

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_124154
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Speaking Anxiety and Intercultural Competence as Predictors of Learner's Willingness to Communicate</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>According to the author of the article, it seems that this research can potentially have useful results with some theoretical and practical implications for the specific L2 teaching/learning context. The strong aspect of the study is the practical orientation and the simplicity of language that, although not always very clear, scientific and cohesive, gradually leads the reader to some conclusions of practical interest (provided these are scientifically sound). Also, at some points the explanation of the results of the analysis is sufficient. WTC is the main construct studied in this research paper and is a very important one in L2 teaching/learning contexts - it is complex, multifaceted and well-researched internationally. Nevertheless, studies that aim to contextualize it are always interesting for practitioners and the scientific community.</p> <p>Although I always believed that the essence of good research should not be judged mainly on the basis of the quality of writing, sometimes it is crucial to be able to use language in a clear and cohesive way in order to explain ideas and processes so that the reader understands not only what the researcher is trying to prove, but also the way or the process through which the results were produced so that these can be effectively linked to conclusions that are scientifically sound. Therefore, based on the information provided in a paper, another researcher should be able to replicate it. This goes beyond language and into two very basic concepts: (a) research questions that are based on good quality literature and that gradually lead to an understanding of the aims and utility of the research, and (b) research methodology.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Yes. The title is strong, concise and suitable as it describes the constructs and the relationships examined. It communicates the aims of the study effectively.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>I kindly suggest the following changes:  <b>Aims:</b> “To examine speaking anxiety and intercultural competence as predictors of willingness to communicate”. The word <i>exogenous</i> is not understood by international audience. I believe the author means <i>predictors</i> or <i>independent variables</i>.  <b>Study Design:</b> Cross sectional, correlational study design.  <b>Place &amp; Duration of the Study:</b> Please, mention what Region 9 is. Readers outside of India won't understand.  <b>Methodology:</b> Please provide at least the sample size here and mention the three variables of the study and how these were measured providing information explicitly on the instruments / surveys that you have used. For example, WTC has been operationalized in many different ways. Which survey have you used (and inside the study explain why you use this survey and not some other and also the adaptations that you have made – and also explain and provide information on them).  <b>Results:</b> I would generally suggest that you avoid using descriptive words for statistical indicators, like <i>moderate</i> or <i>high</i>, because these are judgements and you need to provide some point of reference. On what grounds we can assert that this level of mean Anxiety is moderate and in relation to what? Do you refer to some scholar (e.g., Cohen) on statistics? Also, I believe that the word ‘generally’ is not a good choice for scientific reasoning. We are not aloud to generalize except when based on facts and findings. Does your research provide grounds for your judgement on this? Be more specific and stick to your findings avoiding to make inferences based on pure judgement that is not based on relevant research. For example, why a moderate level of speaking anxiety shows a significant relationship to WTC? The relationship is examined with regression and correlation, so it is the predictive ability (or significance of correlation) of anxiety that shows a relationship with WTC and not the moderate level of it alone. Be precise – you refer to this information in your study.  <b>Conclusion:</b> You may want to use ‘independent variables’ or ‘predictors’ here, instead of ‘exogenous’. Also, because intercultural competence is a significant predictor of WTC, does not mean that a high level of intercultural competence leads to higher / increased WTC. This can be seen in correlation. If these are significantly positively correlated, then what you say is true. But, If intercultural competence is a predictor of WTC but these two are significantly negatively correlated, then a higher intercultural competence leads to lower / decreased WTC. Use all the evidence that you have to provide sufficient support to your conclusions.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Except from a minor error in one paragraph title the manuscript follows a logical and appropriate structure for a quantitative research paper.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>There are some major shortcomings and problems with the manuscript. First, it is not evident to the reader how the author links the literature presented with the aims of the study. The reasoning presents many gaps, the constructs and the relationships are not clearly presented, as well as the research questions. The methodology section is seriously weak. The reasoning behind the choice of the analytical strategy is not sufficient as it is the presentation of the results. The conclusions seem to be arbitrary and not grounded on good quality research literature or always relevant to the results of the analysis. Overall, in its current form, the paper is not scientifically robust or technically sound.</p> <p>To be clear and specific, I consider this manuscript to have the following problems: (a) it is not clear how the researcher links the three constructs of the study based on relevant and well-cited literature beyond a couple of well-known studies in the field, (b) the literature review does not sufficiently present the three constructs (variables) of the study and the relationships between them in a clear and gradual way that links to the aims and scope of the research– it is not evident for the reader to understand were the gap in research literature is, (c) the research methodology section does not provide sufficient information on very important and essential aspect like sample size, the way the constructs were operationalized (The measurement instruments used and the alterations that were made – are these alterations suitable? Do they affect the reliability and validity of the measurement instruments?), the components of the two independent variables, and a clear presentation of the analytical strategy that serves the aims of the study. The choice of analytical strategy (mainly regression here) should be linked to what the researcher is trying to prove. I feel that much time and space were used on correlational analysis when regression results can show a clear picture of the relationships between the constructs, when it is used and interpreted effectively. Also, it is not clear when and under what circumstances anxiety is (or not) a predictor of WTC. It seems that the results of the correlational analysis and the regression do not provide a clear picture.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>Finally, although beyond the scope of the study as was chosen by the author, and in the light of the finding that anxiety is not a significant predictor of WTC, it would be valuable for readers to see an analysis of the relationship between the two predictors (speaking anxiety and intercultural competence). What if intercultural competence is significantly negatively correlated with speaking anxiety? Would this mean that because of their high intercultural competence, the students have low levels of speaking anxiety? What this would also mean for the relationship between speaking anxiety and WTC? Maybe, intercultural competence is a moderator of this relationship. Beyond these comments, I would also like to add that the way the study results are connected to conclusions is a bit arbitrary and not so well-thought. There is huge gap between results and the final conclusion. Also, it would be helpful for some readers to see some study limitations. There are always some limitations for a study or suggestions the researcher could make to help readers understand better the true practical and theoretical value of the study and its replicability.</p> <p>My end comment thus is that the current study is potentially interesting to the extent that the evidential process and the results are scientifically sound.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p>=</p>	<p>Some references are recent and very good quality ones and relevant to papers that are widely cited in WTC literature. The construct is very well researched and there is much depth and width in this research area. Based on the intentions of the author as expressed through the title and the aims of this study, I believe that it would be beneficial for the quality of the paper to refer to many more research papers that would provide a more robust basis for the researcher to offer a much better theoretical background to this study. Some additional references that may add some depth to this research paper could include the following, considering that recency is not the only factor that determines relevance and importance:</p> <p>Zhang, J., Beckmann, N., &amp; Beckmann, J. F. (2018). To talk or not to talk: A review of situational antecedents of willingness to communicate in the second language classroom. <i>System</i>, 72, 226-239.</p> <p>Zarrinabadi, N., &amp; Haidary, T. (2014). Willingness to communicate and identity styles of Iranian EFL learners. <i>Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences</i>, 98, 2010-2017.</p> <p>Yashima, T., Zenuk, Nishide, L., &amp; Shimizu, K. (2004). The influence of attitudes and affect on willingness to communicate and second language communication. <i>Language learning</i>, 54(1), 119-152.</p> <p>Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. <i>Input in second language acquisition</i>, 15, 165-179.</p> <p>Teven, J. J., Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., &amp; McCroskey, L. L. (2010). Updating relationships between communication traits and communication competence. <i>Communication Research Reports</i>, 27(3), 263-270.</p> <p>Pawlak, M., &amp; Mystkowska-Wiertelak, A. (2015). Investigating the dynamic nature of L2 willingness to communicate. <i>System</i>, 50, 1-9.</p> <p>McCroskey, J. C., &amp; Richmond, V. P. (1990). Willingness to communicate: A cognitive view. <i>Journal of Social Behavior and personality</i>, 5(2), 19.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The quality of English is marginally suitable for a research publication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	My comments in this review are provided with outmost respect to the researcher. I strive to be fair and objective and also promote the best interest and development of the researcher and the research community.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anastasios Katsaris</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Greece</b>