

Mui Mui Adeline Lim

Feedback on coursework provided by Professor Paul Dowling

Critical review

The review makes a number of valid points about the research evidencing a good grasp of the survey and statistical methods adopted. The review does, however, rather tend towards an assessment of the paper rather than an interrogation of its argument and some of the criticisms perhaps go a little too far: the researcher used what might be referred to as a 'panel' of students in order to generate the initial set of 70 items and these were reduced and grouped using exploratory factor analysis; no call for an additional panel of experts as suggested by the candidate. Comments relating to the ordering of the items on the questionnaire etc are, though, certainly relevant. I would not place ballet at the same level of analysis as tango!

Research Proposal

Given the general approach that is to be adopted, there is a degree of over-preparation in respect of the formulation of research questions and, in particular, in the construction of an interview schedule, which is certainly not appropriate in this kind of research: a single starter question—calling either for the recollection of a specific instance or, if a classic grounded theory approach is to be adopted, then a grand tour question, in either case this should be followed by probes. If the research is not to be adhering closely to grounded theory, then it is entirely appropriate to list a number of areas to be covered in the interview, but not in the form of specific questions. Otherwise, the proposed research is viable. the discussion of antecedent research is very thoughtful and demonstrates a good level of understanding of relevant methodological issues as does, in general, the description of the proposed research. The critical reviews do rather tend towards assessment of the research, which is not really appropriate, and the interrogation of the statistical techniques used in the first paper discussed are, again, a little over-zealous: the t-test is legitimately understood as a special case of ANOVA in which the means of only two groups are compared, so the accusation that the researcher has mislabelled his test is inappropriate.

Both pieces of work are well presented and well-written.