



**Paper: “Beyond Structural Change: A Cultural Interpretation of School Principals’
“Burnout National” Survey by ANP–LUMSA”**

Submitted: 29 December 2025

Accepted: 13 February 2026

Published: 28 February 2026

Corresponding Author: Grazia Angeloni

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n4p63

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Krzysztof Nesterowicz
Ludovika-University of Public Service, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Isa Spahiu
University of Tetovo, North Macedonia

Reviewer 3: Daniel Jambo Ghirmai
Department of Research and Human Resource Development Ministry of Education, Eritrea

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Isa Spahiu	
University/Country: University of Tetovo, North Macedonia	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/01/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/01/2026
Manuscript Title: Beyond Structural Change: A Cultural Interpretation of School Principals' Burnout National Survey by ANP-LUMSA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: to be filled	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each 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
Comments: The title accurately reflects both the empirical scope and the cultural interpretation presented in the manuscript. It clearly signals the focus on school principals' burnout while emphasizing the analytical lens (cultural interpretation) and the source of data (ANP-LUMSA survey). The only minor suggestion could be to consider hyphenating "BurnoutNational" for clarity: "Burnout National."	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5

Comments: The abstract effectively summarizes the study’s objectives, methodology, key findings, and theoretical contribution. It balances empirical results with the proposed cultural interpretation, providing a clear rationale for why cultural analysis is necessary beyond structural explanations. The inclusion of keywords enhances discoverability. Some sentences are dense and could be slightly shortened for readability.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Comments: The manuscript is generally well-written and academically polished. Minor issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typo: “Administrtrive Director” → “Administrative Director” • Minor spacing/typo in “BurnoutNational” in the title • Occasional complex sentence structures that could be simplified for clarity. These do not impede comprehension but can be addressed in a minor revision.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Comments: The methodology section is thorough, detailing sample characteristics, survey instruments, and key measures. The use of national data and standardized instruments (Maslach Burnout Inventory, JD–R framework) enhances credibility. The discussion of gender, regional, and school type variations strengthens methodological transparency. Linking quantitative methods with the proposed cultural lens is well-articulated and demonstrates methodological rigor.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
Comments: The results are presented logically with clear descriptive statistics and correlations. Tables or figures would further enhance clarity but are not strictly necessary. The manuscript successfully integrates quantitative results with cultural interpretation, avoiding overstating conclusions. Statistical claims (e.g., correlations, p-values) are appropriate and consistent with the narrative.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Comments: Conclusions are consistent with results and reflect the manuscript’s central argument: burnout is both an empirical and culturally constructed phenomenon. The distinction between structural change and cultural transformation is well-supported. Practical and policy implications are cogently linked to findings, offering actionable insights for educational governance.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Comments: References are extensive, up-to-date, and highly relevant, spanning empirical research, organizational theory, leadership studies, and cultural analysis. Foundational works (Maslach, Bourdieu, Schein, Fullan) and recent empirical studies (ANP–LUMSA 2025, OECD 2020) are well-integrated. Minor inconsistencies in formatting (e.g., italics for book titles) could be standardized.	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	Accepted
------------------------------	----------

Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Correct minor typos (e.g., “Administrtrive Director” → “Administrative Director”) and formatting issues (e.g., “BurnoutNational” → “Burnout National”).
- Consider shortening some sentences in the abstract and discussion to improve readability without losing depth.
- Optional: including tables or figures summarizing key quantitative results may improve visual clarity for readers.

Strengths:

- Strong empirical foundation with a nationally representative sample.
- Excellent integration of cultural interpretation with quantitative data.
- Clear policy and practical implications.

Minor Areas for Improvement:

- Typos and minor stylistic issues.
- Some long sentences could be simplified.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Daniel Jambo Ghirmai (PhD)	
University/Country: Eritrea	
Date Manuscript Received: 02/01/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/01/2026
Manuscript Title: Beyond Structural Change: A Cultural Interpretation of School Principals' Burnout National Survey by ANP-LUMSA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 28.01.2026	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. <i>(The title is so clear and adequate to the contents of the study)</i>	5
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>(The abstract is well written, but needs some editing. The researcher required to state the study research design and tool of data analysis.)</i>	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(it is difficult to find deficiency on grammar)</i>	5
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>(This section of the study needs some work. The researcher does not clearly state the study research design, research objectives, questions and tool of data analysis.)</i>	2
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4

<i>(The results do not contain errors, but needs some modification based on the research objectives or questions of the study.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(the conclusion and implication of the study is well articulated and presented)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Although the references are comprehensive, they are old (only two references are published between 2020-2025) and there is a need to add new references)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper remains “of potential interest”. It certainly requires further development. Its strengths include (a) its focus on an educational leadership, (b) its clear structure, which aligns with usual expectations for the reporting of findings from an interpretative investigation, and (c) the attention it gives to a topic of immediate practical importance to the development of resilient principal. However, areas for improvement are:

- 1, The abstract, and the intention of the study is clear, but research approach and data analysis of the study needs clarification.
- 2, There is absence of ethical clearance in the manuscript, so the researcher has to properly address the ethical issue of the study including declaration statement of AI usage.
- 3, Data analysis techniques were not included or presented properly.
- 4, The results do not contain errors, but needs some modification based on the research objectives or questions of the study.
- 5, References are comprehensive, but most of the references are old (26 out of 28) and need to be replaced by new ones.
- 6, Moreover, the manuscript is reasonably written, but additional technical editing or formatting is suggested.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Krzysztof Nesterowicz	
University/Country: Ludovika University of Public Service, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 10.01.2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 20.01.2026
Manuscript Title: Beyond Structural Change: A Cultural Interpretation of School Principals' Burnout National Survey by ANP-LUMSA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0128/26	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4

Yes, the title is broadly clear and coherent with the article’s content.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	2
<p>The Abstract clearly presents the objectives, implicitly references the method, but does not explicitly present results in the conventional empirical sense.</p> <p>You do not need to rewrite the abstract radically. A few targeted additions would make it fully compliant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add one sentence clarifying method, e.g.: “Using a secondary, interpretive analysis of the ANP–LUMSA survey data...” • Add one sentence framing outcomes as results. e.g.: “The analysis shows that principals’ burnout is best understood as a culturally embedded outcome of role delegitimization, trust erosion, and control-oriented governance.” 	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<p>The article is very strong conceptually and stylistically, but there are a few grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, and minor syntactic infelicities scattered throughout the text. They are not frequent and do not undermine comprehension, but they should be corrected before submission</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p>The study methods are clearly described at the level appropriate to a secondary, interpretive article, yet they are not fully explicit in methodological positioning.</p> <p>Suggestion: Add one or two explicit sentences in the <i>Methodological Premise</i> section, e.g.:</p> <p>“This study adopts a secondary, qualitative–interpretive methodology. It does not involve new data collection, but offers a theoretically grounded reinterpretation of the ANP–LUMSA national survey findings through the lenses of organizational culture, anthropology, and educational governance.”</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<p>The results are clear, internally coherent, and methodologically sound, with no major errors.</p>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions are accurate, coherent, and well supported by the content of the article , with only minor caveats related to scope and framing , not substance.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references are comprehensive, appropriate, and well chosen for the article's scope and intellectual ambition. However, I would like to see some more recent publications related to the topic (last 5 years).	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

None.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

None.