



Paper: “Investigating EFL Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Use of Authentic Materials in Teaching English in Iraqi Kurdistan Region”

Corresponding Author: Fouad Rashid Omar

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n23p131

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Haggag Mohamed Haggag
South Valley University, Egypt

Reviewer 2: Hiba Chendeb
Lebanese University, Lebanon

Published: 31.08.2020

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>Haggag Mohamed Haggag</i>	
University/Country: Egypt	
Date Manuscript Received: 22-6-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 25-6-2020
Manuscript Title: <i>Investigating EFL Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Use of Authentic Materials in Teaching English in Iraqi Kurdistan Region</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0907/20	
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.	4
<i>Although the variables are previously mentioned in similar studies but the place delimit is what makes it an adequate title.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract lacks many details such as the research approach (not the quantitative design) and the recommendations. It also has unnecessary details such as SPSS version, mentioning "motivation" although it is not part of the variables of the</i>	

<i>research; it has non-academic words such as “sometimes”. The abstract should be reviewed in terms of coherence and cohesion.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The structure is correct but the academic language used in the paper needs proofreading. There are many run-on sentences as in the “results” section. The word “people” in the participants section and the word “sometimes” in the abstract and “nowadays: in the sources section are examples for misplacement of academic words.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>There are critical issues in the design of the research since it lacks the “descriptive analytical design”; the “quantitative method” is not a design.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>There are issues in the statistical treatment need to be clarified such as high SD of (6-10) year’s participants, how did the authors adjusted the participants? What criteria? Clarifying (sig.df) and its relation to no (3-36) in the results. The paper does not include the whole questionnaire; it has to be included for review as well. The body also lack qualitative data next to the quantitative one as well (this can be done through journals, diaries or even simple interview). The questionnaire should contain both domains and items not only items, you should group items to certain domains or areas for further result analysis (where is reliability and validity of the instrument?). Literature should not start with definitions.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The paper had good conclusions but further studies need to be included to support the results. Recommendations are broad and need to be specific “prescriptive rather than descriptive). I would recommend adding a set section for recommendations apart from the conclusion.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>The references definitely need to be updated since the latest is (2015) and there are others since 70s, 80s and 90s although the variables are recent.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

-Kindly, add the whole questionnaire, follow the descriptive design approach, add qualitative data and review the academic language of the paper. Where is the validation of the questionnaire? Please add it.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

-The questionnaire should be included, references need to be updated and revision is recommended.

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: Dr. Hiba Chendeb	Email:
University/Country: Lebanon	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: July 14 th , 2020
Manuscript Title: Investigating EFL Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Use of Authentic Materials in Teaching English in Iraqi Kurdistan Region	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 09.07.2020	
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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title matches with the article content	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>The abstract states clearly the objective, the research tool and the results. However, the target population and sample should be specified. The selection process should be highlighted as well.</p> <p>The researchers should add to the abstract that they studied whether the Kurdish EFL teachers' preferences of using authentic materials in their classes differ according to their teaching experience. They should also add the result of the study of this factor.</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>The article should be edited for mechanics, punctuation, grammar and sentence structure, choice of words. The researchers can follow the comments on the article.</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>The study methods meet the research objectives but the research could've been better if it included a study of the quality of authentic materials used in the class surveyed and to which extent they improve students' performance.</p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>The body of the paper is clear but it is full of errors.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>The conclusion should recapitulate the findings</p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>The references should be listed on a separate page. The issue nb and page numbers of a journal should not be italicized.</p>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper can be accepted once the required amendments are done.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: