

Paper: **“Enseignement et Formation : Deux Concepts Différents”**

Submitted: 18 October 2021

Accepted: 29 January 2022

Published: 31 January 2022

Corresponding Author: Lahoucine Aguinou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n1p123

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Benie Aloh Jean Martial Hillarion
Felix Houphouet-Boigny University of Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Jonas Kwabla Fiadzawoo
University for Development Studies (UDS), Ghana

Reviewer 3: Drissa Touré
Unisersité Felix Houphouet-Boigny, Abidjan-Cocody, Côte d'Ivoire

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 05/11/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/11/2021
Manuscript Title: ENSEIGNEMENT ET FORMATION : DEUX PRATIQUES DIFFÉRENTES	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1105/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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>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.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>La confusion entre les deux notions est d'abord conceptuelle avant de se manifester dans les pratiques. La différence entre les deux concepts devrait conduire à</i>	

<i>adopter des pratiques différentes. Je proposerais plutôt : “Enseignement et formation: deux concepts différents”.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments) La méthodologie, notamment l’aspect empirique de l’étude, n’est pas perceptible dans le développement comme le prétend le résumé.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les hypothèses ne sont pas très claires et on ne voit pas la manière dont elles sont vérifiées.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les résultats ne sont pas suffisamment clairs à cause des insuffisances de la méthodologie.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>La conclusion exprime bien ce qui aurait pu être les résultats de la recherche. Mais elle n’est pas le reflet du travail développé dans le corps du texte.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

On a certes une recension des caractéristiques de “l’Enseignement” d’une part, et celles de la “Formation” d’autre part. Mais il n’y a pas de procédure mettant en exergue les similitudes et les différences entre les deux. Un tableau comparatif pourrait aider dans ce sens. On pourrait aussi, à partir d’une situation contextuelle ou un cas pratique, montrer ce que serait “l’Enseignement” et ce que serait “la Formation” au regard des définitions théoriques et autres caractéristiques des différents concepts. Dans ce cas, ce qui est considéré dans cette étude comme résultats de la recherche pourrait servir, en partie, à la revue de la littérature. En outre, il faut reconsidérer les hypothèses et adopter une méthodologie claire et pertinente.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Jonas K. FIADZAWOO (PhD)	Email:
University/Country: Ghana, University for Development Studies, UDS-Tamale.	
Date Manuscript Received: 05-11-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 17-11-2021
Manuscript Title: ENSEIGNEMENT ET FORMATION: DEUX PRATIQUES DIFFÉRENTES	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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.	4

<i>(Yes)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>(Yes, the abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. However, as a scholarly work, there should be some recommendations)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(No, there work does not have grammatical errors)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(The study methods are well explained; however, the work needs to be well structured. In fact, there should a thesis statement to summarise the flow of the work indicating each stage of presentation)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Yes)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Yes)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Yes, but the references need not be numbered)</i>	

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 work is thoroughly done. But few things to look at: There's no recommendation, the structuring of the work must well defined in a thesis statement and references should not be numbered

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: BENIE ALOH JEAN MARTIAL HILLARION	Email
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouet Boigny/ Institut Pédagogique National de l'Enseignement Technique et Professionnel (IPNETP)	
Date Manuscript Received: 06/11/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/11/2021
Manuscript Title: ENSEIGNEMENT ET FORMATION: DEUX PRATIQUES DIFFÉRENTES	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1105/21	
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>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.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	0
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les méthodes et techniques de collecte des données ne sont pas précisées. En plus, le mode de traitement des données n'est non plus explicité.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Un écrit scientifique repose sur les méthodes et techniques de collecte des données. Les résultats découlent de l'application d'une méthode de traitement et d'analyse des données qu'il faudrait présenter succinctement.

Les résultats sont présentés selon des critères ou codes retenus pour l'analyse des données.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: