

Education Research (Qualitative)

Abstract Review Rubric

| | 0 - Unacceptable | 1 - Good | 2 – Very good |
|--|---|--|--|
| CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES OR QUESTION | No identifiable objectives or research question. | Objectives and research question could be improved. | Adequate study objectives and research question. |
| APPROPRIATE USE OF QUALITATIVE METHODS AND THEORY (e.g. constructivist grounded theory, phenomenology) | Methods and theory not properly employed/understood, mismatched or inappropriate for the research question, or no discussion of methods and theory. | Methods or theoretical approach are suitable but have limited applicability to the research question. Or, analysis described (e.g. ‘coding,’ thematic analysis) but no overall methods and theoretical approach. | Methods and theoretical approach are well aligned. Other methods may have been slightly more appropriate for the request question. |
| POPULATION AND SAMPLING Was the technique used to recruit the study participants appropriate? (The sampling strategy and technique rather than sample size). Did they study the correct population?? | Haphazard or unclear rationale for sampling the population, or sampled population inappropriate to understand the research question. | Reasonable selection of study participants, but some relevant groups were excluded. | Thoughtful selection of participants, but for practical or logistical reasons could not recruit the best population. |
| DATA COLLECTION Were the correct data collection techniques selected and applied? | Data collection is inappropriate and likely led to an unacceptably biased or incomplete dataset. | Data collection is sufficiently matched to the type of question or sampling, though other methods may have been better suited. (e.g. focus groups were used when individual interviews would have been better). | Data collection is reasonable, but limited by 1-2 key elements (e.g. budget restrictions, logistics of the study design.). |
| ANALYTIC APPROACH Adherence to accepted techniques of the qualitative method employed (e.g. grounded theory employs source triangulation, narrative analysis employing member checking) | Inappropriate techniques or no mention of technique that was used to ensure rigour. | Uses one technique to ensure rigour in the analysis. | Utilizes more than two techniques for ensuring the rigour in the analysis. |

| | 0 - Unacceptable | 1 - Good | 2 – Very good |
|--|--|--|--|
| IMPORTANCE OF THE TOPIC Prioritize topics of major importance to medical/health education at USask | This topic is only of interest to a small group of medical/health educators and is unlikely to result in important knowledge. | This is an important topic, will be of interest to many medical/health educators, including those who do not study this topic. | This is an important topic, will be of interest to most medical/health educators, including those who do not study this topic. |
| CLARITY OF WRITING OR WRITING OF PRESENTATION | Poorly written throughout (e.g. poor syntax, grammar, phrasing), incoherent, and/or inconsistent with the FD RISE submission guidelines. | Adequately written, could be improved in some areas (e.g. incomplete ideas, 1-2 grammatical errors, vague in some areas). Adheres mostly to the FD RISE submission guidelines. | Coherent and well-written, only minor errors. Adheres to the FD RISE submission guidelines. |

Adapted from CAEP 2022 Education Research (Qualitative) Abstract Review Criteria.