

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision. ***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: <b>27 August 2018</b>	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: <b>29 August 2018</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>Influence of Working Conditions on Turnover Intentions of Secondary School Teachers in Meru County</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>30.09.2018</b>	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. However, this submitted paper does not point any specific issue for discussion. Moreover, the same issue with the same result was investigated in a number of research papers as highlighted the submitted paper's authors.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The language of the abstract should be corrected: "The results were corroborated by the results...", etc	
<b>3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of articles (a, an, the) should be re-checked</li> <li>- Use of 3<sup>rd</sup> person tense should be updated</li> <li>- Word repetition (Page 6: "to leave to leave teaching", etc) should be avoided</li> <li>- Numbers of tables should be ordered</li> </ul>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> No paradigm is indicated, no research methodology is described, no perspective is defined (employer, employees, etc) as both of them impact on method selection.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> How ethical sounds on Page 2 that “organizations should take strategic steps to reduce turnover intentions of their employees”? Is the empirical study carried out from the employer’s point of view? Why not from employees? Why not from governmental perspective? Probably, the state is interested in high turnover intentions of school employees.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> Conclusions also include what was not examined in the submitted paper. For example, “Relevant views from principals concluded that teacher motivation is at the lowest levels and the education system appears to be staffed by teachers with poor morale and low levels of commitment to their work”.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.</b> <i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The list of references should coincide with the works cited in the text of the paper. For example, Porte and Steer (1982) is on Page 1, but not in the list of references, and vice versa</li> <li>- Cited authors should have only one version of their surname. For example, on Page 1 “Heunenberger” can be found, the list of references offers “Hennenberger”, many similar cases are found in the submitted paper.</li> </ul>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

I just wonder if the authors could highlight innovation of their paper, as the authors of the submitted paper themselves indicated that they received the results which are similar to the results of other investigations.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**No extra comments**

