Evaluation Criteria for Qualitative Research (Anderson, 2017)

Issue	Relevant References
Six criteria expected in rigorous qualitative research:	
1. Evidence of a coherent audit trail that justifies research design and methods choices by reference to the research context and the research questions.	Tracy (**2010**)
2. Sampling strategy, sample size, and data or theoretical saturation. a. Mechanisms of sample selection b. Data access procedures c. Sample size, evidence of saturation: i. Requisite variety ii. Range of evidence in data presentation iii. Resonance with existing literature base(s) iv. Evidence of negative case analysis	Barusch, Gringeri, & George (**2011**) Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill (**2016**) Nelson (**2016**) Tracy (**2010**)
3. Member-checking procedures to verify the fair representation and confirmability of data gathered and consideration of expert feedback in relation to interpretation of data.	Choi & Roulston (2015) Dellinger & Leech (**2007**)
4. Researcher reflexivity, i.e., a discussion of the researcher's context, positionality, or standpoint, and the possible effect of this on the research process and outcomes.	Wang & Roulston (**2007**)
5. Discussion of ethical choices and obligations in relation to the research context and, where appropriate, in relation to 'exit' from field work.	Tosey, Lawley, & Meese (**2014**)
6. Discussion of transferability.	Walby & Luscombe (**2016**)
Issues that may be relevant (depending upon context):	
7. Prolonged engagement and/or strategies for 'persistent observation'.	Nimon & Astakhova (**2015**)
8. Clear conceptual framework to demonstrate paradigmatic/theoretical positioning of the study.	Rocco (2010)

Issue	Relevant References
9. Triangulation, e.g., bringing together different data sources to achieve comparison and mutual confirmation.	Muir (**2014**)
10. Peer debriefing as a feature of the critical evaluation of the analysis process and outcomes.	Cho et al. (2016)

A Checklist for Quantitative Research Reports (Nimon, 2017)

Section of Manuscript Issue	Relevant References
Introduction	
1. Hypotheses consistent with analyses.	Statistical textbooks (e.g., Kline, 2016)
Method	
2. Sample description.	APA (2009)
3. Statistical assumptions.	Osborne (2013) Zientek, Nimon, & Brown (2016)
4. Procedural remedies for common method bias.	Podsakoff et al. (2003)
Results	
5. Descriptive statistics.	APA (2006)
6. Construct validity.	Graham et al. (2003) Henson & Roberts (2006) Schreiber et al. (2006)
7. Statistical assessment of common method variance and bias.	Richardson et al. (2009) Simmering et al. (2015) Williams et al. (2010)
8. Test statistics, *df*s, *p* values, effect sizes, and indications of uncertainty (e.g., *SE*s or CIs) as well as sufficient statistics to verify *df*s and *p* values and to support replication studies.	APA (2006) Callahan & Reio (2006) Epskamp & Nuijten (2015) Henson (2006)

Section of Manuscript Issue	Relevant References
9. Tests of regression models.	Nimon & Oswald (2013)
10. Tests of canonical models.	Nimon et al. (2011)
11. Tests of SEM models.	Cortina et al. (2017) Kline (2016) Schreiber et al. (2006)
12. Tests of indirect effects.	Wen & Fan (2015) Zhao et al. (2010)
13. Nested models.	van Mierlo et al. (2009) West et al. (2007)
14. Tests of measurement invariance.	Vandenberg & Lance (2000)
15. Instrument development.	Hinkin (1998) Worthington & Whittaker (2006)
Final Checks	
16. Reliability not attributed to instruments.	Thompson & Vacha-Haase (2000)
17. No claims of causality without appropriate design.	Gubbins & Rousseau (2015)
18. Errors in writing.	Onwuegbuzie et al. (2010).
Note. The checklist is an initial version. The most current version can be found at profnimon.com/HRDQxList.pdf.	

Guidelines for Publishing Rigorous Mixed Methods Research (Reio & Werner, 2017)

1. Both quantitative and qualitative components need to be well-developed; one should not be highlighted at the expense of the other.

2. There should be distinct quantitative and qualitative strands, where each has its own separate research questions/hypotheses, data, and analysis to answer the research questions, and make inferences.

3. The sample/data size for each component should be sufficiently sized to support meaningful analysis.

4. The sample/data should be collected via scholarly supported, rigorous methods.

5. The data should be analyzed with leading-edge analytic procedures. Justification for these procedures should be included, not forsaking the need for parsimony and clarity.

6. Validation procedures must be reported, such as how threats to external and internal validity (quantitative) or triangulation and member checks (qualitative) were handled.

7. Meaningful inferences should be made from each strand, i.e.,

   A. The two strands of inferences should be integrated, compared and contrasted with prior research, and interpreted to get a sense of the empirical contributions of the study.

   B. The theoretical implications of the inferences need to be highlighted. Clarify how the research has enriched what is already known about the theories undergirding the study.

   C. Discuss how the study contributes to the field of mixed method research.

   D. Practical implications should be presented. Ideas for practice need to be carefully and tentatively put forth, especially if they were not the results of quasi-experimental or experimental research.

Adapted from "Developing Publishable Mixed Methods Manuscripts," by J. Creswell and A. Tashakkori, 2007, Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1, pp. 107-111. Copyright 2007 by SAGE Publishers.