



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “The Impact of English and German on the Albanian Language Usage among University Students”

Submitted: 16 June 2026

Accepted: 14 August 2026

Published: 31 August 2026

Corresponding Author: Alida Emini-Ismaili

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n23p25

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luisa Maria Arvide Cambra
Professor, University of Almeria, Spain

Reviewer 2: Nino Kemertelidze
Grigol Robakidze University, Georgia

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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 Kemertelidze	
University, Country: Independent researcher, Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 27.07.2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 31.07.2026
Manuscript Title: The Impact of English and German on the Albanian Language Usage among University Students	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree that 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 for the content of the article.	5
The title is clear, concise, and accurately reflects the focus of the study. It specifies the languages under investigation (English and German), the target language (Albanian), and the study population (university students). As such, it provides readers with an immediate understanding of the scope and purpose of the research. The title is fully consistent with the objectives, methodology, and findings presented in the manuscript.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4,5
The abstract is well structured and provides a comprehensive overview of the study. It clearly states the research objective, describes the participants, research instrument, and analytical approach, and summarizes the principal findings and conclusions. The inclusion of key numerical results strengthens the abstract by allowing readers to understand the main outcomes before reading the full paper. One minor suggestion would be to mention explicitly that the study is exploratory and based on a relatively small convenience sample. Including this information would help readers interpret the findings within their appropriate methodological context. Overall, however, the abstract accurately reflects the content of the manuscript.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Overall, the manuscript is written in clear and understandable academic English. The organization is logical, and the terminology is generally used consistently. Only minor language issues were identified, and they do not interfere with comprehension. A careful proofread before publication is nevertheless recommended. A few sentences could be expressed more naturally, and minor stylistic improvements would enhance readability. For example, several passages contain repetitive sentence structures, and some expressions could be made more idiomatic in academic English. In addition, consistency in terminology (e.g., the use of loanword, foreign lexical item, and code-switching) should be checked throughout the manuscript to ensure maximum clarity. These are editorial rather than substantive issues and can be addressed during revision. Overall, the language quality is good and requires only minor editorial polishing.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The methodology is clearly presented and generally appropriate for the exploratory nature of the study. The authors describe the research design, participant characteristics, sampling procedure, questionnaire structure, and data analysis in sufficient detail to allow readers to understand how the study was conducted. The distinction between the quantitative and qualitative components of the mixed-methods approach is also clearly explained. Nevertheless, several aspects could be strengthened. The use of convenience sampling and the relatively small sample size (35 participants from a single university) limit the generalizability of the findings. Although these limitations are acknowledged later in the paper, they could also be stated more explicitly in the Methods section. In addition, the manuscript would benefit from more information about the development or validation of the questionnaire. For example, the authors could indicate whether the instrument was piloted, adapted from previous studies, or reviewed by experts for content validity. Providing this information would further strengthen the methodological rigor of the study.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5

The presentation of the results is exceptionally executed. The data described in the text matches the data points within the tables (Tables 1–6) and the visual illustration (Figure 1) with absolute consistency. There are no mathematical or logical discrepancies in the percentages or participant counts. In Table 1, the sample size is clearly broken down: English program n=24 (68.6%), German program n=11 (31.4%), Total 35 (100.0%). This strict baseline of N=35 is perfectly maintained across all frequency tables. For overlapping variables, the author provides clear statistical annotations: "Note. Multiple responses were permitted; therefore, percentages exceed 100% when combined."	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions are consistent with the research objectives, methodology, and findings. The authors avoid overstating their results and appropriately recognize the exploratory nature of the study. The discussion successfully relates the findings to previous research and highlights the educational implications of the growing influence of English on informal communication among university students. The inclusion of a separate section on limitations and future research is particularly valuable, as it demonstrates awareness of the study's methodological constraints and identifies several productive directions for subsequent research.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The reference list is highly appropriate, relevant, and comprehensive for a study of this scale. It features foundational literature in contact linguistics (Weinreich, Haugen, Labov) alongside established methodological textbooks (Dörnyei, Silverman). All citations within the body of the text map perfectly onto the reference list, adhering to a strict APA formatting style.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Expand the methodological description. Although the methodology is generally clear, it would be helpful to provide additional information about the questionnaire, including whether it was piloted, adapted from previous research, or reviewed for content validity.

Clarify the distinction between loanwords and code-switching. The manuscript acknowledges that some participants reported complete expressions rather than individual lexical items. A brief discussion of how this may have influenced the findings would further strengthen the interpretation of the results.

Perform a final language revision. The manuscript is generally written in good academic English; however, a careful proofread would improve stylistic consistency and eliminate a few minor grammatical and lexical issues. Overall, this is a well-conducted exploratory study that makes a useful contribution to research on language contact and multilingual communication among university students. Subject to minor revisions, I believe the manuscript is suitable for publication.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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!

Date Manuscript Received: July 28, 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: July 30, 2026
Manuscript Title: The Impact of English and German on the Albanian Language Usage among University Students	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0713/26	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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: No	

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 for the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	3
The paper is properly structured, but it offers nothing novel	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
The used English is quite literal	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
Some concepts require clarification	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
The analysis is superficial	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
There are many studies on this topic, and the authors add neither novel content nor conclusions	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
Important bibliography related to the subject is missing and must be included	

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):

- Provide novel content (data, conclusions, etc.)
- Include a deeper analysis
- Clarify concepts
- Improve the English
- Add bibliography in the references

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: