

A TEMPLATE FOR READING AND EVALUATING RESEARCH

	Description	Evaluation – strengths and limitations	Redesign options to address negative evaluations (where appropriate)
<p><u>PART A. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.</u></p> <p>The aims, research questions and/or hypotheses</p> <p>In your own words, explain the purpose of the study, and the RQs/hypotheses of the study.</p> <p>Identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. independent and dependent variables (more commonly associated with experimental designs) or; b. predictor and outcome variables (more commonly associated with non-experimental designs); c. mediators or intervening variables; d. control variables; e. any other variables. 		How clear, specific and understandable are the aims, RQs, and/or hypotheses?	Are the RQs, and/or hypotheses able to be written more clearly?

<p><u>PART B. THE RESEARCH DESIGN</u></p> <p>Categorise and briefly describe the research design.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Categorise the design: Note that more than one of the above may apply. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experimental design? • Quasi-experimental research? • Quasi-experimental design • Written questionnaire survey research? • Interview design • Case study design • Cross-sectional? • Longitudinal? • Other? • Combination of above? 2. Briefly describe the research design. Include any significant design elements present? 			<p>How well is the research design aligned to the stated research purpose? Would a different /adapted design be better? If so, what changes do you suggest and why?</p>
---	--	--	---

<p><u>PART C.</u></p> <p><u>Measurement strategy.</u></p> <p>For each of the variables identified in part A above, provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Conceptual definition; 2. The Operational definitions <p><u>For measured variables:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Was the measure an existing scale, an existing scale with some adaptation; a new scale? Provide the name and reference for the scale if not original. 4. Briefly describe the measurement properties of the scale. E.g., type of scale (rating scale, Semantic differential scale, Thurston scale); number of items; Number of rating points; Anchor labels, etc. 5. Was evidence of Reliability of the measure provided? 6. Was evidence of the construct Validity of the scale provided? 7. Was the measure provided, or information provided as to its availability? 		<p>1 and 2. In particular, how well do the conceptual and operational definitions match?</p> <p>3. In particular, how did the adaptation or development occur?</p> <p>4 and 5. In particular, how well does the evidence provided support the reliability and construct validity of the measures?</p>	
---	--	---	--

<p><u>For experiments:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How were the IVs manipulated? 2. What evidence of the construct validity of the manipulations were provided? (e.g, manipulation checks; other research). <p>Coding strategy specified?</p>			
<p><u>PART D. SAMPLING STRATEGY</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was a target population specified? Can a target population be inferred? 2. Describe the overall strategy. How was the sample chosen? If possible, label the strategy (e.g., simple random sampling, cluster sampling, convenience sampling etc) <p><u>For probability-based methods:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What sampling frame was used or developed? How good was this? How well does this frame match the population? b. How was a probability sample drawn from the 		<p>How representative of target population/sampling frame/drawn sample was the final sample? How statistically generalizable are the findings? To whom are the findings statistically generalizable?</p>	

<p>frame? How good was this process? How well does the sample drawn match the sampling frame?</p> <p>3. What was the final sample size? Was a response rate provided? How can it be calculated from the information provided? Show how, or what information is lacking. Is this size sufficient for the research?</p>			
<p><u>PART E.</u></p> <p><u>Knowledge claim?</u></p> <p>1. what does the authors claim to be true as a result of the application of their method</p> <p>2. In what ways does the author generalise the conclusions? On what basis are these generalisations justified? (Think about analytic and statistical generalisability?)</p>			

<p><u>Conditions for causal claims.</u></p> <p>Were causal claims made or inferred? How and how well met are the conditions required for making causal claims (that is, internal validity)?</p>			
<p><u>Alternative explanations for the results</u> (internal validity and threats to internal validity)</p> <p>What procedures were undertaken to ensure/increase the internal validity of the study? Are other <u>plausible</u> explanations possible?</p>			