

**Paper: “The Impact of Deductive, Inductive and Mixed Methods of Instruction on EFL Students’ Public Speaking Skill (A Case of Georgian Higher Educational Institution)”**

**Submitted: 09 August 2021**

**Accepted: 25 August 2021**

**Published: 30 September 2021**

Corresponding Author: Ana Gadakhabadze

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n33p128

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nawal Ayoub  
Beirut Arab University (Beirut Campus), Lebanon

Reviewer 2: Jelena Zascerinska  
University of Latvia, Latvia

Reviewer 3: Awwad Osman Ahmed  
Taif University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Reviewer 4: Sahar Alameh  
Lebanese International University (Saida Campus), Lebanon

Reviewer 5: Hanaa Ouda Khadri Ahmed Ouda  
Ain Shams University, Egypt

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The title reflects the subject of the article and adequate.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The abstract provided  
a clear summary of the paper.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

(Please insert your comments)

The paper is rather well written .

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The methodology is sound and has been  
applied in an appropriate way.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)


The conclusions are  
supported by data obtained .

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)



References are relevant and recent.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*


- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

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



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

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`'s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The title is clear. How ever,  
the title could also include the mixed  
approach discussed in the paper.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The abstract is clear.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

(Please insert your comments)

There are some misprints:  
- Introduction: 5require  
- Last sentence in  
Literature review : mothodology

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The methods are  
well defined and explained.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The body is well-structured and well-written.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusions mostly reflect the work done. The conclusions could be extended by

- the research limitations and

- work to be done further

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**



\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The list of references is ok.

Anderson 2017 is in the text on Page 2, however, this reference is not shown in the list of references.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

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

Thanks to the author(s) for the interesting and well-written paper! The topic is relevant and of a high research interest.

Revealing the topics of students' public speeches as well as the evaluation criteria of students' public speeches could increase the quality of the paper.

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

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Capitalize only the initials of the words in the title.

Preferably add "of Deductive and Inductive Method of Instruction on....."

Moreover, there are different types of public speaking: ceremonial, demonstrative, informative, and

persuasive, so it is better to focus on one of them to narrow down the topic.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

This abstract lacks your research problem.

In your key results, preferably specify the main improved aspects in the participants' public speaking

performances.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, there are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Please find the attached comments.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The methodology does not include the following sections clearly and separately:

The Research design section

Participants and Sampling

Instruments

Procedure

Results or findings and analysis of the results

Discussion

Concerning the introduction: Please rewrite the introduction taking into consideration that the

introduction of your article, where you set up your topic and approach for the reader, should:

- Present your topic and get the reader interested

- Provide background or summarize existing research
- Position your own approach
- Detail your specific research problem
- may discuss previous research leading up to the study, and may state a hypothesis or question.

Please review carefully the attached comments in the word document of the article.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

Concerning the body:

Please explain on what basis do you depend to choose specific TED talks to watch them with the participants in the study?

Preferably integrate the links of these TED talks into your study.

Avoid passive voice and focus on who conducted the study (the researcher, the teacher, etc,...)

Please specify whether all the students who participated in the study were males and/ or females.

Provide more information about their current EFL proficiency (based on valid and reliable tests), public

speaking skills, and native language

Give more details about the participants' learning styles that you have mentioned in the body .

How are groups divided here? And on what basis do you depend to put each student in each group?

Please explain more about the recipe of the hybrid approach mentioned in the experiment and

discussion section.

According to the latest version of the APA Publication Manual (i.e., APA 7), each table must have a clear

and concise title which should be written in italicized title case below the table number, with a blank line

between the number and the title.

What and where are the questions (Q1, Q2, Q3,...) in Table 1? According to the latest version of the APA

Publication Manual (i.e., APA 7), each table must have a clear and concise title which should be written

in italicized title case below the table number, with a blank line between the number and the title.

The design of table 5 should present its content clearly.

To make your results more valid and reliable, I advise you to add some of your students' public speaking

videos before and after the implementation of the treatment in order to show the effectiveness of the

treatment and the responsiveness of the students to the intervention.

Include all the tools (rubrics, questionnaire,...) used to collect in the appendix.

Pay more attention to indentation, double spacing, etc...( review how to apply apa style the 7th edition)

Place all page numbers in the top right corner in the header. Though the APA Style rules ask for page

numbering to start on the title page, a common academic convention is to include the title page in the

total page count but start the numbering on page two.

Missing the discussion section: Here you discuss how the findings (results) of your research tie back into

the other research done in the field and why what you have found is important. You may also give ideas

for further research.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

Preferably include what are the main aspects that are improved in the participants' public speaking

skills. You can also include your recommendations for prospective studies relevant to your topic.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

All lines after the first line of each entry in your reference list should be indented one-half inch from the

left margin. This is called hanging indentation.

All reference lists should be double-spaced just like the rest of your article.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5



*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

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

A rectangular text input field with a scroll bar on the right side. The scroll bar has three visible buttons: an upward-pointing triangle at the top, a square in the middle, and a downward-pointing triangle at the bottom. The input field is currently empty.

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

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

It contributes to the existing field.  
It tries to fill the gap in this regard.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

yes, clearly  
presents these research aspects.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

(Please insert your comments)

It sounds as a well- organized article.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, clearly explained and presented

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

slight ones

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, with particular reference to the objectives.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The researcher should follow the latest format of APA style carefully.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

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

The researcher should follow the latest format of APA style carefully.



You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

yes

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

(Please insert your comments)

There are a lot of grammatical errors  
w hich should be corrected.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

More details are needed.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

yes

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

yes

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

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