



This is the reviewers' evaluation of an open access article under the CC BY SA license.
Article DOI: 10.52612/journals/eoloe.2022.e11.754

Reviewer 1	2
Reviewer 2	5

Reviewer 1

Maryvonne Charmillot

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-05-05 11:34 AM

Recommendation: Accept Submission

1 - Self-evaluation report

As reviewer, please provide a self-evaluation report, in as many words as you see fit, which includes your perspective (your values and worldviews in relation to education and research at the time of the review of the article) and also if you wish your reasons for having chosen to review the article.

*

Mon domaine académique est l'épistémologie et la méthodologie de l'éducation et de la formation. Je suis donc très à l'aise avec ce type de texte réflexif, analytique et critique, et je défends les mêmes valeurs que l'auteur ou l'autrice, à partir de mes propres travaux ou d'auteurs et autrices francophones (par exemple Jean-Pierre Olivier Olivier de Sardan, La violence faite aux données; Florence Piron, L'amoralité du positivisme institutionnel; Baptiste Godrie, Lucidités subversives etc.). Ce que je connais moins par contre, c'est les références au postdigital age.

Your expertise in relation to the topic of the article.

4 - Fairly confident

2 - Scientific dimensions

Does the content presented address important issues within the field of Open Education research and/or offer ideas for practice improvement ?

*

6 - Strongly agree

Is the contribution consistent throughout the different parts of the article ? *

i.e. is there deep alignment ?

6 - Strongly agree

Are aims clearly stated ? *

0 - Strongly disagree

If this is a reflexive article, are the foundation and positionality of the author clearly stated ? *

6 - Strongly agree

.....
If this is an empirical article, is the theoretical foundation clearly stated and justified ? *

7 - Not applicable

.....
If this is a practice-based article, is the praxis (theory and practice) foundation clearly stated and justified ? *

7 - Not applicable

.....
If this is a research article, is the main research question clearly stated? *

7 - Not applicable

.....
If this is a research article, is the research methodology and design appropriately chosen and rigorously implemented ?

*
7 - Not applicable

.....
If this is a research article, are findings clearly described and backed with robust analysis and interpretation ?

*
7 - Not applicable

.....
Are conclusions and interpretations presented clearly and justified? *

6 - Strongly agree

.....
If instruments are used (e.g. survey, interview form, etc.), are they available in the appendices? *

- Yes for all of them
- No for none of them
- Some are available

.....
If this is a research article, and if there is a dataset, is it openly accessible (i.e. available from Zenodo)? *

- Yes
- No

Provide here any information you wish to bring to the attention of authors, related to your review of the "scientific dimension" section :

Les deux dernières questions ne sont pas applicables



3 - Tables, Figures and language

Are visual artefacts self-contained (i.e. without the text)? *

Yes

Do visual artefacts have an added value ? *

- No
- slightly
- Yes

Is language an obstacle to understand the content ? *

- No
- Slightly
- Yes

Provide here any information you wish to bring to the attention of authors, related to your review of the "Tables, Figures and language" section :

4 - Beneficiaries and impact

Are the beneficiaries of the content clearly stated ? *

i.e. for whom is the content of the article relevant (scholars, young researchers, citizens, decisions makers, etc.) ?

6 - Strongly agree

Is the potential impact of the content mentioned ? *

i.e. does the content of the article have societal impact beyond academic borders ?

- No
- Slightly
- Yes

Provide here any information you wish to bring to the attention of authors, related to your review of the "scientific dimension" section :

5 - Overall feedback

Please provide your overall feedback to start a constructive discussion with the author so that he or she can improve the contribution.

*

Je trouve cet article original, complet, sans complaisance. Il interpelle les chercheurs et les chercheuses sur leurs pratiques d'interprétation en rappelant que la recherche est majoritairement considérée comme apolitique alors qu'elle ne l'est fondamentalement pas (cf. Geoffroy de Lagasnerie, Penser dans un monde mauvais).

Dans le tableau, ou dans le texte, il pourrait être fait référence à des perspectives épistémologiques pour aider à quitter le mode technique ou méthodologique et pour ancrer les propositions qui sont faites dans des épistémologies critiques (épistémologie de la résistance, épistémologie féministe, épistémologie libératrices, émancipatrices, épistémologie du lien etc.)

Le titre est excellent !

Reviewer Files

Reviewer 2

Review Details: The death of data interpretation and throwing sheep in a postdigital age x

Daniel Schneider

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-06-03 03:01 PM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

1 - Self-evaluation report

As reviewer, please provide a self-evaluation report, in as many words as you see fit, which includes your perspective (your values and worldviews in relation to education and research at the time of the review of the article) and also if you wish your reasons for having chosen to review the article.

*

Doing research has never been a big priority in my career as social scientist and educational technologist. I much more enjoyed exploring new ideas and technologies and (sometimes) applying these. However, I was always interested in theory and method, i.e. "good" ways of understanding and creating, and thus I am a fairly critical consumer of research. I also taught introductory methodology classes in political science and educational technology. Finally, I am also opposed to the principle that every qualitative research should code phrases and then produce simple counts with an occasional citation, e.g., as opposed to make meaning out of texts. That is the reason why I said yes to reviewing this article.

