

Joel Simpson

## Feedback on coursework provided by Professor Paul Dowling

### *Review of Hue*

The review exhibits a good level of understanding of a range of methodological issues and certainly raises important points about the research that is reviewed. It does, though, tend rather more towards an evaluation of the research against criteria drawn substantially from Riessman—upon which the review is rather too reliant—rather than an interrogation of the claims that are made by Hue in relation to the methodological choices taken.

### *Review of McGlynn*

Again, this review is primarily an evaluation of the research on the basis of criteria drawn from an albeit fairly wide reading of methodological literature rather than an interrogation of the research in its own terms. This, it seems, is an awkward distinction to make as an engagement with methodological literature is a requirement. Here, the reading of the methods works is perhaps insufficiently critical—by which I mean that this work tends to have been taken as definitive—whilst the reading of the reviewed research is too evaluative. It is clear, however that in both this and the other review a good grasp of a wide range of methodological issues is demonstrated.

### *Proposal*

The proposal evidences a good understanding of a range of literature, methodological, theoretical and empirical and this is deployed in the construction of a viable, if ambitious, project. I personally have reservations about both CDA and CRT; neither, in my view, place sufficient methodological or theoretical pressure on the researcher in respect of the collection of data nor on the sociological (as distinct from the linguistic or literary, for example) analysis of data. This is not related to the standard criticism of these approaches that derives from a positivist stance, rather it relates to the need for any researcher to learn from their research—rather than, as CDA and CRT reports often do, simply re-state what was ‘known’ in advance— and for research to be able to speak forcefully to other than an already converted audience. My own reservations, of course, have no bearing on my assessment of this work as an excellent proposal.

### *General Comments*

The work is well presented and clear and demonstrates a very wide range of reading and understanding that more than compensate for the deviation from the point in the two reviews. The references are inappropriately organized; they should consist of single rather than clustered lists.