

Paper: “The Impact of Students` Needs and Interests on Vocabulary Acquisition in a Private University in Georgia (A Case of Georgian Higher Education Institution)”

Submitted: 28 July 2021

Accepted: 23 August 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Tamta Mshvidobadze

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n33p198

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Magy Martin
Walden University, Minneapolis, USA

Reviewer 3: Adeshina Abideen Olojede
Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai, Niger State

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 and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract was clearly presented with the objects, methods and results.

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


(Please insert your comments)

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

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)



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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of the paper is clear and only contains a few punctuation issues.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

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 comprehensive and appropriate.

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 author did a nice job with the presentation of this study. There just needs to be minimal review of the punctuation, grammar, etc.

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 vague and does not clearly identify the variables, vocabulary materials should be used for developing language in the first place then attitudes with the help of interest and motivation which foster the process of vocabulary acquisition. Therefore, the title includes vague independent variable "vocabulary skills"; I would recommend replacing it with "vocabulary achievement or vocabulary acquisition".

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract lacks stating the research design "two-tailed quasi experimental design". It lacks the statement of instruments used and the major results precisely "rather than stating only competence development".

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

(Please insert your comments)

The paper requires structure revision as there are cohesion and coherence issues "e.g. nowadays, run on sentences at the theoretical part and non-academic words such as "wrote..". The article also has punctuation issues such as the introduction "citation marks" and the literature part description.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

There are major academic issues in methods part: The part should clearly identify the following elements " a. two-tailed quasi experimental design, instruments used, sampling and limitations. It has no description about the nature of tasks used and the layout of these tasks "unit, program or module". There should be validation for these instruments such as "validity and reliability".

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of the paper lacks validation description for the instruments. It should describe the setting, validation and application of the instruments. The ratios of at the tables also require clear description "e.g correlation should be more than 0.8, also paired sample correlation 0.49 which is greater than 0.05 .

The statistical treatment does not include a discussion of results in the light of pertinent literature; there is no discussion for the results.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion is descriptive rather than descriptive; it should clearly summarize the results obtained from the contextualized materials used in sample's vocabulary acquisition.

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, though well organized and following APA citation style, lack integrating up to date references. For instance, references include researches early dated to 1987, 1972, 1975 ..etc.

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):

Instruments and design of the research are not clear and require validation.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: