



Provisional Mark	75
-------------------------	-----------

School of Social and Political Science – PG Feedback Form

Exam number	Student F
Course Instance	March 2014
Course Name	Using Creative Methods in Research with Children and Young People CPD
Component Name	Blog 1

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.

Overview

Marking criterion	Comment	Grade A-H (if appropriate)
Critical/conceptual analysis	The blog aptly discusses the co-creation of fieldwork tools and their suitability for the actual research participants. This discussion is both insightful and well discussed. Given the blog asked for two separate findings, it could have developed one of the other critiques further	B-C
Strength/cohesion of argument	The argument is very clearly, succinctly and effectively made.	A
Use of sources/evidence	Very good use is made of Lomax, to assist with the argument.	A
Structure & organisation	The blog was very well organised, proceeding clearly from paragraph to paragraph. Slightly less descriptive information might have given more room for critique	A/B
Breadth and relevance of reading	The blog could only have been improved by further use of sources (but was not required by the assessment).	B
Clarity of expression, presentation and referencing	Te blog was very lucidly written and well-referenced.	A
Suggestions for future work	The blog was an excellent contribution, in being clearly written and structured, adequately describing the resources and – more importantly – providing a very apt critique. For development, even more use of resources and further critique would have developed and deepened the critical consideration.	

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.

Student F – Blog Contribution – Using creative methods CPD Course

The following resource raises interesting questions about assumptions around representation in the use of creative methods:

Coad, J., Plumridge, G., & Metcalfe, A. (2009) Involving children and young people in the development of art-based research tools. *Nurse Researcher* 16 (1) 56-64.

In the above article, the authors describe the process of working with children and young people to develop art-based activities for use in a study exploring how children and young people communicate with their families about genetic conditions – a research area not previously explored using creative methods. Within the article, Coad et al. (2009) briefly highlight methodological issues about children and young people's participation and some challenges for their research.

Coad et al. (2009) advocate art-based methods based on the idea that they are more relevant to children and young people than 'traditional' research methods, and avoid adult-dominated perspectives that see children as 'objects' of research rather than active participants. Coad et al. (2009: 59) therefore argue that the next logical step in promoting a participatory approach was to co-create research tools with children and young people: 'if the research was to be meaningful to the group, it was important that the tools were developed with the users from the outset'.

In development of the art-based research tools required for the study, the authors consulted with youth advisors who were briefed on the study and participated in workshops to develop two toolkits for ages 8 to 11 and ages 11 to 18. The toolkits produced are focused on encouraging discussion and comprise of a sticky bag/board for the younger age group, and a graffiti board for ages 11+.

It is interesting to note that Coad et al. (2009) acknowledge two pitfalls of this exercise: (1) Many of the children and young people participating to develop the toolkits 'were very articulate and therefore may not have been representative' (Coad et al., 2009: 62); and (2) The majority of participants did not have genetic conditions and therefore did not form part of the target group who would use the toolkits within the study.

Coad et al. (2009) report managing these pitfalls by seeking ongoing feedback from the target research group throughout the study. However, is this satisfactory?

Lomax (2012) argues that 'child-led' visual research methods can overprivilege the perspective of 'the all-knowing and all-seeing child' (106) and can therefore be homogenised by researchers who are supposedly trying to better appreciate the viewpoints of children and young people by using 'child-centred' creative methods.

It seems that Coad et al. (2009) fall into this trap – In their study, youth advisors are in a position to develop research tools for use with other children and young people, by virtue of being children and young people themselves, rather than by virtue of sharing an experience in common with the target research group.

REFERENCES

Coad, J., Plumridge, G., & Metcalfe, A. (2009) Involving children and young people in the development of art-based research tools. *Nurse Researcher* 16 (1) 56-64.

Lomax, H. (2012) Contested voices? Methodological tensions in creative visual research with children. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 15 (2) 105-117.

