



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Generational Language Gap Between Teachers and Students: Analysis of Students' Perception of Effective Communication and Learning
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The topic of the generational language gap between teachers and students is very relevant today, especially in the context of Philippine education where both English and Filipino are used. Your study provides a good perspective on how linguistic match and communication affect student learning. The use of an explanatory mixed-method design is a strong point of your work because it allows you to explain the numbers using the actual experiences of the students. I really appreciate Table 15, which integrates the quantitative and qualitative findings beautifully. This table shows you understand how to mix methods properly.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Abstract and Introduction In your Abstract, you mentioned that your study is grounded in Systemic Functional Linguistics, Communication Accommodation Theory, and Sociocultural Theory. But when I read your Introduction, I did not see any discussion of these theories. You must introduce your theoretical framework in the Introduction so the readers know the foundation of your study. You stated in



the Introduction that today's students belong to Generation Z and Alpha. Please use critical thinking here: your respondents are College of Education students. Generation Alpha babies were born starting around 2010 or 2012. In the year of your study, they are still in elementary or junior high school, not in college. You should remove Generation Alpha or explain this better.

Methodology

You mentioned using a 4-point Likert scale for your survey. Please explain briefly why you chose a 4-point scale instead of a 5-point scale. Usually, researchers do this to force a choice and remove the neutral option, but you need to state your reason clearly. Under Reliability Testing, you said you used Cronbach's alpha to determine internal consistency. Where are the alpha values? You must report the exact numerical results of your reliability test so we know the instrument is actually reliable.

Results Section

You have too many tables for descriptive statistics (Tables 1 to 11). This takes up too much space and makes the reading a bit tiring. I strongly suggest you combine Tables 1 to 3 into one table for Teachers Language Use, Tables 4 to 6 for Linguistic Match, and so on. In Table 13 for your regression analysis, your p-value for Linguistic Match and Level of Communication is written as 0.00. In statistics, it is better to format this as <.001, exactly like you did in Table 12. In Table 14, under the main theme Adaptation of Teacher Language in Learning, you have subthemes about using code-switching and simplifying complex terms. These are good, but make sure they do not overlap too much in your qualitative explanation.

Discussion and Conclusion

Your discussion is quite strong because you explained the mediated model of learning very well. You successfully argued that teacher language affects learning indirectly through linguistic match and communication. However, your Figure 1 (Mediated Model of Learning) looks like the text is corrupted or improperly formatted in the document. There is a repeating text error at the bottom of the page. Please fix the image or text box so it displays clearly. In your Conclusion, you summarize the findings well. But to make it stronger, give one very specific pedagogical strategy that teachers can apply tomorrow in their classrooms based on your findings.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript discusses a relevant issue in classroom communication, especially in multilingual settings where teachers and students may not always share the same language style. However, the paper needs stronger conceptual, methodological, and analytical clarity because some major claims are not fully supported by the way the study was designed and reported.



<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The concept of generational language gap needs to be clarified. The paper discusses differences among generations, but the study seems to measure students' perceptions of teacher language use rather than the actual generation of teachers or students. This weakens the link between the title, framework, and findings.
The methodology lacks important details. The paper mentions 200 students and interviews, but it does not clearly explain the sampling process, participant profile, number of interviewees, inclusion criteria, or how the quantitative and qualitative phases were connected. These details are needed to judge the trustworthiness of the results.
The instrument needs stronger reporting. The paper states that validation, pilot testing, and reliability testing were done, but no actual validity results, expert comments, pilot sample, or Cronbach's alpha values are presented. Without these, the reader cannot know if the questionnaire measured the variables properly.
Some items appear to be negatively worded but are interpreted as positive results. For example, items about confusing terms, feeling lost, or not sharing opinions were still included in the grand mean as if agreement showed a high level. These items should be reverse-coded or explained, otherwise the results may be misleading.
The regression and mediated model need more careful treatment. The paper concludes that teacher language use affects learning indirectly through linguistic match and communication, but no formal mediation analysis is shown. If mediation is claimed, the authors should test it properly and report model fit, R^2 , assumptions, and indirect effects.
The qualitative results are too thin for a mixed-method study. The themes are listed, but there are no participant quotations or clear examples showing how students actually described their experiences. The qualitative part should provide stronger evidence, not only theme labels.
The discussion is generally useful, but some interpretations are stronger than what the data can support. Since the study is limited to one institution and one group of students, the authors should avoid broad claims about Philippine classrooms or generations unless supported by wider data.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.



SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer</u> 1	<u>Reviewer</u> 2
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			