

Paper: **“Appraisal Theory and Interpreting Political Speech”**

**Submitted: 11 June 2024**

**Accepted: 01 July 2024**

**Published: 31 July 2024**

Corresponding Author: Mohammed Alhuthali

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n20p46](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n20p46)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: John Pahoni Stevens  
Eastern Technical University (ETU), Sierra Leone

Reviewer 2: Alina Stela Resceanu  
University of Craiova, Romania

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

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

Yes, the title is clear and adequate to the content of the article

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

The ABSTRACT is somehow clear but did not clearly state the reasons (object) for using the two speeches and the findings in analyzing the speeches

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

there are few grammatical errors. this is the more reason the sentences are longer than expected

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes, the study methods are clearly stated and expressed

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

The body of the paper is clear but needs a little adjustment in rephrasing some sentences

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

Yes, the summary and conclusion are accurate as supported by the study content

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

Yes

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

Please endeavor to rephrase the highlighted sentences and also see if you can reduce the sentence length of some major areas

-----

-----

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

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

The title effectively communicates the main themes and focus of the article. It is specific enough to give a glimpse into the approach taken within the article and set appropriate expectations for readers regarding the academic or theoretical framework that will be employed.

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

The abstract clearly states the purpose of the paper and explains that the study identifies differences in the use of appraisal modes (Affect and Judgement) across different sections of the two speeches analysed. It also provides the scope for the study and indicates the methodological approach of examining real-world examples. All in all, the abstract is well-written and structured, effectively conveying the main points of the study in a concise manner

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

No grammatical errors or spelling mistakes

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The research methods employed in studying semiotic modes in speeches are clearly explained, and the author(s) discusses both qualitative approaches (interpretation using Appraisal Theory concepts) and quantitative methods (counting attitudinal resources). The inclusion of references (Bolouri, 2008; Hamby & Jones, 2022; Shahmir et al., 2023; Troiano et al., 2023; Hofmann et al., 2020; Soo-Guan Khoo et al., 2012) demonstrates a solid foundation in existing literature and methodologies, while acknowledging complexities and adaptations necessary for the current study (the adaptation of Aian's (2017) framework for affect, judgment, and appreciation systems, with critical modifications to better fit the study's objectives; this adaptation reflects thoughtful methodological consideration).

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

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

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

The conclusions effectively summarize the findings regarding the role of Appraisal Theory in analyzing emotional aspects of speeches, clarifying that while emotions play a significant role, the specific wording and context are crucial in understanding their true impact. This section also reflects on the limitations of focusing solely on emotional incidences and emphasizes the need for qualitative approaches to capture

the nuanced meaning of speeches beyond surface-level emotional expressions, and suggests avenues for future research, particularly in refining qualitative methods to better interpret the emotional dynamics of formal speeches.

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

The references support the argument and provide a scholarly context for the discussion on Appraisal Theory and its limitations. The list included at the end of the paper is comprehensive and appropriate.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, no revision needed

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

No comments

-----