



<b>Provisional Mark</b>	<b>60%</b>
-------------------------	------------

## School of Social and Political Science – PG Feedback Form

<b>Course Instance</b>	<b>February 2014</b>
<b>Course Name</b>	<b>Involving Children and Young People in Research &amp; Consultation CPD</b>
<b>Component Name</b>	<b>Blog 2</b>

*Please note that both the comments and the grade remain provisional until ratified by the external Exam Board in May and will be subject to change, moderation and review by our external examiners. This includes whether or not any penalties imposed are upheld.*

<b>Exam number</b>	<b>Student B</b>
--------------------	------------------

**Overview**

<b>Marking criterion</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Grade A-H (if appropriate)</b>
Critical/conceptual analysis	The blog critically considers the reported study, bringing out very salient points in regards to the use of visual methods (and whether they should also be complemented by other methods). The analysis could go even further, in terms of interrogating how visual data can be interpreted for example, and linking to recent re-considerations of the 'voice' of children.	B/C
Strength/cohesion of argument	The blog proceeds coherently, with a reasoned argument. Some aspects could be tied in more tightly: e.g. the card section game could be explained more fully to the reader, in order to then follow the critical argument (why could it not involve verbal discussion?).	B/C
Use of sources/evidence	The blog brings in very relevant literature, to discuss points made. See note below for one point that could be 'tied off' in terms of linking the literature back to the resource.	A/B
Structure & organisation	The blog was well organised, with a descriptive paragraph at the start and proceeding logically.	A
Breadth and relevance of reading	Reading was relevant to the blog.	A
Clarity of expression, presentation and referencing	The blog's writing was clear and referencing within the blog met conventions. It could be useful for a reader – even a blog! – to have some further information about references to follow up the literature cited.	B
Suggestions for future work	This blog meets the task requirements, and shows productive critical thinking. For future work, the following is recommended: pushing critical arguments further, questioning some of the orthodoxies within childhood studies research (e.g. 'voice'), using the latest writings; ensuring sufficient description for the reader to follow points made; ensuring all points are tied into the argument.	

*Susan Elsley and Kay Tisdall, as course convenors, maintain a file of anonymised assessments with feedbacks for further students to consult. If you would prefer to have your assignment not included within this file, please inform Kay Tisdall [k.tisdall@ed.ac.uk](mailto:k.tisdall@ed.ac.uk).*

<http://www.cf.ac.uk/cplan/sites/default/files/CCS-VisualResearchVulnerableChildren.pdf>

I have chosen to explore this case study since it draws attention to, amongst other matters, the complexities surrounding the accompaniment (or otherwise) of a verbal discussion or a written record to visual methods (VMs).

This case study “reflects on the use of visual methods in a study that sought to explore the experiences of street working children in Peru (Bromley and Mackie, 2009)”. The author Mackie reflects on two VM tasks: mapping and a card selection game. In the card section game, there was no reliance on the children’s literacy or verbal skills, meaning that all children who participated were “equally able to express themselves”. Likewise, in the first section of the mapping game there was no requirement for these skills; although for the second section, some oral skills were required to give explain their respective mapping selections.

The strengths of using VM in conducting research with children and young people include: that they are perceived as being fun and enjoyable by children (Hill, 2006: 80, Punch, 2002: 331) and that they are familiar to children in other contexts (for example, in school and in their homes lives) (Mitchell, 2008: 61, Hill, 2006: 79).

Mackie stresses that another much-cited strength of this approach: it does not depend on, at first glance, the literacy or verbal skills of the participant(s). In this way, those may have otherwise been excluded, are included, allowing their voice to be heard. He is not alone in holding this view, for example (Mitchell, 2008: 62). But *are* their voices being properly heard?

Not necessarily. Inexorably, adults see children’s drawings through adults’ eyes (Coates and Coates, 2006; Punch, 2002). Therefore, literature has also highlighted the importance of this additional communication in ensuring that the product, say a drawing, as is accurately interpreted by the adult researcher. White et al refer to the ‘draw and talk’ approach (White et al., 2010). This approach is based on the premise that the richness of the data, and the full meaning of the product, flows from not merely the ‘product’, the drawing, but also the *process* in which the product is generated, and the talk which takes place during this process.

Whilst I am not saying that Mackie and other scholars are necessarily not giving full appreciation to this, it is something to bear in mind. Indeed, many researchers employing VMs are already doing this. However, if this option to ‘double check’ that a researcher has properly interpreted a drawing by supplementing this with a verbal or written interaction, is not available, we should look hard to consider how VMs can be used to ensure views are

Kay 9/7/14 14:04

**Comment [1]:** This is a very intriguing description. For the reader who is not yet read the resource, it would be useful to ensure further key elements, like the purpose of the research, more fully what the card section game entailed etc.

Kay 9/7/14 14:04

**Comment [2]:** Great to use relevant literature to support points made. Are these particular methods – mapping and card section game – familiar to the particular child participants? This would be important to know, for the argument.

Kay 3/7/14 18:25

**Comment [3]:** Yes, good points. You have mentioned this earlier, so you could edit and use the words to address another issue.

Kay 3/7/14 18:27

**Comment [4]:** A very provocative question! There is some contention now about reifying the ‘voice’ of children – e.g. Tisdall et al. 2009, Wyness 2012 ...

Kay 3/7/14 18:25

**Comment [5]:** This paragraph is very clearly and well explained.

Kay 3/7/14 18:26

**Comment [6]:** Yes, you mention that Mackie did discuss with children about their mapping? Was this relevant for the card section game?

Kay 3/7/14 18:28

**Comment [7]:** Yes. Although one could have a debate about what ‘properly interpreted’ means: by what criteria do we judge this?

being accurately heard and represented. Clearly, we do not want to pay mere lip service to the expression of unheard views, or worse, misrepresent them.