

Paper: “Digital Linguistic Markers of Emotions during the September 2024 Hostilities in Lebanon: A Case Study in Communication Arts Course at a University Level in Southern Lebanon”

Submitted: 21 January 2025

Accepted: 01 March 2025

Published: 31 March 2025

Corresponding Author: Nawal Ayoub

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n8p47

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nino Guliashvili
Ilia State University, Georgia

Reviewer 2: Awwad Ahmed
College of Arts, Taif University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Reviewer 3: Zena Abu Shakra
The American University of Dubai, UAE

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Nino Guliashvili	
University/Country: Ilia State University / Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/02/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/02/2025
Manuscript Title: Digital Linguistic Markers of Emotions as of the September 2024 Hostilities in Lebanon: A Case Study in Communication Arts Course at a University Level in Southern Lebanon	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
The title of the paper effectively conveys the main research focus – the role of digital linguistic markers in expressing emotions in response to the September 2024 hostilities in Lebanon. It includes key elements which convey the significance of the paper. However, the initial part of the title “ Digital Linguistic Markers of Emotions as of the September 2024 Hostilities in Lebanon ” is not quite	

<i>accurate. The digital linguistic markers have been made in response to the above-mentioned hostilities. Also, the author should consider the distinction between the phrases: a case study in / a case study of. Therefore, the title requires reformulation.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>The objective of the study is well-defined, methods are clearly outlined, which is a combination of discourse analysis, sentiment analysis, and Conceptual Act Theory. The results are concisely summarized, highlighting the interplay between digital communication, emotions, and social identity.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The paper is well-written. Nevertheless, proofreading would be beneficial for the paper.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The research methodology is thoroughly detailed: a combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches. The data sources are appropriately selected. The use of Conceptual Act Theory is well-argued and justified in analyzing emotional responses in digital discourse.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are well-organized with logical progression from linguistic markers to emotional patterns and social identity construction. Tables and figures along with discussion passages that connect findings to broader linguistic and sociopolitical theories add depth to the analysis.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion is relevant, which reinforces the idea that digital linguistic markers play a role in emotional expression and identity construction.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The reference list is extensive and well-curated.</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):

The manuscript is a well-structured and insightful analysis of digital linguistic markers in conflict-related discourse. The interdisciplinary approach that is applied to the scrutiny of the research topic makes a significant contribution to sociolinguistics, digital discourse analysis, and conflict communication studies.

Areas for minor revision:

1. Title

*The title of the paper effectively conveys the main research focus – the role of digital linguistic markers in expressing emotions in response to the September 2024 hostilities in Lebanon. It includes key elements which convey the significance of the paper. However, the initial part of the title “**Digital Linguistic Markers of Emotions as of the September 2024 Hostilities in Lebanon**” is not quite accurate.*

The digital linguistic markers have been made in response to the above-mentioned hostilities. Also, the author should consider the distinction between the phrases: a case study in / a case study of.

Therefore, the title requires reformulation.

2. *Potential Application – the conclusion could briefly mention how these findings (though not generalizable) could be applied, i.e., what is the practical value of the research.*

3. Proofreading would be beneficial.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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. Zena Abu Shakra	
University/Country: The American University of Dubai, UAE	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/2/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/2/2025
Manuscript Title: Digital Linguistic Markers of Emotions As of the September 2024 Hostilities in Lebanon: A Case Study in Communication Arts Course at a University Level in Southern Lebanon	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title is reflective of the content. ‘As of’ is slightly misleading and may be replaced by a more appropriate term such as ‘during’	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4

<p>The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</p> <p>My recommendation for the 2 objectives is to identify digital linguistic markers <u>prior</u> to exploring how they are utilized by students to convey emotions and reflect social identity. This would create more cohesion.</p>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The manuscript requires proofreading for revision of slight grammatical errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p>The methodology section is quite short. It should not be separate from and should encompass the sections that follow including ‘participants’, ‘data collection’ and ‘data analysis’.</p> <p>Consider providing some brief background on convenience sampling.</p> <p>Data collection lacks a time element. There also needs to be some justification for the methodology chosen for data collection. This can be done through referring back to the discussion of methodology in the literature review.</p> <p>The data analysis section can benefit from more structure to add clarity. It is not clear why there is a short ‘data analysis’ section followed by a more detailed discussion of ‘Survey Analysis’, ‘Focus Group Discussion Analysis’ and ‘Reflection Log Analysis’. This short section needs to be integrated with the analysis that follows.</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<p>Under ‘Survey Analysis’, demographics presents more of a description of participants, rather than a study objective. It thus cannot constitute a finding and does not belong in this section. Moreover, since these demographics are not actual variables in the study, it is not necessary to delve into them in such detail.</p> <p>Under both ‘Focus Group Discussion Analysis’ and ‘Reflection Log Analysis’ there is a brief description of each instrument respectively backed up by some literature. This could more aptly be placed under methodology.</p> <p>With the exception of findings under ‘Reflection Log Analysis’, there seems to be no discussion of the literature used to support findings.</p> <p>Overall, the findings seem to be quite descriptive and detailed presented in accordance to methodology. More analysis is needed in order to present more general findings from all 3 instruments (survey analysis, focus group discourse analysis and reflection log analysis) together. Each finding would then be a conglomerate of data from all 3 instruments combined.</p> <p>Finally, this section needs to live up to its promise of addressing Discourse Analysis, Conceptual Act Theory and Sentiment Analysis presented earlier.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3

The conclusion is brief and fails to discuss the significance of the findings and their contribution to the literature on digital linguistic markers of emotions. This can be coupled with a consideration of the generalizability of the findings.

Although some limitations are mentioned, the shortcomings of the study need to be addressed more comprehensively. More specifically, there seems to be a few assumptions that are not questioned. One is related to the first objective of the study which assumes that ‘utilizing language in the context of social media platforms channels positive and negative sentiments in a constructive way’. Although the study demonstrates how this language channels sentiments, it fails to discuss how this may be considered ‘constructive’. Furthermore, the assumption that the Lebanese hostilities are a contributing factor to the findings is slightly presumptuous as there is an absence of similar data prior to the hostilities.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
---	----------

References do not follow a proper APA documentation style

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: