

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_112695
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Impact of Culture Shock among Tertiary EFL Learners in Indonesia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Importance for the Scientific Community: The manuscript is significant for the scientific community, particularly in the fields of language education, intercultural communication, and psychology. It addresses a gap in the existing literature by specifically examining the impact of culture shock on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning in Indonesia. The study's focus on the negative effects of culture shock, psychological impacts, and adaptation issues provides valuable insights for educators, institutions, and policymakers involved in language education. The recommendations and practical insights offered make this research relevant for improving support systems for EFL students undergoing cultural transitions.</p> <p>Title Suitability: The title is generally suitable, as it accurately reflects the central theme of the research. However, it could be refined for greater precision, such as "Understanding and Mitigating Culture Shock's Impact on EFL Learning: A Study of Tertiary Level Students in Indonesia."</p> <p>Comprehensiveness of the Abstract: The abstract is comprehensive, effectively summarizing the research's objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. It provides a clear overview of the study's focus on the negative effects of culture shock on EFL learners in Indonesia and emphasizes the significance of cultural adaptation and pre-arrival readiness.</p> <p>Appropriateness of Subsections and Structure: The manuscript follows a logical structure with well-defined sections such as Introduction, Literature Review, and Method. However, some paragraphs in the Introduction and Literature Review sections are lengthy and could be broken down for better readability. Additionally, a more concise presentation of the research question and objectives could enhance clarity.</p> <p>Scientific Accuracy: The manuscript appears scientifically sound, relying on established concepts like culture shock and integrating relevant literature to support its arguments. However, a more explicit mention of the research methodology, data collection, and analysis techniques would strengthen the research's transparency and credibility.</p> <p>References Sufficiency and Recency: The references provided are relevant and offer a diverse perspective on the subject. However, there is a slight imbalance in the number of references cited for different sections. While some references are recent, a more even distribution across the years could enhance the paper's academic robustness. Suggested additions include recent studies on cross-cultural communication and interventions for culture shock.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, some sentences could be revised for clarity and conciseness. Proofreading for minor grammatical errors and improving sentence structures would enhance the overall readability.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Organization and Flow: The manuscript is well-organized, with clear sections and subsections. The flow of ideas is logical and coherent. However, there is some repetition in Sections 4.3 and 4.4, which should be addressed for better clarity.</p> <p>Content Quality: The content is informative and well-researched. It covers various aspects of culture shock, its impact on individual psychology, adaptation to a new culture, and challenges faced by English Language Learners (ELLs). However, the manuscript could benefit from further elaboration on specific examples, case studies, or real-world applications to strengthen its argument.</p> <p>Citations and References: The paper includes a comprehensive list of references, demonstrating a strong foundation in existing literature. However, it might be helpful to integrate references more smoothly into the text, connecting them explicitly to the points being discussed.</p> <p>Language and Style: The language is clear and concise, making the manuscript accessible. However, there are instances of repetitive phrases and concepts, which could be refined for a more polished presentation.</p> <p>Conclusion: The conclusion effectively summarizes the key points discussed in the manuscript. It encourages ongoing initiatives but lacks specific recommendations for future research or practical applications.</p> <p>Figures/Tables: The manuscript could benefit from the inclusion of visual aids, such as figures or tables, to enhance the presentation of data or concepts.</p> <p>Specific Recommendations:</p> <p>Address the repetition in Sections 4.3 and 4.4 for improved clarity and conciseness. Consider providing specific examples, case studies, or practical applications to illustrate key points. Integrate references more smoothly into the text to enhance the coherence of the argument. Consider including visual aids like figures or tables to enhance the presentation of data or concepts. Provide more explicit recommendations for future research or practical applications in the conclusion. Overall, the manuscript has potential but requires a major revision to address the mentioned points and strengthen its overall impact.</p>	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Montasser Mohamed Abdelwahab Mahmoud
Department, University & Country	Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University, Egypt