

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"

James McLellan¹

¹ University of Brunei Darussalam

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Open Peer Review on Qeios "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"

Notes

The article as submitted is brief (a virtue, not a criticism), clear and succinct. It is also original, and highly relevant in the Covid19 pandemic era when teaching has had to migrate to fully online rather than blended mode.

It is well-structured, and describes and analyses findings from original research using a quasi-experimental method. The rationale is clearly stated in section 2, as are the two pertinent research questions at the beginning of section 3 (Method).

In order to provide a constructive, rather than a critical review, I would like to mention the questions which occurred to this reader while going through the article:

With reference to Table 2 on p.5, I feel that readers need an explanation of why the experimental group number in the September column is lower than that of the control group. The statement below Table 2 also requires further explanation and justification.

In the conclusion, limitations of the study are rightly pointed out. But there could be a better balance, i.e. the author should also talk up the findings in favour of the use of blogs on this English for Tourism course. Perhaps this could be done by stating whether she would be in favour of continuing to ask students to produce and comment on blogs when the course is no longer fully online, i.e. in the post-pandemic period.

One issue noted in the references: journal titles should be *italics*, according to APA-Style v7.