

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

Oluwayemi Ibukun Oluwa Olatoye¹

¹ Walter Sisulu University for Technology and Science

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

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

The abstract provides a clear overview of the paper's purpose, methodology, findings, limitations, and potential value. However, there are some areas where it could be improved:

The abstract is relatively clear, but it could be made more concise. Remove redundant phrases and sentences, such as "Based on this paper's key research objectives" and "The findings show that." Additionally, mentioning the time frame of data collection could be useful. It mentions that SPSS was used for data analysis but doesn't specify what kind of analysis was conducted. Were there statistical tests or just descriptive statistics? Providing a brief insight into the analytical methods used would be helpful. While the abstract touches on the challenges faced by teachers in integrating technology, it lacks specific details about these challenges. Providing a bit more information about the nature and extent of these challenges would make the abstract more informative. The limitations section is quite brief and could be expanded. Discussing potential sources of bias, data limitations, and any other relevant constraints would enhance the abstract's transparency. The statement about the study's originality and value could be strengthened. It mentions that the study is helpful, but it doesn't explicitly state why it's valuable or how it contributes to the existing literature. Mentioning potential implications for policy or practice could make this clearer. Also ensure proper grammar and punctuation for clarity. For example, "Addressing these challenges will require comprehensive policies, infrastructure development, and professional development programs" could be revised for greater clarity.

Lack of Engagement in the Introduction: The introduction provides a broad overview of the Digital Revolution but lacks engagement with the reader. It doesn't draw the reader into the topic or explain why it is relevant or interesting.

Citation Use: The introduction cites a few sources to support its claims but could benefit from more diverse and recent references. Additionally, there are several references listed, but the manuscript doesn't integrate them effectively into the text. Citations should be used to provide evidence for specific claims or to support arguments.

Clarity of Purpose: The objectives of the study are outlined but could be stated more clearly. Each objective should be specific and measurable, allowing readers to understand precisely what the research aims to achieve.

Balance of Information: The introduction provides a substantial amount of information about the Digital Revolution and the importance of digital competencies, but it could be more concise. Readers may lose interest if the introduction is too

lengthy and lacks a clear focus.

Organization: The introduction could benefit from better organization. It jumps between topics, from the history of the Digital Revolution to the importance of digital competencies for teachers, without a clear transition. A more logical flow of ideas would improve readability.

Grammar and Style: There are minor grammatical issues and awkward sentence structures in the manuscript. Proofreading for clarity and coherence is essential.

Cultural Sensitivity: When discussing challenges in Zambia, it's important to approach the topic with cultural sensitivity. Ensure that descriptions of challenges are accurate and avoid any potential biases.

Theoretical Framework: The manuscript lacks a clear theoretical framework or conceptual model that would guide the research. Defining the theoretical foundation can help readers understand the study's approach.

Data Analysis: While the use of SPSS for data analysis is appropriate, the methodology lacks detail about the specific statistical tests or methods that will be used. This can affect the rigor and replicability of the analysis.

Sample Size: The methodology does not explain how the sample size of 281 teachers was determined. Without this information, it's difficult to assess whether the sample size is sufficient for drawing meaningful conclusions.

Data Presentation: The methodology mentions data will be presented in table form with simple frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. While these are useful statistics, it would be beneficial to provide more detail on how these statistics will be applied to answer the research questions.

Bias in ICT Use Questions: Section B asks about ICT use and purpose, but the questions might not capture the nuances of ICT integration into teaching. For instance, knowing whether teachers have computers and internet is valuable, but it may not fully capture their digital teaching practices or challenges.

Limited Insight into Difficulties: Section D includes only one question on the difficulties in teaching digital competencies. This might provide limited insight into the challenges teachers face. While the methodology has some strengths, such as its structure and sampling approach, it also has several weaknesses, including its limited scope, reliance on self-reported data, and lack of detail in data analysis. To improve the methodology, consider addressing these weaknesses and providing more context for the research process. Additionally, it's essential to ensure the research findings are interpreted and applied within the appropriate context.

Lack of Specific Data References: The discussion section mentions findings from the study but doesn't provide specific data or statistics to support these findings. It would be more convincing if actual percentages or figures from the research were included to illustrate the key points.

Citing Sources: When referencing external research studies or scholars (e.g., Tafa, 2019; Mukosa & Mweemba, 2019; Kolog et al., 2022; ITU, 2021; European Commission, 2021; Souter, 2014; Makudza et al., 2022; Floyd, 2022; Rajandiran, 2021), it's essential to provide proper citations and integrate these sources into the discussion. This enhances the

credibility of the discussion and allows readers to explore these sources for more in-depth information.

Lack of Depth on Teacher Proficiency: While the discussion mentions that teachers' proficiency in using digital devices and integrating technology into teaching practices should be explored further (citing Tafa, 2019), it doesn't delve into this topic in detail. Providing some insights into how teachers can be supported in improving their digital literacy skills would add value to the discussion.

More Specific Policy Recommendations: The discussion emphasizes the importance of comprehensive policies and infrastructure development but doesn't offer specific recommendations or strategies for addressing these issues. Providing actionable policy recommendations would enhance the practicality of the discussion.

Consideration of Socioeconomic Factors: The discussion mentions the high cost of new technology and the lack of computers in schools as significant challenges. It would be beneficial to discuss how socioeconomic factors contribute to these challenges and whether there are potential solutions, such as public-private partnerships or funding mechanisms.

In-Depth Regional Comparisons: While the discussion briefly compares the findings to other regions, it could benefit from a more in-depth analysis of the similarities and differences in challenges and solutions. This could provide valuable insights into the global landscape of digital education. In conclusion, while the discussion provides a solid overview of the research findings and their implications, it could be strengthened by incorporating proper citations, actionable policy recommendations, and more in-depth regional comparisons. This would make the discussion more informative and actionable for readers interested in addressing the challenges of teaching digital competencies in the study area.