

South African Association for Language Teaching
 Suid-Afrikaanse Vereniging vir Taalonderrig
 Mbumbano ya Afrika Tshipembe ya u Gudisa Nyambo

Journal for Language Teaching
 Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig
 Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi

REPORT BY PEER REVIEWER

Please email the completed report to the
 editor: tobie.vandyk@nwu.ac.za

Title of article reviewed: XXX

Reviewer surname and initials: XXX¹

Email address: XXX

Date article emailed to reviewer: XXX

Due date for submission of report: XXX

Date of review submission: XXX

¹ The journal adheres to the blind peer review process and details of reviewers are not revealed to authors.

Descriptors	Response to criteria with additional comments
1. Is this paper suitable for publication in the <i>Journal for Language Teaching</i> ? Does it make a substantial contribution (new knowledge) to <i>language teaching</i> ? What adjustments do you think should be made in this regard?	
2. Does the title succinctly encapsulate what the article is about? If it should be improved, what are your suggestions?	
3. Is the abstract appropriate? In other words, does the abstract provide a clear and true summary of the article?	
4. Is the introduction brief and relevant, giving the reader a clear indication of what is to follow?	
5. Has the research problem (this could be empirical and/or conceptual) been stated clearly?	
6. Is the rationale for the research problem defensible and clear as opposed to absent/vague/ irrelevant? Has the study been sufficiently contextualised?	
7. Has a clear research question, and where applicable, sub-question(s) been formulated? Are they aligned with the title and purpose of the study?	
8. Is the literature well-integrated, critiqued and written logically? Are key issues/trends/silences in the subject field mentioned? Does the author display adequate insight into the relevant literature? Is the connection between the various viewpoints posed in the literature review clear? Does the literature review include an appropriate range of relevant sources (national and international)?	
9. Is an appropriate theoretical / conceptual framework presented for the study? Are the work of relevant scholars indicated and discussed briefly to explain the chosen theoretical / conceptual framework?	
10. Is the overall research design appropriate for the study and has it been clearly described?	
11. Has the research methodology (e.g. qualitative and/or quantitative) been described? Is the research methodology based on an acceptable scientific basis? Are the results based on a clearly demarcated field of research and/or	

comprehensive database? Has the design of the protocols/instruments been clearly described? Have the sampling strategies/selection criteria been adequately described? Has reference been made to how ethical considerations were adhered to? ²	
12. Have the data collection procedures been described adequately, including the rationale, the advantages and disadvantages for using these in this study?	
13. Have the data analysis procedures, including rationale/advantages and limitations, been described? Is the audit trail clear? Have issues relating to validity/reliability, trustworthiness etc. been addressed?	
14. Has a well-founded conclusion been reached? Have the research questions been answered? Have limitations been suggested?	
15. Does the author write in a scholarly/scientific manner using his/her own words, appropriate academic/technical terms and avoiding colloquial expressions? Is the article error-free with reference to grammatically and technically accuracy?	
16. Does the author use in-text references correctly and appropriately? Is the list of references complete and correct? Where applicable, are sources recent and sufficient for a journal article?	
17. With regards to the format, has the in-house style of the SAALT journal been adhered to?	

² There is no expectation that reviewers answer all these questions about the research methodology in the report. However, these are the issues related to research methodology that the Editorial Board would like the reviewers to please consider.

RECOMMENDATION BY THE REVIEWER

Reviewers are requested to please indicate their recommendation to the editor by selecting one of the options below. Reviewers are welcome to add notes to explain the recommendation.

1. I recommend that the article be accepted for publication after <u>minor</u> changes or corrections as indicated in this report have been made to the satisfaction of the editor.	
2. I recommend that the article be accepted for publication after <u>substantial revision</u> has been conducted to the satisfaction of the editor. Issues to address are noted in the text and/or report.	
3. I recommend that the article <u>not be accepted</u> for publication in its current form.	
4. I recommend that the article be submitted elsewhere for consideration.	

OTHER REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS OFFERED BY THE REVIEWER

xxx

Submit the completed report to the editor: tobie.van.dyk@nwu.ac.za
