

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

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. 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 (not perceived the impact). 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: 17 / 12 / 2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 18 / 12 / 2016
Manuscript Title: "Utilization of Social Networks among Saudi EFL Learners: Trends and Uses"	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0106/17	

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.

<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>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The title provides a good description of the contents of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Abstract seems to cover the main issues of the paper. The survey method might be flagged at this point, and some indication of the overall trends highlighted.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The general editorial quality seems high. It would be desirable however for a light proof read to be carried out to address what would seem to be rather colloquial uses of the language inappropriate for an academic piece, and also to resolve minor grammatical infelicities such as in relation to the use of prepositions. Very minor.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Seems clear.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Seems good. I would not necessarily agree with all of the emphases, but one would not expect to. In particular, I felt that the references to “Digital Natives” and “Digital Immigrants” calling on Marc Prensky’s work from 2001 might overstate the clarity and significance of the work. It has received a great deal of criticism recently; for example Bayne, S., & Ross, J. (2011). Digital native' and 'digital immigrant' discourses: a critique. In S. Bayne, & R. Land (Eds.), <i>Digital differences: perspectives on online education</i>. (pp. 159-170). Sense Publishers.	
As a matter of courtesy, the editors should note that danah boyd does not use capital letters in the representation of her name. For example, see : http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x/abstract	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Seems good.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> A useful collection of sources.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is good to have this overview of the use of social networking systems in the Saudi Arabian setting, and thus the work makes a valuable contribution. There can always be different directions taken, and different emphases made. One thing that I would suggest would be that you might moderate the references to Prensky’s (2001) rhetoric on the “Digital Native” somewhat, as the idea has received quite a bit of criticism in recent years. If that particularly “strong” version of Prensky’s arguments are problematized somewhat, then the argument that follows about current students being rather different in their expectations from those of recent generations could stand. You might want to call upon sources such as Bayne, S., & Ross, J. (2011). Digital native' and 'digital immigrant' discourses: a critique. In S. Bayne, & R. Land (Eds.), *Digital differences: perspectives on online education*. (pp. 159-170). Sense Publishers, and Jones, Chris and Shao, Binhui (2011). The net generation and digital natives: implications for higher education. Higher Education Academy, York

(<http://oro.open.ac.uk/30014/>)

Note that danah boyd does not use capital letters in the representation of her name. For example, see :
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x/abstract>

As a matter of courtesy you should follow that “convention”. See :
<http://www.danah.org/name.html>

I would also suggest a look at Figure 1. When printed, the axis labels will be extremely difficult to read because of font size.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This is a useful piece, which provides some important baseline data from a particular time and location. Having information like this from the Arab World is particularly important. Some light copy editing would enhance the quality of the piece.

