| **Reviewer A:** | **Reviewer C:** | **Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Is there evidence of plagiarism?: | | |
| *Significant problem – paper should be rejected without review* | *No problem* | Article was submitted to Turnitin at UWC previously to check for plagiarism before submission to SAICSIT. It was reworked for SACJ - this may account for the similarity with a student paper (mine) at UWC. All other similarities were less than 1%. |
| Does the title of the article reflect the subject matter discussed in the paper?: | | |
| *Not at all* | *Partially but could be much better* | Re-worded the title which was*:*  *Technology Affordance in Student Collaborative Environments*  To Read  *Insights into the use and affordances of social and collaborative applications for student projects.* |
| Does the abstract of the article satisfactorily show the aims, methods and result of the article?: | | |
| *Mostly* | *Yes – clearly* | Noted and checked but did not change the abstract as Reviewer C was satisfied with it.  *Theory of affordance was included in the abstract.* |
| Is the topic of the paper relevant, timely and of interest to the audience of this journal?: | | |
| *To a limited extent* | Yes – good | Noted |
| Is the rationale of the paper well grounded (is it based on a known theory or does it break new ground)?: | | |
| *Partially – rationale could be clearer* | *Partially – rationale could be clearer* | *Check the clarity or rationale and added the rationale as stated in the abstract.* |
| Is the research methodology for the study rigorous, appropriate and applied properly? | | |
| *Mostly – could be more rigorous or application could be better* | *Mostly – could be more rigorous or application could be better* | The following was added:  *The methodology involved included a questionnaire and follow-up group discussions. These were organized by the researcher with each student project team in order to corroborate responses from the questionnaire.* |
| Is the content of the article rigorous, technically accurate and sound in supporting the arguments?: | | |
| *Mostly – rigorous and sound for most part* | *Mostly – rigorous and sound for most part* | Noted |
| Is the content sufficiently novel to justify a journal publication?: | | |
| *Partially – lacking novelty and interest* | *Mostly – either could be more novel, or could be of greater interest* | Noted |
| Are the conclusions / contributions supported by the material presented in the article? | | |
| *Partially – conclusions or contributions could be clearer and better supported* | *Partially – conclusions or contributions could be clearer and better supported* | Added the results for each research question in the Conclusions section. |
| Is the language used appropriate for an international readership?: | | |
| *No – very poor language or excessive use of jargon or both* | Yes – good use of language, not excessively weighed down by jargon | The article was sent to an editor for comments. |
| Does the article have sufficient length to adequately satisfy its aims?: | | |
| *Yes – neither too long nor too short* | *Yes – neither too long nor too short* | Noted |
| Are figure / graphics used in the article clear and appropriately captioned?: | | |
| *Partially – significant lack of clarity in figures or captions* | *Yes – sufficient figures, clearly presented, clearly captioned* | Noted |
| Are the references cited where relevant? | | |
| *No – far too few reference citations or mostly not relevant* | *Mostly – sometimes not cited where relevant* | More current references were added. |
| Are the references shown related to the article theme?: | |  |
| *Yes – all clearly related, nothing significant left out* | *Yes – all clearly related, nothing significant left out* | Noted |
| Are references relevant, recent and representative (i.e. not biased to only support one view)?: | | |
| *Mostly – most sufficiently recent and relevant; representative* | *Yes – all sufficiently recent and relevant; representative* | Noted |

| **Reviewer A:** | **Reviewer C:** | **Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Please add any text here that clarify your selections in the form questions. Detail to help the author(s) is very much appreciated.: | | |
| *The methodology describes included a questionnaire, focus groups and interviews, yet no description on how the focus groups or interviews were implemented.*  *The y-axis on the chart is not labeled.*  *Some of the references date back to early 2000's e.g. 1998, 2003, 2006, which is really dated in terms of technology use. Although some relate to topics such as collaborative learning, I am quite sure there are more recent references that could be used.*  *The data analysis is limited to frequency, which limits the conclusions to be drawn.* | *This is a nicely written paper on a topic of interest to the SACJ readership. I attach a copy of the paper with some comments for the authors. I think the paper needs to be strengthened in two major respects. Firstly,*  *the authors fail to define what an affordance is, and this makes it difficult to appreciate the categories that emerged from the analysis.*  *Secondly,*  *there is no clear theoretical underpinning to the study, making it a bit hard to place the results in the body of knowledge. Perhaps affordance theory could be used?* | * The methodology involved included a questionnaire and follow-up group discussion was organized by the researcher with each student project team in order to corroborate responses from the questionnaire. * The axes have been labeled. * References Updated. * *Section added to define and explain affordance.* * *This study adopts affordance theory.* * *Noted the comment about data analysis however the frequencies were only used to identify important concepts or occurrences of affordances.* |
| Please outline here any corrections or improvements to the article: Minor editorial corrections to referencing. | | |
| *Include the data collection implementation of focus groups and interviews. Try and find some correlations to identify themes and tendencies*. | 1. *Align the questions in the introduction and the literature review. As it stands its hard to identify the research questions. Make these clear.* 2. *Include a discussion of affordances and affordance theory and show how this paper relates.* 3. *Make some comment on the ethics of researching students in this way. Clearly their participation was not voluntary.* 4. *Explain why the Ikamva system was left out of the discussion in the results section, when most of the teams were using it.* 5. *The claim that this research could improve the design of LMSs is not substantiated, since the LMS already has all four of the affordances identified. Some further discussion as to why students used additional systems would be helpful.* | * Decided to take out the interview and focus group approach. Rather just referred to “discussions” with the teams to corroborate/strengthen the responses. * Aligned the research questions and literature review by adding heading 2.1 and 2.2. * Included discussion on affordance and affordance theory. * The students were not forced to participate in this study and were given a consent form to sign stating that they can withdraw at any time if they are prepared to participate. Ethical clearance was received from the UWC Research Committee and HSSREC. * iKamva’s functionalities were not used by the teams for their projects. They preferred using alternative applications. This was added to the results. * The LMS.did not provide the functionality for collaboration as was required for this CS project. Students therefore resorted to the use of applications other than the LMS. Future work will consider a wider group of LMSs to identify differences. |