
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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 28/10/2018	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/10/2018
Manuscript Title: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION AMONG TEACHERS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN MAFRAQ PROVINCE OF JORDAN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 107.10.2018_corrected paper	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve your name as a reviewer of this paper is available on the ESJ's website: Yes/ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

Evaluation Criteria:

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 [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are mistakes again, in appointments. They are marked in the body of the article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p>In general, the methodology of the investigation is adequate. The observations already made are corrected. But,</p> <p>Cronbach's Alpha is a relation between items of a sample that indicates the degree of link in the measurement of the same theoretical construct. Then, the relationship is expressed in values between 0 and 1. They do not mean percentages. 0.8918 is an acceptable value.</p> <p>In his case, the sample taken on 120 teachers, meant the application of the total instrument, which was then used for the total investigation. Then, table 1, must indicate N = 120 (Population) and not number of items (understood as resolved questions or questions to be investigated)</p>	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes the conclusions are consistent with the study resolved.</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Again errors in the references. DO NOT RESPECT the APA standards. There is a poorly cited bibliography. There is also forgetfulness of authors named in the body of the text and not referenced. There are indications in the references of the document.</i>	

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, please consider the suggestions given essentially to the analysis and significance of reliability; as well as to the bibliographical references. There are forgotten authors, there are others badly cited for mistakes in surnames and / or writing.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Dear Editor,
the author has improved the article. It has given more clarity to it.

But it still has errors in the references. It is indicated in the same paper.
I have suggested an improvement in the analysis of the reliability index.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

