

Paper: "Research Methodologies in Urban Wolof Studies: A Critical Review of the Literature and Suggestion for New Analytical Perspectives"

Submitted: 01 June 2022 Accepted: 22 June 2022 Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Aziz Dieng

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n20p22

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Marinella Lorinczi University of Cagliari, Italy

Reviewer 2: Mariana Coanca

Romanian-American University, Romania

_

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

The title of the paper is concise and informative as Dr. Dieng includes key information about the design of the study, important keywords (e.g. critical review, research methodologies) and the author's new perspectives for Urban Wolof studies.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The review conducted by Dr. Aziz Dieng reconceptualizes the Urban Wolof, the language of millions of Senegalese, in Senegal and abroad, taking into consideration the translanguaging theory. The study is not limited to how this languaging form is spoken in Senegal, which has been the main research subject of many studies. Therefore, the author also focuses on the impact of mobility on Urban Wolof by establishing a correlation between transmigration and translanguaging. This two-fold approach showcases the author's original stance in the critical review of the literature and in the speaker-centred investigation, moving away from the scientific considerations that the urban Wolophone alternates between languages or codes.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The paper is free from grammatical errors and spelling mistakes.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

In the section entitled "Methodological Approaches to Data Collection", Dr. Dieng presents the most popular ethnographically-informed methodologies of collecting UW communicative speech samples used in the UW scholarship and how the advent of social media has impacted ethnographic research.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The length of the body is proportional to the length of the paper as a whole. In the "Introduction", the author presents the information clearly and logically so that the reader could understand the purpose of the research - to review the different methodologies that have been used in UW studies so far. First, the author argues that "Urban Wolof (UW) has, for the most part, up until now, been viewed through the code-based approach of language mixing." Second, Dr. Dieng claims that the scholars have mainly focused on the Senegalese city-dweller languages and have not investigated "the aspect of mobility". Third, the author points out that the review aims to analyse the "Wolof outside the confines of Senegal and into the cities of the Global North to highlight the aspect of mobility."

Last but not least, the author concentrates on the dual view of code-switching and

code-mixing and on the unitary view of translanguaging. The author justifies the analysis of the dual view of codes stating that it is "the preferred theoretical approach for many in the UW scholarship." As for the unitary view of translanguaging, Dr. Dieng presents a different perspective on UW, considering the scholars' examination of the dual view legitimacy. Moreover, the author emphasizes that "in an African context, with a plethora of languages, viewing the so-called shuttling between them in terms of switching codes can prove somewhat of a difficult endeavour."

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Dr. Dieng concludes that the adoption of the translanguaging model in translanguaging studies can determine "whether speakers follow special patterns in their choice of language features in their daily translanguaging practices." Although the transmigration and the translocality processes are defined "as the macro-level contexts in which the micro-level context of translanguaging occurs", the author does not specify how the translanguaging model can be deployed in UW studies.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The author uses the APA style minutely. The list of references is comprehensive and it highlights that the author chose the most relevant studies on Urban Wolof.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
5
Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
4
Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
5
Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, no revision needed
Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s)

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Marinella Lőrinczi					
University/Country: Italy					
Date Manuscript Received: 04 June 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 17 June 2022				
Manuscript Title: Research methodologies in urban Wolof studies: a critical review of the literature and suggestion for new analytical perspectives					
ESJ Manuscript Number: 44860-1					
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.

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

(Please insert your comments)		
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5	
(Please insert your comments)		
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.		
Attention to proper names: García, Li Wei		
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5	
(Please insert your comments)		
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5	
(Please insert your comments)		
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5	
(Please insert your comments)		
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5	
(Please insert your comments)		

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):

There are only a few, two-three points, marked in red in text, to be taken into consideration. I kindly ask the author to read the few points marked in red.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: