

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_102171
Title of the Manuscript:	How the Learner-Teacher Digital Divide is Impacting Learning in Basic Education Classes: Livid Experiences of Teachers in Botswana
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community, particularly for researchers and educators interested in understanding the impact of the Learner-Teacher Digital Divide on learning in basic education classes. The study focuses on the experiences of teachers in Botswana, providing valuable insights into the existing digital gap between teachers and learners in the context of a developing country. The findings and proposed solutions contribute to the ongoing discourse on technology integration in education, emphasizing the need for training and support to bridge the divide and enhance educational outcomes. 2. The title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the focus and content of the study. However, if an alternative title is desired, a suggestion could be: "Examining the Learner-Teacher Digital Divide: Implications for Learning in Basic Education Classes - Insights from Teachers in Botswana." This alternative title maintains the key elements of the original title while presenting a slightly revised and concise version. 3. The abstract of the article provides a comprehensive overview of the study. It introduces the topic of the Learner-Teacher Digital Divide, highlights the technological revolution's impact on education, and discusses the potential implications of the divide on learning outcomes. The abstract also mentions the research methodology employed, the theories used to analyze the data, and the main findings of the study. Additionally, it includes key terms relevant to the research, giving readers a clear understanding of the study's focus. However, one limitation of the abstract is that it does not provide specific details about the research methodology used in the study. While it mentions structured interviews and focus group sessions, it does not provide information on the sample size, selection criteria, or the specific questions asked during the interviews. Additionally, the abstract does not provide a clear indication of the scope of the study or the generalizability of the findings beyond the context of Botswana. These details are important for readers to assess the rigor and validity of the study. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate. The manuscript follows a logical flow, with sections dedicated to introducing the topic, providing background information, stating the problem, outlining the purpose of the study, presenting the methodology, and discussing the findings. Each section is clearly labelled. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. This is a relevant and important topic in the field of education, considering the increasing influence of technology in educational settings. The manuscript refers to previous studies conducted in various countries, including Botswana, to support the existence of the digital divide and its implications. 6. The references provided cover a range of topics related to education, technology integration, teacher attitudes, and the digital divide. They include sources from various years, with some more recent references. These references provide relevant and up-to-date information on the topics mentioned. 7. Introduction section: the introduction does not specifically mention the context of Botswana or provide specific details about the lived experiences of teachers in that country. It also does not clearly state the research objectives or the significance of the study. These aspects could be considered limitations of the introduction. 8. The conclusion of the study has a few limitations that should be considered. The conclusion lacks a comprehensive exploration of the barriers to ICT integration in schools. While it briefly mentions shortage of resources, lack of skills, and policy-level issues, it does not delve into a detailed analysis of these barriers or consider other potential factors that could contribute to the learner-teacher digital divide, such as infrastructure limitations, cultural factors, or socioeconomic disparities. Additionally, the implications and challenges associated with the suggested solutions are not thoroughly discussed. The conclusion suggests in-service training and reformulation of teacher training policies, but it does not address the cost, time, sustainability of training programs, or the need for ongoing support and professional development. 	

Review Form 1.7

	Lastly, the conclusion does not provide suggestions for future research directions or identify areas that require further investigation.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article need to be improved for scholarly communications due to several reasons. Firstly, there are grammatical errors present throughout the article, including the omission of articles ("the," "a") in some sentences. For example, the sentence "The paper also presents solutions aimed at reducing the digital gap" should be revised as "The paper also presents solutions aimed at reducing the digital gap." Secondly, the sentence structure in the article is often poor, making it difficult for readers to understand or follow the ideas being presented. An example of this is the sentence "The rate at which learners were acquiring the ICT skills was much faster compared to the technological adaption speed of teachers," which could be rephrased for better clarity and coherence. Furthermore, the article lacks precision in its language, using vague or imprecise phrases that are not ideal for scholarly communications. For instance, the phrase "the emergence of information and communication technology (ICT) is currently having a disruptive effect" could be more specific and precise in describing the impact of ICT on teaching and learning. Lastly, the article does not adhere to consistent style and formal academic writing conventions. It incorporates informal expressions like "grappling with."	
Optional/General comments	Several weaknesses exist that pose challenges to bridging the divide. Insufficient resources and funding hinder the provision of adequate technological devices and infrastructure in schools. Limited access to reliable internet connectivity, especially in rural areas, further exacerbates the divide. Inadequate training and professional development opportunities hinder teachers' ability to effectively integrate technology into their teaching practices. Resistance to change and a lack of digital literacy skills among some teachers also impede progress. Inconsistencies in the availability and quality of digital tools across different schools and regions create disparities within the education system.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	I Putu Andre Suhardiana
Department, University & Country	Universitas Hindu Negeri I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa Denpasar, Indonesia