Also, sorry for taking my time. I am retired and trying to stick to a "normal" life.....

.....
Your expertise in relation to the topic of the article.

3 - Confident v

2 - Scientific dimensions

Does the content presented address important issues within the field of Open Education research and/or offer ideas for practice improvement ?

*

5 - Moderately agree v

.....
Is the contribution consistent throughout the different parts of the article ? *

i.e. is there deep alignment ?

5 - Moderately agree v

.....

Are aims clearly stated ? *

5 - Moderately agree

If this is a reflexive article, are the foundation and positionality of the author clearly stated ? *

6 - Strongly agree

If this is an empirical article, is the theoretical foundation clearly stated and justified ? *

7 - Not applicable

If this is a practice-based article, is the praxis (theory and practice) foundation clearly stated and justified ? *

7 - Not applicable

If this is a research article, is the main research question clearly stated? *

7 - Not applicable

If this is a research article, is the research methodology and design appropriately chosen and rigorously implemented ?

*

7 - Not applicable

If this is a research article, are findings clearly described and backed with robust analysis and interpretation ?

*

7 - Not applicable

Are conclusions and interpretations presented clearly and justified? *

5 - Moderately agree

If instruments are used (e.g. survey, interview form, etc.), are they available in the appendices? *

- Yes for all of them
- No for none of them
- Some are available

If this is a research article, and if there is a dataset, is it openly accessible (i.e. available from Zenodo)? *

- Yes
- No

Provide here any information you wish to bring to the attention of authors, related to your review of the "scientific dimension" section :

I would qualify this contribution as an interesting position paper that should trigger some debate.

I do think that it could be improved by adding some more grounding here and there. I do understand that this is methods paper, however it could benefit from linking the issues to debates in the philosophy of knowledge or theory of science. For example, your "liquid" could be associated with Feyerabend's relativism ("anything goes"), your overall stance is close some to form of phenomenological thought (i.e. focused on making "meaning"). I also miss an exchange with critical theory or mention of the positivism disputes/debates (coding in some quali research is a form of positivism).

I don't really understand why postdigital is particularly slippery. Indeed some social practice does change but it did so before the digital. There is what can be called connectivism, but I wonder in what respect it makes research more difficult. Information is hidden in reified discourse and ideas/rumors can spread really fast on a global scale. In what respect is that more slippery than for example ethnographic research in a prison or a theater ? I do agree that things are different, but don't know what exactly. Is all that reified discourse that enables digital data mining a challenge and if so what challenge ? So: expand the section on short data a bit ?

You mention "mixed research" but only a bit. IMHO it is the way that most research in educational innovation should go. Therefore, interaction with "objective" data (e.g. log files that show what users do) is not a topic but it could be, in particular if you are concerned by the "digital age". Also, "confirmation bias", "people not knowing what they do and why", etc. are topics that you maybe should address since "in-depth" data interpretation may not be enough to understand and maybe explain. You do mention the importance of a conceptual framework, but it's a bit "disconnected". What is the relation with "métissage" ?

Finally, there are some passages that may need a little elaboration, e.g. "digital natives and immigrants" debate is indeed passé (for me the distinction is wrong, but for most people it is not), "portrayal" could be defined.

Reference for Schneider 87 is missing.

Final thought: I often have the impression that qualitative research is poor because there is pressure to publish as much as the quanti people do. I.e. instead of confronting interviewees with interpretations that cost double or trying to make "meaning" folks just do one shot descriptive research (akin to quantitative single case studies).



3 - Tables, Figures and language

Are visual artefacts self-contained (i.e. without the text)? *

No

Do visual artefacts have an added value ? *

- No
 slightly
 Yes

Is language an obstacle to understand the content ? *

- No
 Slightly
 Yes

Provide here any information you wish to bring to the attention of authors, related to your review of the "Tables, Figures and language" section :

I can see problems with the table on page 13. Some approaches may be missing, e.g. all sorts of design research and arts-based research that you present later. Some entries in the researcher stance column could be debatable, e.g. case studies often do not include dialogue. The status and use of theory is maybe missing although somewhat addressed in the researcher stance (add an extra column to explain the relationship between theory and representation ?).

4 - Beneficiaries and impact

Are the beneficiaries of the content clearly stated ? *

i.e. for whom is the content of the article relevant (scholars, young researchers, citizens, decisions makers, etc.) ?

5 - Moderately agree

Is the potential impact of the content mentioned ? *

i.e. does the content of the article have societal impact beyond academic borders ?

- No
 Slightly
 Yes

Provide here any information you wish to bring to the attention of authors, related to your review of the "scientific dimension" section :

You could a 2-3 sentences, argue that "deeper" and politically grounded research is more useful than superficial quali-quantitative research.

5 - Overall feedback

Please provide your overall feedback to start a constructive discussion with the author so that he or she can improve the contribution.

*

Overall, the contribution is interesting for an important large scale debate that is pending, but it may need (1) some stronger philosophical grounding (2) maybe some considerations of design research and critical research (which are forms of action research), (3) some didactic improvements (make some concepts more explicit for novice readers).

Reviewer Files