

Review of: "Between Avoidance and the Need to Learn: Emerging Dynamics in the First Weeks of Classes in Higher Education in Angola"

Ana Raquel Matias¹

¹ ISCTE-Instituto Universitário de Lisboa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

General comments:

The article brings a very relevant and needed discussion.

Here are some comments aiming to help improving its content.

In general, some sentences are too long

Introduction

1st paragraph

It is advisable to specify which countries are the authors referring to when mentioning: sub-Saharan Africa (as there are very diverse educational systems in this geographic region).

2nd paragraph

It is advisable to explain what is meant by "few scientific resources".

It is advisable to justify why referring only to "student's cultural reality", and not other social, economic and political contexts.

3rd paragraph

"Teaching context" can be many things beyond curricula and skills profiles, could you specify?

5th paragraph

This paragraph is one single and long sentence. Please revise the structure of the sentence and its arguments, and be more clear and specific about the later.

Last paragraph

The relevance of the link between the questions ending the introduction, and the main argument for study presented in

the beginning, is not very clear.

Section 2, Angolan Higher education

In this section, the authors propose a division of historical periods by socio and political trends and their impact on the development of higher education system, but sometimes there is no information on the specific historical years the authors are referring to.

The 2nd paragraph presents a summarized history of Angola that neglects its history before Portuguese colonization, and the fact that the existing language diversity is not a consequence of the unification of the territory during the late period of its occupation through colonization, and the independence since 1975. It is advisable to explain your arguments.

The 3rd paragraph does not mention the “estatuto de assimilado” which is crucial to understand the relation between citizenship, absence of citizenship and access to education. In addition, there is no reference to the very low percentage of those who had access to education and relevant citizenship, and would be advisable to present, even briefly, the data and the studies available on these matters. No mention on the segregating school and higher education systems and infrastructures of these earlier periods.

The 4th paragraph says nothing on the students on international mobilities that characterized this period, beyond the consequences of the civil war. It is not clear why the 4th and the 5th paragraph refer to different historical moments, and/or why the period in the 5th paragraph goes from 1975 to 2002, a time frame where the phenomenon under analysis goes through many different policies and historical trends. A suggestion could be to divide this period (1975-2002) in two periods (for instance: 1975-1986; 1986-2002), which reflect different dynamics in terms of educational policies in Angola.

The 6th paragraph could inform which foreign countries are the authors referring to.

The message in the 7th paragraph is not clear, and the conclusion on the last paragraph of this setence could be more clearly argued.

The third and fourth sections of the article are very relevant, however, a brief analysis on how higher education institutions are managing or not to implement these considerations, worldwide or in specific regions of the world, would give more strenght to this discussion.

Section 5 Methodology

Please revise the writing of the 2nd paragraph.

The research questions should identify directly the main subject, and avoid the use of “they”.

The relevance of Figure 1 would benefit it there was more detailed interpretation on this figure in the text, clearly linked to the specificities of the fieldwork characteristics and the research aims.

In addition, it is advisable to provide more detailed information on the participants’ characteristics, researchers’ contact strategies and lenght of fieldwork, and information on the specific context of the fieldwork – information that would turn the

methodology more clear.

More details on how the interview guide, in terms of content, was organized would also be relevant for the article.

Section 6 results.

There is a lack of information on the source of some of the data presented and discussed.

In some paragraphs, students' citations are not correctly edited.

The discussion of the results is interesting and goes in hand with the previous presented theoretical considerations. However, there seems to be a common understanding and vision for all participants, and few or no contradictions and differences. This could be more developed by the authors.

Section 7 discussion

The third point for discussion is very relevant for the argument of the article, but is only very briefly developed in the data analysis.

Section 8 conclusion

The importation and transnationalization of knowledge and the massification of higher education institutions were not much develop in the data analysis.