

Paper: “Examining the Status of English as a Medium of Instruction in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Study of Botswana and Nigeria”

Submitted: 14 July 2021

Accepted: 02 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Oris Tom-Lawyer

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n36p51](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n36p51)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Paola Clara Leotta
University of Catania, Italy

Reviewer 2: Jesus Gerardo Martinez Del Castillo
University of Almeria, Spain

Reviewer 3: Justine Forchap
University Institute of Science and Technology of Central Africa, Cameroon

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: PAOLA CLARA LEOTTA	
University/Country: UNIVERSITY OF CATANIA/ITALY	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/07/2021
Manuscript Title: <i>Examining the Status of English as a Medium of Instruction in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Study of Botswana and Nigeria</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 69.07.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

<i>The title is related to the content of the article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The method is not so clear</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Please, revise some expressions</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The bulk of the article presents several studies, but there really is no methodology presented.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>Results are clear, but not so original.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions are accurate</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The reference list fits the content</i>	
	5

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript seems to be more of a descriptive narrative on the status of English as a medium of instruction in sub-Saharan Africa, rather than a scholarly article with a clear methodology. Please, look back at your method.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

OESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Justine Forchap	
University/Country: University Institute of Science and Technology of Central Africa Douala Cameroon	
Date Manuscript Received:09/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:12/08/21
Manuscript Title: Examining the Status of English as a Medium of Instruction in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Study of Botswana and Nigeria.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0769/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title is clear and it is adequate and very relevant to the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract presents objects and results but the methodology does not seem to be very present	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The aspects of grammar and spellings are well taken care of in this article	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The study methods are explained clearly	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): The paper has been very well researched.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: Good research has been done.

The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Jesús Martínez del Castillo	
University/Country: Almeria, Spain	
Date Manuscript Received: 9-8-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 10-8-2021
Manuscript Title: <i>Examining the Status of English as a Medium of Instruction in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Study of Botswana and Nigeria</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 69.07.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

	<i>Rating Result</i>
<i>Questions</i>	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

(If it is of interest for the authors of this article let me make the following considerations about the problem).

The problem studied is extremely difficult. It has some internal factors and some external factors. The internal factors have to do with learners. It is language learners the ones who have to do something to learn. The external factors are those analyzed in this article. Internal factors have to do with language (the human capacity to perform the activity of speaking) and thus with the human condition of learners. Human subjects conform their personality and mind with their native language. It is necessary to help learners to reproduce the method used by them when they learnt their native language. On the other hand, their native language will condition in one sense or another the new knowledge they may acquire all their life along.

From my point of view the problem of learning a new language should have in mind the very reality of the process of learning, the most important of which is the agent of it, that is, the HUMAN learner. Learning for a human subject, however young they may be, means CREATING in their conscience a REPRESENTATION of the topic being learnt. This fact is possible because human subjects are creative because they are free. Language learners cannot be but human and thus they have to “create” in their conscience the new language proposed. From the very start a child understands the function the language they hear plays in the life of their mother and relatives. A child from the very beginning wants to learn the language of their parents and family. They start babbling and will end up with speaking. In that process they do not merely imitate but CREATE tentative forms. Language thus constitutes part of their human life: it means the integration of the child in the family group constituted by their mother and relatives. The language of their mother and other relatives is the means the child perceives to get in contact with their mother and their family and relatives. In this primary task children are creative trying to understand and reproduce the sounds they hear with the significance they can discover in the contexts and situations they live when trying to speak. This fact is possible because the child wants to actively participate with their parents and relatives. At the same time as they discover the significance of the expressions by their parents and relatives they feel themselves members of the speech community constituted by their mother and relatives. The initial learning of their native language is nothing but the creation of their conscience thought and personality: the foundation of their capacity to learn about the things surrounding him. To learn a second language (or anything else) must be the continuation of that process of learning initiated in their childhood. It is the learner who must participate in the creation of the new type of knowledge (competence) involved in the new language proposed.

The problem with education and learning in Botswana and Nigeria is that the *lingua franca* in their countries is English, not any of their native language. The problem thus is not different to students of the same age in the great majority of European countries. As intelligent human subjects they learnt their native language trying to imitate their parents’ speech and with the help of their parents who will encourage them accepting their forms thus encouraging them and then correcting the forms said by them. Learners of a foreign language should learn that foreign language (English) in a similar manner as the one they lived when they learnt their native language: they must actively participate in it. But the problem now is that they cannot reproduce those moments of their childhood.

Because of this, from my point of view, teachers should be bilingual, that is to say, teachers should be speakers of the native language of their students and speakers of English as a second language. Students must consider their teachers as mates who want to help them as the real creators of the new language in their conscience. Because of this, teachers should be native speakers of the native language spoken by the learners and at the same time must speakers of English as a second language. With this the learner will feel confident to ask the teacher in the only language he can speak and thus encourage them to actively participate. That is, transferred this situation to Botswana and Nigeria. Teachers of English should speak one of the official language there and English, not as a native English speaker, but as a second language speaker.

Because of this I consider a MISTAKE to start with the native language for three or more years and then change to English. The whole curriculum in education should be bilingual in the form stated, just from the very beginning up to the end. In this process it is necessary avoid that break in the curriculum of students usually

imposed by political reasons. The learner of a foreign language must find in the teacher someone who overcomes or overcame the same difficulties as he himself meets every day with the new language. In this sense the learner may find a parallelism with the contents explained in their native language and the contents in English.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: