

Review of: "Digital Literacy Skills of Teachers: A Study on ICT Use and Purposes"

Andrew Virtue¹

¹ Western Carolina University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for letting me read your article, "Digital Literacy Skills of Teachers: A Study on ICT Use and Purposes." While I enjoyed reading it, I thought there were some areas that could use additional attention to strengthen the purpose behind the article:

1. I think the title and preface material need additional attention. While reading the work, I felt there were times at which the main purpose or questions that the paper was trying to answer changed. At some points, it seemed more like a literature review versus an analysis of policies versus a report on survey findings, etc. Consequently, it was hard to define a consistent trajectory with the ideas in the paper.
2. The literature review felt a little too dense and generalized. I understand the intent with why the authors explored this information, but the literature review took up a significant portion of the article and the focus of certain regions of the world seemed problematic. For instance, looking at Europe, North America, the U.S., or Nordic countries makes it difficult to parse out any meaningful data because those areas are so large. This then felt compounded based on the local level of the surveys. Performing the surveys in twenty secondary schools from the Lusaka region of Zambia doesn't seem like it would complement the material that was explored in the literature review.
3. The methods section could use more detail. Admittedly, I find these the hardest sections of a research article to write. But the big thing is that the methods section was less than a page, and I felt like I did not have a clear grasp on how you conducted the study and survey. More detail is needed in each of these sub-sections to build ethos around your study.
4. I liked the data that was explored within the Results section, but this was another area that needed more detail. For instance, the first tables provided demographic information and then the text simply restated that information in paragraph form. I think you could remove some of the 19 tables and summarize some of the information differently, like the demographic information. Additionally, provide a little more context regarding some of the findings displayed in the table. I felt like you were trusting the reader to infer a lot of ideas that should probably be made a little more explicit.
5. Similar to the Results section, I felt like the Discussion and Conclusion were a little rushed, especially compared to the level of content in the literature review. Likewise, I feel like this section could do a little more with reintegrating the ideas from the introductory material to tie everything together.

Overall, I love the idea behind this paper, but there are areas that could be revised. In particular, I would consider revising

the scope with a lot of your content. Your survey is pulling data from one specific location so I would advise framing your whole article in this manner. Using national or continental regions seems counter-intuitive based on the nature of your data. Along with that, I think you have enough data related to the Lusaka region that there is an interesting story/findings to tell at the local level, which could potentially be used as a starting point for additional studies too. Again, thank you for sharing your work--I appreciate your level of commitment to the content area!