

**Paper: “The Effectiveness of the Methods in Use to Promote Fluency among EFL Learners at Foreign Languages Department, Taif University”**

Corresponding Author: Awwad Ahmed

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n11p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luisa Arvide  
University of Almeria, Spain

Reviewer 2: Haggag Mohamed Haggag  
South Valley University, Egypt

Reviewer 3: Bakheit Mohammed Abdelgadir Elnagar  
King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

Reviewer 4: Omer Elmahdi  
Taibah University, KSA

Published: 30.04.2020

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

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: <i>Bakheit Mohammed Abdelgadir Elnagar, PhD</i> <i>Consultant of the Deanship of Graduate Studies , Research Consultant of Research Services Unit for the Graduate Students &amp; Head of Research Services Unit for the Graduate Students.</i>	Email:
University/Country: <i>Deanship of Graduate Studies (DGS) King Abdulaziz University (KAU) P.O. Box: 80217 Jeddah 21589, K.S.A.</i>	
Date Manuscript Received: <i>19/03/ 2020</i>	Date Review Report Submitted: <i>24/03/ 2020</i>
Manuscript Title: <i>The Effectiveness of the Methods in Use to Promote Fluency among EFL Learners at FLD, Taif University</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <i>0408/20</i>	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
(A well-written title appropriate with the content. But this acronym (FLD) stands for Foreign Languages Department (FLD) should be mentioned)	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
(Appropriate .But this acronym (FLD) stands for Foreign Languages Department (FLD) should be mentioned)	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<p>(Table (4.5) demonstrates that <b>there is no significant difference</b> in terms of gender due to the education levels regard the oral skills.</p> <p>It is good to substitute this phrase (that <b>there is no significant difference...</b>) with(that is statistically non-significant difference...) to be more strong.</p> <p>Furthermore, table (4.6) stresses that <b>there is no notable</b> variation due to gender in the context of speaking improvement.</p> <p>This phrase (<b>there is no notable</b> ....) should be replaced by (is unmemorable...).</p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
(It is indeed a great and rich experience)	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
(Well done)	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
(Highly suitable and well-conceived)	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
(they are adequate )	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>x</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

I believe that it should need some recent references that dated from 2010 to 2019 to update and fill the gap to support the theoretical overview and literature review by adding some recent information if it is available.

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



# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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!***

Date Manuscript Received: <b><i>March 19th</i></b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b><i>March 23rd</i></b>
Manuscript Title: <b><i>The Effectiveness of the Methods in Use to Promote Fluency among EFL Learners at FLD, Taif University</i></b>	
<b>ESJ Manuscript Number: 0408/20</b>	
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.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>  <i>- FLD acronym should be fully written at the title of the paper.</i> <i>- The phrase (Methods is use) is vague; a phrase like (prevailing teaching methods) is fine.</i> <i>- The title does not specify what (Methods) are the core of the paper.</i>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>  <i>- The abstract is short and comprehensive, still key results need to be highlighted as well as</i>	<b>3</b>

<i>statistical numbers and levels (e.g 0.1 or 0.01) . Qualitative data results should be included. No research design is mentioned at the abstract (e.g. descriptive, experimental or quasi-experimental).</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>- The paper is cohesive and coherent .</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The paper lacks 2 main parts: a. Interpreting the results with relevance to literature review and related studies. b. Adding and integrating both the qualitative as well as the quantitative data.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>- The paper lacks key scientific areas such as, hypotheses, research design, definition of terms, delimits as well as related studies from the Arabian context. - Follow APA6 style guide or other relevant guides to the body of the paper. - Questions should be separate area not to be added to introduction. - Add aims of the research to the body.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>- Though conclusion is comprehensive, still key results need to be highlighted and other qualitative data need to be included.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>- No up-to date references are included. - References are tiny to the scope of the paper. - References need to include other Arabian context related references</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

- *Research area of the paper is very good and it adds to the prevailing methods in the Arabian TEFL contexts.*
- *Kindly add definition of terms, update references and add interview questions, feedback or other qualitative data results.*

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



---

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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!*

Date Manuscript Received: 19.03.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 08.04.2020
Manuscript Title: The Effectiveness of the Methods in Use to Promote Fluency among EFL Learners at FLD, Taif University	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 08.04.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
The title is clear and one can easily link it to the content of the article, but it would be better if it were shortened (to express more concisely the subject dealt with in the paper).	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
Although the author states the aims of the research, the methods and the research questions, the many grammatical and semantic mistakes make the text ambiguous and at some point unclear.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this</b>	<b>2</b>

<b>article.</b>	
Unfortunately, the grammatical mistakes affect the understanding of the sentences and hinder the meaning of the text. I strongly advise the author to check the article again and correct the mistakes.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
The study methods are explained with enough clarity, but research aim A more interesting approach of this topic would have been a comparative one: between the perspective of the teachers on the one hand, and the perspective of the students on the other hand. Then, these perspective should have been assessed, compared and statistically measured.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
The body of the article contains insufficient data points and statistically non-significant variations for the stated research aim.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
The conclusions do not provide relevant feedback on the presentation and analysis of the data discussed in the paper, nor on the the sustainability and reproducibility of the methodology used.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<p>Most of the bibliographic sources used for the elaboration of this article are appropriate and up-to-date, but such a topic should also include references regarding the ongoing debate on fluency vs accuracy, especially when taking into consideration the productive skills (writing and speaking). Besides, the references should be revised (to correct the mistakes) and uniformly structured, complying with the journal-specific guidelines (for example, the name of David Nunan was wrongly spelled as ‘Nanan’ in Naunan, D., Bailey, K., and Curtis, A. (2001). Pursuing Professional Development. Heinle and Heinle, Boston) including page numbers for the articles in collective volumes or journals/reviews.</p> <p>Moreover, the author should indicate the date when the online sources were accessed and check the availability of the links (I randomly checked this link: <a href="http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/December_08_zn.php">http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/December_08_zn.php</a>, but the source is not available).</p>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>X</b>
Reject	

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

The Literature review, which is presented in the second section of this article, is not clearly structured so as to reflect the main ideas/research objectives.

One more (rather) formal/editorial suggestion: instead of extensively using the his-her distinction, a



better option is to use them and the corresponding plural forms (the students, them)

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



# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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!*

Date Manuscript Received: <b>March 19, 2020</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>March 22, 2020</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>The Effectiveness of the Methods in Use to Promote Fluency among EFL Learners at FLD, Taif University</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0408/20</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## **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><b>Questions</b></i>	<i><b>Rating Result</b></i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
The abstract should add some data.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>

The language used is correct but too literal.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
The manuscript is not too novel. Similar subjects have already been studied.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
The discuss is slightly superficial and weak.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
The manuscript should deep in both analysis and conclusions.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
Some relevant bibliography should be added.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

The paper will improve:

- 1) By adding data in the abstract
- 2) By doing a more thorough analysis of the study results
- 3) By showing a deeper conclusion
- 4) By including some further relevant bibliography

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

