

Paper: **“The Dimension of Textile use in the Expression of Verbal Creativity”**

Submitted: 14 March 2021

Accepted: 17 February 2022

Published: 28 February 2022

Corresponding Author: Ilona Valantinaite

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n6p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n6p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Franca Daniele

“G. d’Annunzio” University, Chieti-Pescara, Italy

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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 too ambitious and it would be better if it were more specific.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

This section reports an aim that is not consistent with the results reported in this same section,

i.e. The students' verbal creativity was examined by means of a verbal expression questionnaire which had been compiled following the methodological recommendations of E. P. Torrance for diagnosing a person's creativity.

The results of the study show the readiness of prospective teachers of the Baltic states to contribute to the preservation of textile handicrafts, but also show the problems of popularity of ethnicity in the countries.

In other words, it is not clear if the study concerns students, teachers, or students who wish to become teachers.

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

(Please insert your comments)

The paper needs rewriting in English. Some parts of the paper are extremely difficult to understand, and I am sure the lack of language accuracy invalidates the content.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

In section 5.3 the four tasks reported seem to be different from the ones described in the figure.

The participants are not delineated clearly, i.e. the students seem to be in 1-4th grade, and although the table reports their age, it is not specified if these are high school students or university students.

The way the questionnaires were administered is not clear.

The number of subjects is too low. This is in contradiction with the Abstract.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The number of participants is too low to allow any broad conclusions.

Informants appear in the results section for the first time, and it is difficult to understand who/what these are. A difference seems to exist between these and students. So inconsistency seems to appear with the participants reported in the methods section.

The results section should explain only the data obtained from the study, and any argumentation should be done in the discussion section.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusions are too broad for the little sample of 26 students. The argumentations should be more dubitative and be limited to the specific study population.

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 references are reported in the text, however, some need to be corrected.

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):

This is an extremely interesting paper since it attempts to search for a consequence between verbal creativity and real actual expressive creativity, specifically in the field of wool manufacturing. The paper is well set and organized in specific sections that respond to the model of research papers.

The methods used are very well-established and known ones. The authors should improve and better detail the characteristics of both the tasks and especially of the participants. The results should be the direct consequence of the tasks posed.

The conclusions should be restricted and specific to the small sample and to the experimental conditions of the study, avoiding broad and useless epilogues.

The crucial problem with this paper is that it is not clear who the participants are - students, teachers, students wishing to become students? This is an extremely important clarification that the authors should make, and consistency should be present in all sections of the paper. They should also be coherent throughout the whole text with the terms used.

The text needs to be rewritten in accurate and fluent English.

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 only partly clear as it is very general. It could be improved by specifying the field of research.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract is clear and impactful.

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

(Please insert your comments)

This paper needs further editing as there are some mistakes and inconsistencies regarding punctuation (.emphasized, creative industries can transform the cultural identity), spelling (e.g. Today's technological education), unnecessary repetitions (responsible responsible consumer culture). Moreover, the references need to be consistent.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Inconsistencies in the context description can be noticed.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

As mentioned above the paper needs further editing and proofreading.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

On the whole, the conclusions is clear 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)

References need to be edited more consistently.

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 introduction should announce the different sections of the article.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: