# Review of: "Stakeholders' Perceptions on Adoption of Blended Learning Approach in Tanzania Secondary Schools"

Johannes Pernaa[1]

1 University of Helsinki

Dear all

The topic of the manuscript is current – even though one might think that blended learning approach (BLA) is over two decades old idea. It is important framework in designing educational strategies, learning environments, courses etc. In addition, the Tanzanian context is locally interesting and can serve as a valuable example for scholars working among same kind of educational design environments.

About the publishing channel. I have a challenge with Qeios platform because I do not know that should I review this paper like a scientific manuscript or is this some other kind of text such as blog text. I have not been instructed about this, but I have decided to look this as a scientific paper. This perspective must be considered when reading the review.

As a summary: This paper has many solid features but there are several major challenges that would lead to an editorial desk rejection in a regular scientific journal. Next, I will open write down the positive things and recommendations how to improve some of the biggest shortcomings.

I hope that my suggestions are useful for authors in when they improve the paper.

Best regards

Johannes Pernaa

University Lecturer

University of Helsinki

Finland

https://researchportal.helsinki.fi/en/persons/johannes-pernaa

**Title vs. content (NOT ALIGNED)**

The title guides reader to think that the manuscript addresses different stakeholders' perceptions of BL adoption in Tanzanian secondary schools. Because it is not declared as a case study the I am looking forward to a massive quantitative survey data. However, from the abstract I see that the N of participants is 76, and in research question the

focus is Morogoro Municipality, not whole Tanzania. In this regard, the title is not well aligned with the paper content.

## Introduction (REVISION NEEDED)

Blended learning as a context has been introduced well. Authors have used classics and more recent literature. Basically, with concepts that has multiple definitions and traditions, you can choose the one that fits to your work and justify your selection. Then readers debate with the arguments whether they agree or disagree with them.

However, I see no logic in the selection of earlier literature examples. Some of them are addressing countries and others are very general. My question is that what is the introduction part aiming to achieve? What is the research gap? Why it is important? Is the aim of the paper to produce insights of stakeholders' perceptions for making research-based decisions on how to integrate ICT in secondary education in Tanzania? If yes, what kind of added value this can offer for scientific community?

I recommend that you highlight the aim of the paper more clearly and explain readers why this is important to make the paper more useful for readers with different backgrounds.

## Research questions (DEFINE CENTRAL CONCEPTS USED IN RQs)

The manuscript has three RQs from which 1–2 are qualitative and number 3 quantitative. The RQs itself are clear but the questions are very broad. In addition, the connection to stated problem could be clearer. For example, stakeholders are a central concept in RQs, but you have not defined it in the introduction.

1. What are stakeholders' perceptions about the adoption of a blended learning approach in secondary schools in Morogoro Municipality? (QUALITATIVE)
2. How do school learning environments support the adoption of a blended learning approach in secondary schools in Morogoro Municipality? (QUALITATIVE)
3. To what extent is the blended learning approach used in secondary schools in Morogoro Municipality? (QUANTITATIVE)

## Theoretical framework (MORE METATEXT NEEDED)

BL and BLA sections are excellent. However, to leave a professional image and show that you have read literature broadly, it is always a good protocol to provide some infographics or tables. These are metalevel tools that transfer your insights as experts and help readers to activate higher-order cognitive skills.

However, the theoretical frame is lacking metatext. Readers can't understand why CBAM model is included there. You need to open this innovation context already in the introduction and continue explaining the theoretical choices in the root of the theoretical frame section. You have this text at the end of the CBAM section. Just revise it so that readers are first

explained why CBAM is needed/used and then what it is. In addition, the CBAM model is highly criticized. This discussion is missing from your paper. Please revise and be more analytical in choosing the tools even if they are just used as contextual analysis frameworks.

For the critique, see e.g., de Vocht, M., & Laherto, A. M. P. (2017). Profiling teachers based on their professional attitudes towards teaching responsible research and innovation. *European Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 5*(3), 271-284. https://doi.org/10.30935/scimath/9511

**Methods (NOT SCIENTIFICALLY SOUND)**

- Mixed methods approach is aligned with RQs.
- Sample description is clear.
- The description related to instruments is not adequate because I would not be able to reproduce the research setting based on this description. It is too general and doesn't describe how instruments are related to presented literature. Even the instruments itself are missing. Why did you not use the CBAM tools? I thought that CBAM is included because it offers ready-made instruments.
- Data analysis is missing analysis examples for the qualitative analysis. In addition, you do not specify any methodological references that you have used.

So even though methods had some solid parts, there are major shortcoming that would lead to an automatic desk reject is a scientific journal. However, because Qeios doesn't have editors to make this decision, the responsibility is left to reviewers. But it seems that my fellow reviewers see no challenges with this. But it is not the best quality control tool because reviewing is a voluntary-based task, why hardy anyone puts much effort in it.  But I guess this is the challenge with all preprint platforms.

**Results and Discussion (STRUCTURE OK, CBAM CHALLENGE)**

This section is organized through RQs which is always a good choice. It makes it easy for readers to follow the main narrative. I would even make subheadings to make the structure clearer. It would also add technical structure to support e.g., TTS reading with software and conversion to different file formats etc. Try e.g., save this file as PDF and look the Document Outline. There you see that the structure of the paper is otherwise logical, but Results section has no subheadings.

The results section is quite good, but I do not understand why you selected low measurement level including mainly items with 2 answer options. This would be an important matter to be explained in the methods section.

My concern is the CBAM model. It seems to be separate from the rest of the study because you do not use it in the methods, report in results or reflect in discussions. By using the CBAM model more comprehensively it would shift the focus to match the title which indicates that this is a study of adoption innovations.

**Conclusions (NEEDS TO BE REVISED)**

Conclusions are quite bold looked from the acquired data perspective. I agree with conclusions 1a and 1b. However, are you sure that you can make these conclusions 2 and 3 based on this data?

With these I can agree:

*C1a: First, stakeholders perceived BLA as an essential and useful methodology for teaching and learning in secondary schools.*
*C1b: And that if appropriately used, BLA increases the quality of education offered in secondary schools.*

But how about these two? I see no relation between your data and these conclusions.

*C2: The school environment facilitated the networking of teachers and improved the teaching approaches and methods that students were able to follow and enjoy what was taught.*

*C3: Third, the high application of BLA motivates students to participate actively in the creation of knowledge, and thus it improves their academic performances.*