

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"

Novi Prihananto

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

As initial research, this study is good in the process and concluding stages. The involvement of students in this study was requested voluntarily by the researcher, likewise, in determining the population and samples taken. However, several things still need to be looked at more closely so that this study can draw more accurate conclusions.

First, the provision of extra activities, namely writing on a blog for the experimental group, while the control group was given extra activities, which were not writing but oral activities. These two activities could not be compared equally. Writing activities can be designed, drafted in advance, edited, and arranged collaboratively, while oral activities are more spontaneous.

Since this study focused on the role of blogging in increasing writing activity (as the title implied), it would be better if all samples were given the same extra activities on writing, with the difference in the experimental group writing on the blog. In contrast, the control group did not write on the blog. In this way, the validity of the blogging would be increased. The extra activity given to EG and CG should be closely similar, such as blogging writing activity for EG vs. non-blogging writing activity for CG. Hence, the result would lead to a conclusion on whether blogging might indeed motivate the students' writing performance.

Second, since the title implied that the blogging activities were done collaboratively in the EG, did the CG were given similar collaborative activities as well? Can oral activities be collaborative?

Third, the main activity in the English class must be well-controlled, both in the experimental and control groups. This is to avoid any influence outside of blogging.