

Review of: "Refining ESP Learning and Increasing Motivation through the Incorporation of Technology into TBLT"

Beatriz Chaves-Yuste¹

¹ Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article should be carefully revised or proofread since it is sometimes, difficult to understand. It starts with the following sentence: "This research investigates whether incorporating technology into Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) would help further improve their attitude", but it is not clear who "their" is referring to. In the introduction, for instance, ideas are not interwoven properly.

In section 2: needs analysis in ESP setting more updated scientific literature should be provided. All the references, despite some are quite relevant, are quite old and there is plenty of more recent research conducted on the topic.

In section 3: ICT, there are problems with references ((Jorge, C. M. H., Jorge, M. d. C. A., Gutiérrez, E. R., García, E G., & Diaz, M. B. (2003)). This section is extremely brief and does not get deeply into the topic. It speaks about hybrid education, but it does not provide a definition or what the authors speak about when using this term.

In section 4: Data gathering instruments, more information should be provided regarding the participants of the study (i.e., ages, genre, experience of teachers, etc.) and the instruments used. Which questionnaire was used? Was it validated? Was it reliable? Was any test taken to prove the reliable scale of the questionnaire? Was it assessed by an expertise group or ethics committee? How many items does the questionnaire comprise? Has it got a Likert scale? Are there open-ended questions?

In section 5: Discussion, the following information, provided at the beginning of the article, is repeated: "Surprisingly, they felt that the Listening and Speaking skills are the most important skills for their students." Why is it surprising? Can the authors back up this idea? This section describes certain Tables (24, 14, 25, etc.), with an awkward numbering, that are not included in the article or cannot be seen. It tries to justify the integration of ICT tools and TBLT but this methodology has not been introduced, described or explained.

Section 6: Conclusions is extremely brief and does not offer any pedagogical implication. Authors should work further on this section too.

The topic is very interesting and it is necessary to study this issue, but in general terms, the article needs more depth and scientific rigor.

