Coughlan et al. (2007) framework from Fothergill, A., and A. Lipp. "A guide to critiquing a research paper on clinical supervision: enhancing skills for practice." Journal of psychiatric and mental health nursing (2014).

# Section one – elements influencing the believability of the research

#### Writing style

*Is the report well written – concise, grammatically correct, avoid the use of jargon? Is it well laid out and organised?* 

## Author

Do the researcher(s) qualifications/positions indicate a degree of knowledge in this particular field?

## **Report title**

Is the title clear, accurate and unambiguous?

### Abstract

Does the abstract offer a clear overview of the study, including the research problem, sample, methodology, findings and recommendations?

### Section two - elements influencing the robustness of the research

### Purpose/research problem

Is the purpose of the study/research problem clearly identified?

### Logical consistency

Does the research report follow the steps of the research process in a logical manner? Do these steps naturally flow and are the links clear?

### Literature review

Is the review logically organised? Does it offer a balanced critical analysis of the literature? Is the majority of the literature of recent origin? Is it mainly from primary sources and of an empirical nature?

# **Theoretical framework**

Has a conceptual or theoretical framework been identified? Is the framework adequately described? Is the framework appropriate?

### Aims/objectives/research question/hypotheses

Have aims and objectives, a research question or hypothesis been identified? If so are they clearly stated? Do they reflect the information presented in the literature review?

### Sample

Has the target population been clearly identified? How was the sample selected? Was it a probability or non-probability sample? Is it of adequate size? Are the inclusion/exclusion criteria clearly identified?

### **Ethical considerations**

Were the participants fully informed about the nature of the research? Was the autonomy/confidentiality of the participants guaranteed? Were the participants protected from harm? Was ethical permission granted for the study?

### **Operational definitions**

Are all the terms, theories and concepts mentioned in the study clearly defined?

# Methodology

Is the research design clearly identified? Has the data gathering instrument been described? Is the instrument appropriate? How was it developed? Were reliability and validity testing undertaken and the results discussed? Was a pilot study undertaken?

### Data analysis/results

What type of data and statistical analysis was undertaken? Was it appropriate? How many of the sample participated? Significance of the findings?

### Discussion

Are the findings linked back to the literature review? If a hypothesis was identified was it supported? Were the strengths and limitations of the study including generalizability discussed? Was a recommendation for further research made?

### References

*Were all the books, journals and other media alluded to in the study accurately referenced?*