Investigating the Social World

Critical Methodological Review



Overview

- ➤ You will examine a published peer-reviewed article (we have provided you with 9-10 articles to choose from)
- ➤ You are going to answer **three** questions and **write up to 500 words** (max) for each question
- No outside/additional research is needed; you will not need any citations; you should not need any direct quotes in your responses
- ▶ It is not a test there is no rubric; feel free to surprise us, but your review will be evaluated based on the quality of your responses, applying the concepts we have covered in the first five weeks
- You can come to my office hours to discuss your preliminary responses with me; the goal is not to give you a mark before the deadline but to clear any confusion



Review questions


- ▶ What is the main research question of this article? State the research question in your own words and discuss the methods used by the author(s). What is the underlying epistemological stance? Explain.
- ▶ In your own words, provide the key theoretical claim(s) of this article. Identify and discuss the nature of these claims, as well as how the author(s) aligns theory with empirics.
- ▶ Does this paper make any original and/or significant contributions? Discuss. Also, can/should the authors extend their research to a different case? If yes, what is the scope condition? What would be a possible case choice using the same condition?



Useful tips and reminders

- Before you start, read the guidance and questions carefully
- ▶ When you work on your review
 - Answer every part of the question
 - Fully develop your arguments and explanations
 - Qualify any adjectives or adverbs (e.g., unique; comprehensive; objective)
 - Consult lecture slides and readings, if necessary
- When you submit your review
 - Attach the coversheet (available on Moodle)
 - Enter your student ID in the field of Submission Title on Turnitin
 - Submit your review before midday, 3 April 2025





Enter your student ID (and nothing else) as submission title when you submit



Common pitfalls to avoid

- Writing Style and Clarity: Comments focused on the need for succinctness, clarity, and appropriate academic writing style, indicating that improving clarity and conciseness in writing was a frequent suggestion
- Structure and Coherence: Many submissions have issues with the overall structure and logical flow of the responses; the feedback suggests a need for better organization and coherence in presenting arguments and analysis
- Analytical Depth and Application of Concepts: This theme points to the need for deeper analytical engagement with the material and a better application of theoretical concepts in the analysis; many responses lacked depth or did not adequately apply class concepts to the articles being reviewed

