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**1.       Is there a clear research question?**

The research question appears to be clear – What are students digital literacy practices or how do students engage with texts and technologies in and outside of the curricula?

**2.       Is the methodology clearly stated by the author(s)?**

The methods take precedence, however, ethnographic style research is mentioned under Research methods.

**3.       What methods have the author(s) used?**

Qualitative methods were used in the form of interviews and in some cases small focus groups.  In total 45 students were interviewed from three very different institutions over a six month period.

**4.       What issues – if any – arose during the data collection phase?**

The authors were very clear about issues they encountered.  As they were outside researchers organising access to students was difficult.  This was due to the fact that many students were part time and spent little time on campus.  They also had to rely on the good will of the institutions to organise interview venues which was also problematic.

**5.       What are the main strengths of the research design?**

It included a good range of quotes from their research which added to its credibility.  It was easy to read and I felt it did not drift from the research question.

**6.       What are some weaknesses of the research design?**

A clear definition of digital literacy from their viewpoint was not clear.  It did not include seminal pieces you would expect in the referencing.  Furthermore, many of the references referred to prior work from one of the researchers. In the initial findings the authors used “some said” and “some participants” – mentioning how many of the 45 students stated this may have been beneficial.

**7.       To what extent does the paper answer its research question?**

The paper concludes with the authors answering their research question.  I believe this is due to the fact that they did not drift from it during the paper despite the overlap between the textual and technological lens.