

Review of: "Using concepts related to research design while writing thesis and dissertation at universities: questioning the status quo"

Saralyn McKinnon-Crowley¹

¹ University of Texas at Austin

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

questioning the status quo

Thank you for this submission. I think there are good ideas here, but we need more support as readers to see support for the proposed change to dissertations. First, though this is a narrative review, the details about the literature review are under-supported. It would be very helpful to have more specificity in the search terms provided other than what is offered. For instance, which keywords were used? How did the author move from the keyword results to analysis? I would consider providing all sources consulted as a table. Additionally, I would like to have seen the actual source cited for Taddie & Tashakkori rather than referring what piece it is cited in. Second, what is the evidence that headings are required in all universities and departments? I wonder if "terminology" might be more accurate than "headings." Third, there is an assumption in the piece that could be re-framed. While the author critiques doctoral programs for insufficient explanation of the terms defined, there is no evidence that the sources cited in the literature review are those used to teach graduate students. If the author provides evidence that Punch or Cresswell and Plano-Clark is used in methods coursework or provided to students, that would be more persuasive. For that matter, *which* doctoral programs? Narrowing the scope of the argument to education, social sciences, location, etc. would be more compelling. The existence of different terminological definitions is not itself a reason to argue for a change. I look forward to seeing revisions of this piece.