GEORGE

1. Why are there no quantitative or mixed methods being used or considered?

For this study I will be identifying a baseline of how educators are using the internet to extend their studio spaces. I will be more laying the groundwork and looking at a system that is in a state of transition between the old traditions and the new ways being developed.

I will not be looking for correlations in learning outcomes or measuring the impact of what happens when studios are extended. I will be looking exclusively at the experiential element of extending studio pedagogy and be looking to understand the experience of educators, thus I will not be using any quantitative or mixed methods, methods.

Quantitative data may be useful in measuring attitudes across a large sample, however, GTM offers a powerful methodological framework if the aim of the study is to learn about individuals' perceptions.

CATHERINE

1. How did Fleischmann conclude that educators do not think the critical/creative thinking skills can happen via fully online spaces?

In 2015, Fleischmann interviewed ten design educators from three different countries to explore what design education of the future might look like. Though educators noted online learning was a factor to consider, all believed the critical and creative thinking skills necessary to be a professional designer cannot occur in a fully online course (p. 105).

2. Any info on how certain personalities/individual differences of learners affect success in this type of environment (I.e. Critique, see

p. 33 of proposal)?

3. Quantitative research too acknowledges the complex, ever-changing nature of the world...why not use it?
See Above.

4. Regarding participant criteria, You may have explained this in our conversation, but it seems you need an explanation of this criterion. What if you identified people who previously taught in brick and mortar settings?

5. Are you going to practice interviews prior to formal data collection?
No. But I will be sending potential topics out to design educator peers to gauge their reactions to see if the pathways I'm thinking about heading are correct and worthwhile.

6. Can you give examples of insights revealed during coding which might direct your next round of data collection?

7. Will you code as you go or after all of the interviews?
I will code as I go.

8. Can you give an example of a substantive theory as defined by Charmaz?
Substantive theories provide a theoretical interpretation or explanation for a particular area, in other words this type of theory is used to explain a phenomenon in a specific setting. This is in contrast to a general theory which is more abstracted and can be used to explain a wider range of behavior.
For example, I will develop a substantive theory about how

graphic design educators are using the internet to extend their studio spaces which will be particular to graphic design education application. If I was developing a formal theory, it would be something that could explain how art and design educators in general (so painters, sculptors, etc.) can use the internet to extend their studio spaces.

9. What steps will you need to take for each participant to receive a transcription of their interview and make any additions or corrections?

I'll need to transcribe the interviews and then email them out with a specific deadline for participants to get them back to me.

10. Is it common/accepted in this type of study proposal to provide your pre-study theory in order to verify that your results are grounded in the data?

No. Grounded theory is built on inductive reasoning so you must first gather data and only then begin to curate it through coding to see what theory might emerge.

JON

1. You mention 'tacit beliefs' and I am not sure what those are. Do you mean 'implicit beliefs'?

2. It seems worth exploring Polyani's ideas on tacit knowledge which is not just 'unsaid' but 'unsayable' and all knowledge is thus derived from these things.

3. I see a whole bunch of relevant McLuhan themes here too - the role of the medium, the nature of mediation, etc, and, especially, his views on the evolution and impacts of media.

4. Have you considered a bit more of the broader influences on Studio Pedagogy beyond the Bauhaus?

5. It could be interesting to more methodically compare what was new in the Bauhaus with existing practices.

6. It would perhaps be interesting to discuss influential online/ virtual design programs in similar depth and detail to that found in the Bauhaus section.

7. It might be worth dwelling a little more too on New Media and how design has grown to embrace them - many articles available on pedagogies for teaching New Media

8. I think the fact that you are looking at blends and hybrids might make it worth mentioning the broader area of blended and hybrid pedagogies - and their distinctive benefits and challenges - in your lit review too. The effects of f2f are mostly useful but they dilute and sometimes stifle online engagement, so it is likely that some very distinctive pedagogies and practices will emerge that will have peculiar dynamics.

9. It would be particularly salient to more clearly articulate the connection between broadly constructivist pedagogies and a somewhat constructivist approach to the research process: there is no necessary connection between these things but the reasoning that leads from one to the other might help draw out the intention more clearly. I think this does come out when you talk of Constructionism (a constructivist model) - just needs to be a little more explicit and perhaps be articulated earlier on.

10. A bit more needed on avoidance/embrace of bias- your reasoning is good, but the methods emerging (other than 'being aware' of your own bias) are not entirely clear. I'd suggest explicit, regular, structured and, ideally, public or semi-public reflection would be appropriate. This can spring from and partly be encompassed by the memo writing - might even be the same thing - but, I'd suggest, ought to be thought of as a separate, though linked activity that knits those memos together. If you did this in the form of blogging you would gain the benefits of peer debriefing for free.

11. It would be useful to briefly explain the reasoning behind your use of Symbolic Interactionism (capital letters again!). Perhaps worth noting it is a framework rather than a theory. You might find value in theories that broadly conform with the notion such as Activity Theory or Actor Network Theory, that also align well with your Social Constructionist model. ANT would seem particularly appropriate here, given the critical importance of non-human actors in the activity and the methodological crossovers with GT.

COHORT
1. Why am I excluding educators in fully online programs?

2. What's my estimate of number of participants required?

3. What do all of my trustworthiness variables really mean?

4. Constructivism vs. Social Constructivism....which do I actually mean and why?