

Hitomi Nakajima

## Feedback on coursework provided by Professor Paul Dowling

The critical review exhibits a general understanding of some key methodological issues, but there are also some misunderstandings. For example, it would have been inappropriate for Johnston to have provided a rationale for the study—as the candidate suggested she should have—as this is classic grounded theory and so the focus of the research must emerge from the data collection process. Triangulation is not a *requirement* in empirical research and nor does it 'ensure' validity and reliability. These qualities are established in classic GT via constant comparison and theoretical saturation. The questioning of Johnston's interpretations is not really helpful: it is always necessary to place a degree of trust in the researcher, in this case, trusting that she has, as she says that she has, applied theoretical sampling, constant comparison and theoretical saturation. Contrary to what seems to be suggested, no formal GT was developed, although some suggestions as to how this might proceed were offered. Overall, the review has a tendency to evaluate, which is not the purpose of the task.

The proposal presents a viable study, which has already begun and the proposal includes reference to some preliminary coding. Details are provided of the approach to data collection and analysis, which has been organised well despite the difficulties involved in managing data collection at a distance. Overall, this is a confident piece of work that exhibits a good understanding of a range of methodological issues and strategies. In terms of the critical review of literature, rather more is presented than is asked for in the task remit. This has reduced the depth of methodological interrogation in respect of any given study, but the overall result demonstrates a good grasp of key methodological issues.