

# Review of: "On the use of blogging in the classroom of English for Specific Purposes in times of COVID-19 to promote written skills: a collaborative approach"

Muhammad Najmussaib Diya Alhaq

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article is quite interesting, considering its factual and actual aspects – the topic underlines learning during a pandemic. The author manages to raise the pedagogical language learning issues in the context of contemporary technology. Furthermore, the used IMRAD (Introduction, Method, Result & Discussion) structure shows that the author has sufficient experience in academic and research writing. But of course, there is still room for suggestions and input that can be used to improve the quality of this article itself.

Overall, this research article is more likely to be a *short report* of research activity rather than a *research article* designed to find a significant novelty. It is based on several things and points as a reference for a future evaluation:

1. This research does not have a significant gap compared to previous studies. The discussion about the use of full-scale blogs in online learning within the pandemic context does not seem to provide enough novelty. It is necessary to conduct a more in-depth literature review so that such research can fill the existing scientific gaps and make a significant scientific contribution.
2. The concepts presented in this article are not consistent. At the beginning (as in the title, abstract, etc.), the author uses English as Specific Purposes (ESP) for the approach. But a different one was introduced in the latter part of the article, where the author uses English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Such inconsistency makes the research findings questionable due to the theoretical discrepancy. It would be better if the author used a consistent approach to increase the validity of the theoretical framework.
3. This research is not based on a specific theory or a clear framework. To provide a vibrant research stance, the author needs to base his research on a theory or framework that various previous studies have presented. From this, the reader can understand how this research stands against previous studies; be it supporting, rejecting, evaluating, etc. Some theories or frameworks that can be used in criticizing the phenomenon of technology-based EFL learning in the informal setting include:
  - *Informal Digital Learning of English (IDLE)* - Lee, J. S. (2021). *Informal Digital Learning of English: Research to Practice*. Routledge.
  - *Extramural English learning* - Sundqvist, P., & Sylvén, L. K. (2016). *Extramural English in teaching and learning: From theory and research to practice*. Springer.
  - *Computer Assisted Language Learning* - Beatty, K. (2013). *Teaching & researching: Computer-assisted language*

learning. Routledge.

- *Out-of-class language learning* - Benson, P., & Reinders, H. (Eds.). (2011). Beyond the language classroom. Springer.
4. This study does not explain the urgency and significance of digital technology usage in EFL learning. The author has not given enough picture of the importance of contemporary language learning transformation thru the adoption of digital technologies. It is crucial since adopting the latest technology requires procuring resources that are not merely simple. By providing a clear picture of the phenomenon, readers can understand the significance of switching to this learning mode and the worth of their efforts.
  5. Exposure to research methodologies and instruments is not carried out consistently. Although the section describing the post-questionnaire instrument has explained the framework used, similar efforts do not apply to the depiction of other instruments. In addition, the results of the validity and reliability of quantitative instruments (Likert scale) are not presented. This makes it difficult for the reader to understand how the author arranges the instruments.
  6. The research methodology seems obsolete and does not consider the latest methodological developments. Looking at this context, it would be more appropriate if the author considered using more pragmatic research methods, such as mixed methods. That way, the research results also become more reliable, holistic, and efficient.
  7. Readers need to understand how the author processes research data. Unfortunately, the data analysis is not clearly presented. The description of research indicators is less elaborate. Moreover, the author does not explain the framework used in analyzing data. Lacking these various points can affect the validity of the finding. It would be better if the data analysis is explained more fully for the sake of future research.
  8. Even though there is still quite a lot of room for the author to give more of her thoughts, the author's interpretation of the findings is still fairly shallow. Still, the research implications presented also do not provide any significance other than as a pilot study for further research. In fact, this kind of research is expected to shed light on the potential of implementing contemporary technology in language learning, especially EFL. It would be more appropriate if the author elaborated on his research findings further so that more people could understand the full potential of this research topic.