

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_126817
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Computer Literacy Skills Among Barangay Secretaries and Treasurers of Eastern lines Barangays of Maco Through Comprehensive Workshop
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it addresses a critical issue in public administration: the digital literacy gap among local government officials, particularly barangay secretaries and treasurers. The study's focus on a targeted intervention through a comprehensive workshop offers practical insights into how digital skills training can enhance job performance and improve service delivery. The findings underscore the significance of providing accessible, relevant training to public sector employees, which can contribute to more efficient governance. I appreciate the manuscript's clear, quantitative approach and its focus on a real-world application, making it a valuable resource for scholars, policymakers, and local government planners looking to bridge the digital divide in similar settings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	This title is quite descriptive, but it could be refined to make it more concise and engaging. Here are a few suggestions: 1. "Empowering Barangay Secretaries and Treasurers in Maco: A Workshop on Computer Literacy Skills" 2. "Boosting Computer Literacy for Barangay Secretaries and Treasurers in Eastern Maco" 3. "Comprehensive Workshop on Computer Literacy for Barangay Officials in Maco's Eastern Lines" Each alternative maintains the original title's focus on computer literacy training but shortens it for clarity and readability.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive, covering the study's purpose, methodology, findings, and conclusions. However, it could benefit from some reorganization and minor additions for clarity and flow. Here are my suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the Purpose: Start with a statement that emphasizes both the assessment and enhancement goals, such as <i>"This study aimed to assess and enhance the computer literacy skills of barangay secretaries and treasurers in Maco, Davao de Oro, Philippines."</i> Streamline the Methodology: The mention of a "quantitative descriptive comparative approach" is effective, but this section could be simplified to highlight the before-and-after comparison of skill levels. For example, <i>"Using a quantitative descriptive comparative approach, the study measured skill levels before and after a comprehensive intervention program."</i> Highlight Key Findings: The abstract includes numerical results, which are helpful, but briefly summarizing their significance would improve readability. For example, you could say, <i>"The intervention raised the participants' skills from a low baseline (mean of 1.89) to a moderate level (mean of 3.036), reflecting a significant improvement."</i> Conclusion and Broader Implications: The current conclusion is strong but could be slightly expanded to connect the findings to broader potential impacts on community service delivery. <p>Revised Abstract <i>This study aimed to assess and enhance the computer literacy skills of barangay secretaries and treasurers in the Local Government Unit of Maco, Davao de Oro, Philippines. Using a quantitative descriptive comparative approach, the study measured participants' skill levels before and after a comprehensive seminar-workshop. Conducted from January to August 2024 across twelve barangays in the Eastern Line, the study included 22 respondents—both the appointed secretary and treasurer from each barangay. Initially, participants showed a low proficiency in computer literacy, with a mean score of 1.89, indicating a limited ability to use basic computer applications. Following the intervention, this score increased to 3.036, reflecting a moderate skill level. This improvement underscores the effectiveness of targeted training in closing digital literacy gaps among government employees. Enhanced computer skills among barangay officials not only improve job performance and satisfaction but also contribute to more efficient community service delivery.</i></p> <p>These adjustments make the abstract more concise and engaging, emphasizing both the methodology and the broader relevance of the findings.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound, primarily due to its clear use of a quantitative descriptive comparative approach to assess and measure changes in computer literacy skills before and after a targeted intervention. By collecting and analyzing data systematically across multiple barangays, the study provides a reliable baseline and post-intervention assessment of computer literacy levels, adding credibility to the reported outcomes. Additionally, the use of descriptive statistics, such as mean scores, offers concrete, quantifiable insights into the effectiveness of the training, enhancing the study's validity. The findings are grounded in measurable improvements, suggesting that the intervention was effective and thus supporting the broader applicability of similar training programs in other local government contexts.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references list is fairly comprehensive, covering a range of sources related to digital literacy, computer literacy challenges, and training outcomes for local government employees. However, there are a few observations and potential additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Recency: Most sources are recent (from 2020-2023), which is ideal for a study on a rapidly evolving topic like digital literacy. However, one source (Van Dijk, 2005) is quite dated. Unless it offers foundational theory on digital inequality that is directly relevant, it may not add as much value as newer sources would. Relevance to Comparative and Intervention-Based Research: While Cantrell's (2011) source provides insights on descriptive comparative research, it could be beneficial to include a more recent study focusing on pre-and post-intervention assessments or training evaluation in local governance. Suggested Additional References: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For intervention effectiveness: A recent study on digital skills training program outcomes in government or educational contexts. For methodology: Research specifically on evaluating intervention impacts on digital skills in public service contexts, to strengthen the quantitative aspect of the study. For local context: Studies on digital literacy and technology challenges specific to the Philippines or similar settings in Southeast Asia, to align with the study's context and enhance its applicability. <p>In general, the references are well-chosen, but adding a couple of these suggested sources could improve the manuscript's depth and relevance.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language in the article appears mostly suitable for scholarly communication, as it uses formal and precise terminology typical of academic writing. However, some phrasing could likely be refined for clarity and to better align with scholarly standards. Here are a few specific suggestions for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity and Conciseness: Academic writing benefits from concise, straightforward language. For example, phrases like "this study was taken place" could be revised to "this study took place," which is clearer and more direct. Consistency in Terminology: Ensure consistent use of terms, such as "computer literacy" and "digital literacy," as they are sometimes used interchangeably but can imply different skill sets. Grammar and Syntax: A few minor grammatical errors, like subject-verb agreement and sentence structure, could be corrected to enhance readability and precision. Academic Tone: Phrasing like "this means that the barangay secretaries and treasurers exhibit modest computer skills and a positive attitude toward technology" could be revised to sound more objective, such as "these results indicate a moderate level of computer literacy and openness to technology among barangay secretaries and treasurers." <p>With these adjustments, the manuscript's language quality would be further aligned with scholarly standards, making it clearer and more professional.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jesszon B. Cano
Department, University & Country	College of Business and Management, Bohol Island State University, Philippines