

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: Examination of the Relationship Between Teachers' Perception of Organizational Exclusion and Levels of Happiness at Work

Submitted: 30 April 2022

Accepted: 07 June 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Selcuk Demir

Email: selcukdemirs3@gmail.com

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v9no2a121

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Aurela SaliAj

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 30.06.2022

EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: EJES 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.

EJES editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands EJES out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 18-05-2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 24-05-2022
Manuscript Title: Examination of the relationship between teachers' perception of organizational exclusion and levels of happiness at work.	
Manuscript Number:	
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 in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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.	5



<i>The title is clear and evidently represent the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The results' part within the abstract seems more as it's giving conclusions than specific findings with numbers and percentages.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>I haven't noticed grammatical and spelling errors.</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>In the manuscript the research model, population, data collection and analyses are presented thoroughly and with the entire essentially elements.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>The findings are methodically presented and the tables are accurately depicted. Discussion is properly based in research data's interpretation.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusion should be better represent the research findings.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The authors should have been referred to a more updated literature. There are few references within last 5 years and a lot of them are more than 10 years ago.</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 section that need to be revised are Abstract and Conclusion

Abstract should have more detailed findings at results' section. The statistical analyses' sentence isn't necessarily important in this section.

Conclusion section should be better written. The confirmation (or not) of the hypotheses should be clearly paraphrased as closing statement. The recommendations should be mentioned as such separately and be based on conclusions.

I suppose that in the sentence: 'It is useful for school administrators to give responsibilities in such a way that no teacher is excepted.' the authors meant '..... is excluded'.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

