Thomas Bagan

Feedback on coursework provided by Professor Paul Dowling

Critical Review

The review evidences a good understanding of the approach that has been adopted in the research—classic grounded theory—and the candidate makes a number of relevant observations about the absence of certain details from the article. The emphasis is on demonstrating comprehension of the method rather than on questioning some of the decisions made: for example, the choice of the empirical expression, pushing, to label the core category perhaps fails sufficiently to get out of the data. The use of the term, hypothesis, in the review is not really appropriate here. The review also includes a questionable interpretation of the term 'positivist'.

Proposal

Again, the proposal demonstrates a good understanding of methodological issues and is suitably circumspect in the matter of the approach to be adopted to analysis. The delineations of grounded theory and phenomenology, however, does act selectively on the range of approaches within each of these general traditions and the (wise) reluctance to attempt a causal explanation might have led to alternatives to both of these approaches. The introductory section is unduly long for a proposal and there is a more general tendency to verbosity elsewhere. The candidate raises a question about the suitability of the Seixas article for the purposes of the review of literature, but perhaps this shows a misinterpretation of a key purpose of the literature review, which is to position the proposed study within extant research as well as, of course, to inform the researcher and (in this case) exhibit methodological knowledge. Theoretical sensitivity is brought to the research in grounded theory as well as being developed in the course of it