on obedience and stress within a Philippine cultural context. While the concepts discussed are classical, they are approached in a novel way through their unique methodological combination.</p> <p><b>2) Literature Review</b> The literature review is well-structured and highlights prior research (Milgram, 1961, &amp; Asch, 1951) while also integrating recent studies (e.g., Machen, Bègue &amp; Vezirian, Götz, etc.). However, the author seems to conflate the studies of Milgram and Asch. The former examines an inter-individual phenomenon, whereas the latter focuses on an intra-group phenomenon. It seems these conceptual distinctions have not been fully understood. It is therefore recommended that the author clarify this distinction and specify the position and contribution of Asch's study. Alternatively, consider removing it from the literature review.</p> <p><b>3) Methodology</b> The techniques used are well explained and detailed, such as the simple stress measurement scale and the counting method quantifying the number of violations. Furthermore, ethical conditions were explicitly respected, ensuring the validity of this experiment. The sample size (40 participants) is appropriate for an experimental study, thus ensuring the reliability of the results. However, the sample consists exclusively of students, raising the issue of generalizing the findings. It is therefore recommended to specify in the title that the study focuses on a student population. Regarding the procedure and design, the authors refer to a "leader" as an authority figure. It would be helpful to clarify what is meant by "leader." It is important to note that the notions of "leader" and "authority" are distinct. Indeed, a leader does not necessarily embody an authority figure. We invite you to elaborate further on this distinction. Additionally, it is essential to justify the credibility of the authority figure in your study, as respect, prestige, and credibility are moderating factors in obedience (Milgram, 1961).</p> <p><b>4) Results</b> Have you examined whether the variable "sex" might moderate the results? In other words, is the degree of obedience identical between females and males? Similarly, is a female authority figure perceived in the same way as a male authority figure?</p> <p><b>5) Conclusion</b> To improve your research, it is recommended to clearly define the concepts of "leadership" and "authority." Including references in the theoretical section of your manuscript would also be preferable to strengthen your arguments. With these adjustments, your manuscript will gain clarity and scientific rigor.</p>	<p>Thank you for your thorough and constructive feedback on our manuscript. We appreciate your insights and suggestions, which have been instrumental in improving the quality of our research. Below, we address each of your comments in detail:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>Study Objective</b> We are pleased to hear that the study's unique methodological approach and cultural focus were engaging.</li><li><b>Literature Review</b> We have carefully revised the literature review and removed references to Asch's study to avoid conflating the concepts of inter-individual and intra-group phenomena. This ensures a more focused and accurate discussion of the relevant studies.</li><li><b>Methodology</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The title has been updated to specify that the study focuses exclusively on a student population, addressing concerns about generalization.</li><li>The distinction between "leader" and "authority figure" has been clarified in the procedure and design sections. We elaborated on the credibility of the authority figure in our study.</li></ul></li><li><b>Results</b> We did not analyze gender differences in this study, but we have acknowledged this as a limitation in the manuscript. Additionally, we have included a suggestion for future research to explore the potential moderating effects of gender and perceptions of male versus female authority figures.</li><li><b>Conclusion</b> The concepts of "leadership" and "authority" have been clearly defined in the revised manuscript, and additional references have been incorporated in the theoretical section to strengthen the arguments and improve scientific rigor.</li></ol> <p>We are confident that these revisions address your concerns and improve the clarity and impact of our manuscript. Thank you again for your valuable input.</p>

[Review Form 3](#)

**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>	