# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. 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 peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended 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!

Reviewer Name:		
Date Manuscript Received: 16/10/2018	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/10/2018	
Manuscript Title: THE DEGREE OF MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THEM		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 107.10.2018		
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No		
You approve your name as a reviewer of this paper is available on the ESJ's website: Yes/No		

### **Evaluation Criteria:**

word requires capitalization).

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

Questions	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
Yes, the title indicates the work node.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
The end of the summary should be improved. I would add clarity.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Yes, there are some grammatical errors (Likert scale, Cronbach's Alpha, Introduction). Review use	

of commas and points. Also, after "colon" you start typing with a lowercase letter (except that the

#### 4. The study methods are explained clearly.

You indicate that:

Thus, the weights of paragraphs (3.68- 5.0) are high, (2.34-3.67) medium, and (1.00- 2.33) low.

I suggest revising Table 3, second section "Moral Motivation". The "Arithmetical Mean" indicators would not agree with what is indicated in the "Degree of assessment" column.

Regarding the previous studies on "1. Studies on satisfaction at work" and "2. Studies on motivation"; refer to various fields not only education.

Considering the importance that you donate to the role of the teacher and education as the center of development of a country;

*Also the objective of the study;* 

Can the cited studies be referents, to be compared to satisfaction and motivation in the educational field? The complexity is very different, from the continuous preparation to the unique interaction during the class.

# 5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.

2

2

In the conclusions, you do not link these previous studies with your research findings Base for the suggested recommendations.

### 6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

1

The references do not respond to APA standards.

There are numerous authors indicated in the text that are not referenced.

There are other authors named in references that do not appear in the body of the text.

## Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

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

Dear author

Your article is of interest, considering the dimension of analysis.

You will be able to attend to the suggested adjustments so that your study is a reference of new studies and / or advances.

Cordially.

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

Dear Editor,

the article may be of interest in your journal, if the indicated adjustments are resolved. Cordially.





