

Paper: “Exploring American Cultural Themes in Language Learning: A Qualitative Analysis of 'Focus 4' EFL Textbook”

Submitted: 15 January 2025

Accepted: 23 February 2025

Published: 28 February 2025

Corresponding Author: Flora Amiti

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n5p44

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Vanya Katsarska
Air Force Academy, Bulgaria

Reviewer 2: Adil Jamil
Amman University, Jordan

Reviewer 3: Claudia Pisoschi
University of Craiova, Romania

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title of the manuscript is clear and properly reflects its content. Slightly longish, though.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is informative—it includes key information and sets the tone for the rest of the article. However, there is a point that raises questions. The abstract claims that the textbook 'contributes to both academic and personal growth,' but the body of the article does not seem to provide evidence of academic or professional growth.

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

One can notice a few minor structural and grammatical errors, along with some punctuation mistakes that can be easily corrected.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The research questions and hypotheses are straightforward; they are adequate to the content. The method is simple and clearly explained. The manuscript contains enough information to enable researchers to understand what was done and how.

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

Although there is some redundancy, the ideas in the manuscript are clear and logical. Overall, the manuscript contributes to a better understanding of the subject matter.

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

The key message is clear. The implications – relevant.

The data supports the conclusions of the paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Every reference is cited in the text and vice versa.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

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]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I guess ESJ readers will find the article interesting and motivating for their future work. Proofreading is recommended to ensure accuracy in punctuation and vocabulary usage.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Yes, the title is clear and adequate to the content.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, the abstract complies with the requirements. No further comments.

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

Yes, there are such errors and mistakes. Please, see the reviewed manuscript attached. Among the aspects to be addressed by the author, we mention: the use of commas, wrong inverted commas, preposition use, some incomplete and/or obscure linguistic structures.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes. No comment.

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

Generally speaking, the body of the paper is clear, but some negative aspects mentioned should require concrete examples and further argumentation, considering the objectives of the study. Please see the reviewed manuscript attached.

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

Yes. No comment.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Most references are incomplete (see the reviewed manuscript).

Garinger (2001) is not mentioned as an indirect source.

The selection of the references is adequate.

In-text notes are inconsistent throughout the article (see the reviewed manuscript).

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

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]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please consider the observations and questions in my comments. Be more specific if necessary. Include examples or enlarge upon your ideas in order to make your point clear(er).

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: See Comments

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

The title is adequate.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is complete.

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

Sometimes punctuation needs revision.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The explanation of the methods is clear.

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

A few sentences are not clear mainly due to incorrect punctuation.

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

The conclusion is accurate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The References section should be more extensive and possibly include other studies, if any, where the relationship between culturally-oriented content and linguistic skill development, particularly speaking skills, is investigated and discussed.

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]

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]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

A comparison with other books or other possible similar studies could improve the quality of this article.
