

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JESBS_118952</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Perception of Students on ICT Use in Teaching and Learning to Public Secondary Schools in Mbeya District, Tanzania</b>
Type of the Article	Research Paper

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that an author should write his/her feedback here)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, this manuscript will address challenges and opportunities related to ICT and this will foster innovation and prompt further improvement related to ICT integration in education.</p> <p>2. The title is succinct and managed to effectively capture the essence of the study. However, it can be rephrased a bit to enhance clarity. Suggested alternative title: Student Perceptions on ICT Use in Teaching and Learning in Public Secondary Schools in Mbeya District, Tanzania</p> <p>3. The abstract summarizes the key aspects of the study. However, it could benefit from a brief inclusion of other key methodological details, such as study design, sample size and sampling methods. The methodology section explains that 20 teachers were interviewed, but the abstract says students were interviewed. Please clarify that.</p> <p>Furthermore, the abstract currently contains 334 words, which exceeds the 300-word limit specified by the journal. Perhaps a brief revision is needed for it to adhere to the journal's word limit requirement for submission.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is well-structured and the subsections are labelled clearly, except for Section 5.0 which should be labelled as: Discussion of findings.</p> <p>There was a lack of consistency in presenting the results. Students' responses were presented using table only (Table 2, Table 3) while figures (Figure 1, Figure 2) were used to present the responses from teachers. Is there any specific rationale for that?</p> <p><b>Literature Review-</b> Each section of the literature review directly relates to the research questions. However, there is a need to provide more critical analysis and synthesis of the findings from the reviewed studies. There is a need to discuss the potential gaps which have not been explicitly addressed in the current literature and explain how the current study fills these gaps. This part is not entirely clear. Providing specific details on how the research addresses the gaps would strengthen the argument. Perhaps, author(s) can consider relating it to the specific context of the research to emphasize its relevance and significance.</p>	
<p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p>	<p><b>5. Methodology-</b> While some sections are sufficiently detailed, some others, such as the methodology, could benefit from additional elaboration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please clarify how stratified sampling methods were employed in this study? The description of</li> </ul>	

## Review Form 1.7

the stratified sampling process is not provided. Kindly provide sufficient detail to help readers understand how different strata were identified and sampled.

- It would be beneficial to elaborate on why Sharma's formula (2020) suggestion of 30% (note that this source was not listed in reference list either) was chosen over Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) formula for determining sample size.
- What are the questionnaire items? How many questions were there? Were they adapted from somewhere? Including the questionnaire items would allow readers to better understand how the variables were operationalized (For example, how did you measure student attitudes etc.) As there is no information on the questionnaire items, it is difficult to assess whether they are aligned with the research objectives. How about the response rate? It was not mentioned either.
- Perhaps it is necessary to clarify why some interviews were conducted using a restricted format while others used an unrestricted format. How many rounds of interview were conducted? 20? Individually? Or group interviews? With audio/video recording? Details on transcription methods and software used would also add clarity. How about the interview questions? These details can help demonstrate the validity and reliability of the data collection process.
- As for data analysis, how about the analysis of qualitative data? What software/ tool was used? There is a need to detail the procedures for data management, including coding, categorization processes and identification of themes/ patterns.

**Findings** - Additional details are needed to reconcile the conflicting information presented in Section 4.1 The title for Figure 1 is Students' perception towards ICT, but explanation highlights that it is the teachers' perception. Please clarify that.

It is also unclear as to whether the same set of questionnaires was administered to both students and teachers. The methodology part only mentioned that 40 questionnaires have been distributed, but Section 4.1 presents the survey results from the 20 teachers. The wording and context of questions may need to be adjusted for students versus teachers. However, no such explanation was provided in Methodology.

**Section 4.2** - Frequency-based items with the terms such as "rarely," "occasionally," "frequently," and "always" can be very subjective and might be interpreted differently by different respondents. Are there any efforts to address the reliability and validity of the data collected using these frequency-based response categories? "Based on the pilot testing, were any adjustments made to the questionnaire items? If yes, please clarify it.

**Section 4.3 Table 5**- There appears to be a discrepancy between the information presented in the title of Table 5 and its description. The title of Table 5 suggests 'teachers' views' and a total of 20 respondents involved, whereas the description says '40 students' were involved. There is a need to clarify this.

**Section 5.1 & 5.2**- the italicized text- Why is the text here placed in quotation marks? Is it a direct quote from the interview? If so, please provide more context before presenting the quote. 20 teachers were interviewed, but only 3 quotes were presented. Perhaps, author(s) can consider including more direct quotes from interviews to enrich the discussion of qualitative data.

**Section 8.1** - Some claims (such as investigating the impact of ICT integration and looking into the link between technological advancements, and the impact of STEM disciplines on student views and performance) were beyond the scope of this study. Kindly refine them to align closely with the study's defined scope/ objectives

**Conclusion**- Too many subheadings (eg. 6.1 -6.4) within a short span. Revising the conclusion with fewer subheadings could strengthen its impact and cohesion.

6. Relevant sources were cited. However, this source (Sharma, 2020) was mentioned in text but missing from reference list. Please check through and ensure all cited sources are accurately

**Review Form 1.7**

<p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>listed in the reference section.</p> <p>The referencing style used does not conform to the journal's requirements. There is a need to check through the whole paper and revise accordingly according to the Author Guidelines <a href="https://journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/about/submissions">https://journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/about/submissions</a> for both in-text citations and reference list</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript requires thorough proofreading to address some language issues related to grammar, sentence structure, tenses, and word choice so as to enhance the overall readability and coherence of the document</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this article. I believe in the potential of the work. However, the manuscript would benefit from attention to several areas, including expanding on how the study addresses gaps in the existing literature, providing additional details on some key methodological concerns (questionnaire items, interview questions, analysis of qualitative data, which includes procedures for coding, categorization and identification of themes/ patterns), addressing the conflicting information presented in Section 4.1 as well as discrepancy between the information presented in the title of Table 5 and its description, correcting any inaccurate claims in Section 8.1, maintaining consistency in presenting the results (eg. Table 2, Table 3) vs Figure 1, Figure 2), aligning the referencing style with the specified journal's guidelines referencing style and conducting a thorough proofreading. Addressing these aspects will strengthen the overall presentation and impact of the research.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Catherine Nguoi Chui Lam</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Politeknik Ibrahim Sultan, Malaysia</b></p>