**Quantitative Research Evaluation Tool**

for Articles in the Social Sciences

Use this Quantitative Research Evaluation Tool as a guide to help you:

1. **Assess if you are looking at a quantitative research article** (i.e., it attempts to count, measure, and generalize findings, has an abstract, makes references to other academic articles, is in a peer-reviewed journal, includes a doi number, has elements of the following questions, etc.).
2. **Evaluate the quality of the research article** (i.e., in general, the more explicit these elements are detailed in the article, the more confidence you can have of its quality).

This tool is not intended to be comprehensive nor address all research variations. There is not a magic number for how many of these must be present in a “good” article, but more make it easier to evaluate and potentially apply to research or practice. Learning how to assess and evaluate research takes time, effort, and guidance, and this checklist is intended to help in that process.

| **Front Matter** |
| --- |
| 1. Is the title focused and engaging?
 |  |
| 1. Does the author have qualifications to be a credible authority?
 |  |
| 1. Are there keywords that fit the study?
 |  |
| **Abstract** |
| 1. Is the purpose clear?
 |  |
| 1. Is the significance mentioned?
 |  |
| 1. Are the methodology and method stated?
 |  |
| 1. Is the sample and context mentioned?
 |  |
| 1. Is there a brief summary of results?
 |  |
| **Introduction** |
| 1. Is the problem that led to this research clearly stated?
 |  |
| 1. Does background information / literature situate the problem in context?
 |  |
| 1. Are there gaps or problems identified in the literature?
 |  |
| 1. Is the significance or importance for this study detailed?
 |  |
| 1. Is there a clear purpose or aim for this research?
 |  |
| 1. Is there a theory or theories presented that will be tested?
 |  |
| **Literature Review** |
| 1. Is there a section devoted to the (peer-reviewed) literature to contextualize the research?
 |  |
| 1. Does the literature provide various sides of an issue?
 |  |
| 1. Does the literature detail a gap that requires this research?
 |  |
| 1. Is the literature cited current (within 5 years of the article)?
 |  |
| 1. Are classic studies or authors in the research area referenced?
 |  |
| 1. Are there in-text citations with few or no direct quotes?
 |  |
| 1. Does the literature naturally build to the research questions?
 |  |
| 1. Are all in-text citations matched in the reference list?
 |  |
| 1. Is there a summary to help the reader understand take-aways?
 |  |
| **Methodology and Method** |
| 1. Is the research design (methodology and methods) described in detail?
 |  |
| 1. Is the research question(s) explicit and realistic?
 |  |
| 1. Is the methodology (e.g., survey, experiment, etc.) detailed and appropriate for the research question?
 |  |
| 1. Were hypotheses given?
 |  |
| **Data Collection** |
| 1. Were the data collections methods piloted?
 |  |
| 1. Were ethical issues and consent addressed?
 |  |
| 1. Is the sample size adequate for the methodology?
 |  |
| 1. Is it clear how the data was collected from the participants?
 |  |
| 1. Was the location for gathering the data described?
 |  |
| 1. If instruments were used, were they developed for this study or did they previously exist?
 |  |
| 1. Were samples of the instrument provided as examples of what was asked and collected?
 |  |
| 1. Were validity (it measures what it claims to measure) and reliability (consistent results over time) addressed?
 |  |
| 1. How were controls used, if included?
 |  |
| **Data Analysis** |
| 1. Were the steps in data analysis clearly described?
 |  |
| 1. Were variables identified and described?
 |  |
| 1. Did the data analysis process flow from the methodology?
 |  |
| 1. How was a statistical analysis conducted?
 |  |
| 1. Was the statistical treatment appropriate?
 |  |
| 1. Are there sufficient charts and tables to express how the data were analyzed?
 |  |
| **Discussion of Findings** |
| 1. Did the findings flow from the statistical analysis?
 |  |
| 1. Was the explanation of the findings easily understood?
 |  |
| 1. Do the findings answer the research questions or prove / disprove the hypotheses?
 |  |
| 1. Are the findings objective?
 |  |
| 1. Are the findings generalizable, and if so to whom?
 |  |
| 1. Are limitations stated?
 |  |
| **Implications / Next Steps** |
| 1. Are implications for practice identified?
 |  |
| 1. Are next steps for future research offered?
 |  |
| **References** |
| 1. Was there a Reference List?
 |  |
| 1. Did the items in the references match the in-text citations throughout the study?
 |  |