

OPINION A

How to reference this paper:

Tabiri, M. O., Mirici, I., Jones-Mensah, I., & Ocloo, J. K. (2026). Learning languages online in Ghanaian higher education during COVID-19 from the perspective of students. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 30(esp1), e026012. <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v30iesp1.20896>



| Submitted: 05/01/2026
| Revisions required: 12/02/2026
| Approved: 17/02/2026
| Published: 30/03/2026

Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes
Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

REVIEW FORM

Article title: Learning languages online in Ghanaian higher education during covid-19 from the perspective of students

| A. COGNITIVE DIMENSION |
|---|
| Sequential and logical sequencing of the content of scientific ideas. |
| 1. Does the article contain original ideas that have not yet been presented on the subject? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 2. Is the topic important to the context in which it is inserted? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 3. Does the introduction make the research topic clear, present the studies that have addressed the problem or similar research and point out the gap that the research covers/justification for the research? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 4. Does the introduction make it clear what the research question is or the hypotheses (if applicable) and are the general and/or specific objectives in line with the research question? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the objectives set? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 6. Is the theoretical framework presented in sufficient quantity and quality for the research construct and are the ideas presented in sufficient depth for the study in question? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 7. Does the theoretical framework presented include classic authors in the field who are still relevant to the discussion, and does it also include work from the last five years? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 8. Are the results consistent with the aim of the research, the theoretical framework and the methodology? |

| |
|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 9. Is the data calculated correctly and do the results show that there is no fabrication or falsification of data? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 10. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the theoretical framework? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 11. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the results presented? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 12. Do the conclusions provide an answer to the research question and objectives? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 13. Do the conclusions present authorial closure without repeating previous parts of the article and pointing out the limitations of the research itself and future research? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Reviewer's comments on the cognitive dimension. |
| - |
| B. METHODOLOGICAL DIMENSION |
| Precise description of the methods and techniques used. |
| 1. Does the title specify the content of the work more generally and the subtitle (if there is one) is a technical title more related to the topic? Another possible approach is when the title refers to the theoretical object and the subtitle to the empirical object. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 2. Does the abstract present the objective, methodology, results and conclusions in a way that is coherent with the work? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 3. Is the choice of keywords in line with the content of the article and the field? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 4. Is the objective clearly written? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No |

5. Is the methodology detailed, characterized and does it explain how data will be collected (if applicable) and analyzed?

Yes Partially No

6. Is the methodology coherent with the theory and consistent with the results?

Yes Partially No

7. If the research involves human beings, have the procedures carried out to comply with research ethics guidelines been described or the approval number of the work by the research ethics committee indicated?

Yes Partially No

Reviewer's comments on the methodological dimension.

-

C. AESTHETIC DIMENSION

Writing, form and normalization.

1. Are the rules observed with regard to citations (ABNT 10520 - 2023), references (ABNT 6023 - 2018), presentation of illustrations and tables (title and source)?

Yes Partially No

2. Does the text show correct accentuation and typing of words; nominal and verbal agreement; correct arrangement of words and connection between sentences or paragraphs (cohesion); logical relationship of the ideas presented (coherence); avoid repetition in the text of what is already written in the illustrations and tables?

Yes Partially No

3. Are the illustrations (graphs, charts, images, figures, maps) and tables of adequate size and legibility for reading?

Yes Partially No

Reviewer's comments on the aesthetic dimension

-

Recommendation

- Accept
- Accept with mandatory corrections
- Submit again for evaluation

Submit to another journal

Reject

The reviews will be published without the identity of the reviewer, in accordance with the principles of Open Science. The reviewer must state whether he/she authorizes the publication of the review with his/her identity or authorizes it without his/her identity.

Once the reviewer agrees to the review, the review will be published without their identity. If the reviewer wishes to authorize their identification, please inform it in response to the review request.

Reviewer's opinion/ Comments

- The work provides a very interesting insight into the development of an online/hybrid learning system in a context that has been little studied and little publicized in this way, namely the context of Ghana, and explores the difficulties that developing countries still face and that are not the norm in the prevailing literature on remote and hybrid teaching.

- Although the work is very well constructed, I believe that there are still some changes that could be made to clarify certain issues addressed in the writing.

- First, the title deals with online language learning, but the summary already specifies which languages are covered. Throughout the text, there is no clear explanation of why these languages were selected, and the data collected even includes students who were not learning any of these languages, but it is also unclear whether they were learning other languages online. It is extremely important that the reason for this limitation of languages be clearly explained, both methodologically and theoretically, after all, the theme of the work is online language learning, so why would someone learning Arabic or Spanish online not be taken into consideration?

- The division of hypotheses in the work seeking to explain the points being observed by the authors is interesting, but hypothesis 1, both in its presentation and at the moment of confirmation after analysis, is unclear; it is not easy to understand what the specific factor being considered is. This hypothesis, I believe, needs to be rewritten in order to make it very clear what it is about the apprentices' perceptions that is being observed.

What exactly is being attempted to be observed about teaching and online presence?

That said, the article is recommended for publication after the mandatory changes mentioned above and listed below have been made.

In addition, a review of the writing of the paper is also recommended. There are some minor grammatical issues that could be improved, and there are also some problems with the citations made throughout the text that could be addressed for greater clarity of writing.

It is reiterated that the sole purpose of this opinion is to contribute to the authors' work in the best possible way.

List of mandatory corrections

- Specify theoretically and methodologically the choice to make a selection of languages rather than just considering the criterion of online language learning in general
- Revise the first hypothesis presented to clarify what is being observed there, as indicated earlier in this opinion

Publication of the opinion, according to Open Science standards

- I authorize publication without the name of the reviewer
- I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer
- I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer, being aware that the journals of Editora Ibero-Americana, it is mandatory to.

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação
Review, formatting, standardization, and Translation

