

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_124154
Title of the Manuscript:	Speaking Anxiety and Intercultural Competence as Predictors of Learner's Willingness to Communicate
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
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.	This manuscript addresses a timely issue in language education, focusing on the predictors of learners' willingness to communicate (WTC), which is crucial in fostering effective communication skills. The exploration of speaking anxiety and intercultural competence as variables provides a well-rounded perspective, particularly in the context of the Philippines. The findings can help educators devise strategies to improve learners' communication skills, making this a valuable contribution to educational psychology and language learning research. However, further refinement is needed to improve the clarity and depth of the discussion.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Speaking Anxiety and Intercultural Competence as Predictors of Learner's Willingness to Communicate," is clear and accurately reflects the content. However, a slightly revised title might enhance clarity: "Exploring Speaking Anxiety and Intercultural Competence as Predictors of Learner Willingness to Communicate in Philippine Public Schools."	
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.	The abstract is fairly comprehensive, summarizing the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. However, it could be improved by adding specific details regarding the methodology (e.g., sample size) and statistical tools used. Additionally, the conclusion in the abstract could highlight that intercultural competence emerged as the stronger predictor.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is generally well-structured with appropriate subsections for each component of the study. However, more detailed subsections within the results (e.g., separate discussions for each variable) could make the presentation of findings clearer and easier to follow.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, employing appropriate methodologies such as regression analysis and Pearson's r to examine relationships between variables. The study is technically sound, with sufficient sample size and attention to detail in data collection and ethical considerations. The use of relevant literature to contextualize the findings adds to the validity of the study. However, a more in-depth discussion on the limitations and how these findings contribute to existing literature would enhance its scientific rigor.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are sufficient and include a good mix of recent studies. However, some references are relatively old (e.g., studies from 2015-2017). Adding more up-to-date references, particularly from 2021-2023, would further strengthen the manuscript. For example, more recent studies on intercultural competence in communication contexts could be included.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally acceptable for scholarly communication. However, there are a few instances where sentence structure and grammar could be improved for better clarity and flow. I recommend a thorough proofreading or professional editing to enhance the overall readability.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Farhana Diana Deris
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia