


i-HOP's Quality Assessment Tool for research and evidence around Children of Offenders

In Partnership with



Part 1: Identification of research item type (and QAT Key)



Part 2: Methodological Quality of Primary Research Studies

2a. Questions that apply to ALL primary research studies						
		Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
Appropriateness	[1] The design and method employed are appropriate to addressing the aims of the study					
	[2] The data collection and analysis are sufficient to address the aims of the study					
	[3] The timeframe of the study is appropriate so that one could reasonably expect to observe the intended outcomes (<i>HINT: this is applicable to all study designs but has special relevance to longitudinal studies</i>)					
Coherence	[4] The original aims of the study have been explicitly addressed					
	[5] Adequate reference is made to previous literature and this is suitably connected to the aims and/or design of the current study (<i>HINT: it is used to inform the current study</i>)					
	[6] The findings of the study are interpreted in relation to previous literature, including theory and/or empirical findings					
	[7] The findings and conclusions of the study are supported by the data (<i>HINT: the findings and conclusions are believable</i>)					
Clarity of reporting	[8] The aims and objectives of the study are clearly defined and articulated					
	[9] The article has a clear structure that helpfully guides the reader through the various steps of the study					
	[10] The article is written in a style that is accessible to most audiences (<i>HINT: specialist terminology and principles have been clearly defined and/or explained</i>)					
	[11] Ideas are explained clearly and in sufficient detail to enable the reader to understand the meaning associated with the study (<i>HINT: might include the background/context to the study and/or the interpretation of the findings</i>)					
	[12] The methods of data collection are described in sufficient detail to enable replication of the study					
Transparency	[13] The author(s) have openly declared any organisational affiliations, interests or sources of bias					
	[14] Sources of support and/or funding have been declared					
	[15] Limitations of the study have been appropriately acknowledged					
	[16] The author(s) openly discuss findings that are inconsistent with their original theoretical position or predictions					
	[17] The authors openly acknowledge findings that do not follow the general pattern of results, or are not entirely consistent with the main conclusions of the study					

		Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
Ethics	[18] Key ethical principles have been adhered to					
	[19] There is evidence of approval by an independent ethical panel					
Diversity	[20] The methods employed enable as many children as possible to participate in the study to an equal degree (<i>HINT: they are sensitive to differing capacities and cultural sensitivities</i>)					
	[21] The findings are interpreted in light of differing social and cultural contexts					
Sampling	[22] The sample size was appropriate to the design and method employed in the study, and was large enough to inspire confidence in the findings					
	[23] The recruitment methods produced a sample that was representative of a <u>defined</u> target population					
	[24] Inclusion and exclusion criteria were suitably defended					
		SCORE:				

Part 2 (b-f): Reliability & Validity of Primary Research Studies

2b. Additional questions that apply to experimental designs						
		Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
[25]	The sample includes enough participants in each subgroup to identify key differences					
[26]	The procedure for randomly allocating participants to conditions was suitably defended					
[27]	At the start of the experiment, the groups were sufficiently similar on key factors that could affect the outcome					
[28]	Aside from the experimental intervention, the groups were treated equally					
[29]	Unintended differences between the groups were controlled for in the analysis and/or taken into consideration when interpreting the findings					
[30]	Core aspects of the experiment (e.g. the aims and allocation to conditions) were adequately concealed from the participants and/or researchers so that this knowledge did not interfere with the outcomes of the study					
[31]	The drop-out rate was acceptably low and was not noticeably different between groups					
[32]	The author(s) explain how missing data was handled					
[33]	The choice of statistical tests was suitably justified					
[34]	The analysis was well-developed and rigorous					
		SCORE:				

2c. Additional questions that apply to quasi-experimental designs

	Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
[35] The similarity of procedures for recruiting participants into each subgroup was suitably defended					
[36] The sample includes enough participants in each subgroup to identify key differences					
[37] Aside from the experimental intervention, the groups were treated equally					
[38] Core aspects of the experiment (e.g. the aims and allocation to conditions) were adequately concealed from the participants and/or researchers so that this knowledge did not interfere with the outcomes of the study					
[39] The drop-out rate was acceptably low and was not noticeably different between groups					
[40] The author(s) explain how missing data was handled					
[41] The choice of statistical tests was suitably justified					
[42] The analysis was well-developed and rigorous					
SCORE:					

2d. Additional questions that apply to observational qualitative studies

	Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
[43] A systematic approach was taken to the collection, recording and transcription of data (as applicable)					
[44] Reference is made to a recognised analytic technique, and there is a clear description of how this has been applied to the current study (<i>HINT: it is clear how themes, concepts or categories have been derived from the data</i>)					
[45] Adequate evidence is provided to support the analysis (e.g. quotes, case studies, extracts from raw data)					
[46] The detail, depth and complexity (i.e. richness) of the data has been conveyed					
[47] Findings are discussed in sufficient depth and detail to provide meaningful insights into the topics under consideration					
[48] The author(s) openly discuss findings that contradict their original theoretical position or predictions					
[49] The diversity of any theoretical perspective(s) and content has been explored (<i>HINT: an account is given of the different theoretical perspectives framing the study phenomena</i>)					
[50] Any theory which has been developed during the study provides a comprehensive picture of the phenomenon under study					
SCORE:					

2e. Additional questions that apply to observational quantitative studies

	Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
[51] Data collection tools were shown to be valid					
[52] The variables that were measured appear to be a good representation of the main concepts in the study					
[53] The author(s) provided a discussion of how fieldwork methods or settings may have influenced the data collected					
[54] Data collection tools were shown to be reliable					
[55] There was some attempt to objectively assess the variables being measured (<i>HINT: this might include complementing self-report data with other sources of information</i>)					
[56] The authors' explain how missing data was handled					
[57] The choice of statistical tests was suitably justified					
[58] The analysis was well-developed and rigorous					
SCORE:					

2f. Additional questions that apply to observational mixed methods studies

	Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
[59] The qualitative and quantitative methods are sufficiently developed to support an integrated approach to the analysis					
[60] The qualitative and quantitative findings are used in a complementary fashion to support the development of conclusions					
[61] Inconsistencies in quantitative and qualitative findings are openly acknowledged and discussed					
SCORE:					

Part 3: Methodological Quality of Secondary Review Studies

3a. Questions that apply to ALL secondary review studies						
		Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
Coherence	[62] The original aims of the review have been explicitly addressed					
	[63] The conclusions of the review are supported by the literature/data (<i>HINT: the conclusions are believable</i>)					
Clarity of reporting	[64] The item has a clear structure that helpfully guides the reader through the various steps of the review					
	[65] The item is written in a style that is accessible to most audiences (<i>HINT: specialist terminology and principles have been clearly defined and/or explained</i>)					
	[66] The aims and objectives of the review are clearly defined and articulated					
	[67] Ideas are explained clearly and in sufficient detail to enable the reader to understand the meaning associated with the review (<i>HINT: might include the background/context to the review and/or the interpretation of the findings</i>)					
Transparency	[68] The authors(s) have openly declared any affiliations, interests or sources of bias					
	[69] Sources of support and/or funding have been declared					
	[70] Limitations of the review have been appropriately acknowledged					
	[71] The author(s) openly discuss literature/data that is inconsistent with their original theoretical position or predictions					
	[72] The authors openly acknowledge literature/data that does not follow the general pattern of observations, or are not entirely consistent with the main conclusions of the review					
		SCORE:				

Part 3 (b-e): Reliability and Validity of Secondary Review Studies

3b. Additional questions that apply to secondary data analysis studies					
	Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
[73] The dataset(s) being analysed are shown to be valid and reliable					
[74] There is evidence that the author(s) have further critically appraised the dataset(s) (<i>HINT: they scrutinised the datasets for limitations or missing information</i>)					
[75] There is evidence of triangulation in the study (<i>HINT: the data is verified by comparing it to inputs from different sources</i>)					
[76] The author(s) make clear when they make any assumptions, judgements or 'educated guesses' in their analysis (<i>Hint: conjectures and speculation are highlighted as such</i>)					
[77] The author(s) contextualise their data by comparing it to other sources (<i>HINT: for example, national or international population statistics</i>)					
SCORE:					

3c. Additional questions that apply to meta-analysis/synthesis					
	Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
[78] The heterogeneity of the studies was carefully considered and described (<i>HINT: the authors assessed the uniformity of the original studies including their aims, methods and findings</i>)					
[79] In cases where the original studies were found to be heterogeneous ('dissimilar'), the author(s) explored the causes of this and potential impacts that this might have on the results of the meta-analysis/synthesis					
[80] The author(s) suitably defended the combination of the results of the studies in this meta-analysis/synthesis					
SCORE:					

3d. Additional questions that apply to systematic reviews and rapid evidence assessments					
	Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
[81] A highly comprehensive and systematic search strategy was adopted (<i>HINT: additional steps were taken to retrieve unpublished work, manually check reference lists, and retrieve non-English publications</i>)					
[82] Inclusion and exclusion criteria were pre-specified and clearly defined					
[83] Satisfactory steps were taken to critically appraise the studies included in the review					
[84] There was an appropriate level of consistency to the review process (<i>HINT: a standardised tool was utilised to review items for inclusion and quality</i>)					
[85] There was an appropriate degree of independence to the review process (<i>HINT: two reviewers assessed items for relevance and quality, for example</i>)					
[86] The likelihood of a publication bias was given sufficient consideration					
[87] The likelihood of a reporting bias was given sufficient consideration					
SCORE:					

3e. Additional questions that apply to non-systematic reviews					
	Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
[88] A clear description of the strategies used to identify and select relevant publications is provided					
[89] There is evidence that the author(s) have been inclusive in the items included in the review (<i>HINT: they have included literature that is not entirely consistent with their main theoretical position or argument</i>)					
[90] There is some degree of critical appraisal of the items included in the review					
SCORE:					

Part 4: Methodological quality of Theoretical/Conceptual Items

4a. Questions that apply to theoretical/conceptual items						
		Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
Clarity of Reporting	[91] The item has a clear structure that helpfully guides the reader through the various steps of the review					
	[92] Ideas are explained clearly and in sufficient detail to enable the reader to understand the meaning associated with the subject of the article (<i>HINT: might include the background/context to the article</i>)					
Transparency	[93] The authors(s) have openly declared any affiliations, interests or sources of bias					
	[94] Sources of support and/or funding have been declared					
SCORE:						

4.b. Reliability and validity of theoretical/conceptual items						
		Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
	[95] The author(s) possess sufficient credentials and/or experience to provide a commentary on the topic					
	[96] The item is published in a credible source, or is published by a recognised body/organisation					
	[97] The statements presented appear credible (<i>HINT: they draw upon published theory and/or empirical evidence</i>)					
	[98] The statements presented seem plausible (<i>HINT: they broadly consistent with the wider knowledge-based in the area</i>)					
	[99] The author(s) openly acknowledge evidence or arguments for and against their statements					
	[100] The author(s) identify limitations to their statements					
SCORE:						

Part 5: Child-Centredness

	Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
[101] The study (or article) is directly based on data collected from children and young people (<i>HINT: the study does not solely rely on proxies such as parents, carers or professionals</i>)					
[102] Where data is collected from groups other than children (e.g. parents, carers or professionals), the experiences and support needs of children are actively considered					
[103] In the case of primary research, children and young people were allowed to express themselves in an age-appropriate way					
[104] The study (or article) clearly reflects children's voices (<i>HINT: the item used quotes or drawings produced by children</i>)					
[105] Efforts are made to empower children (<i>HINT: this might include enabling children to contribute to the design of research methods, presentation of findings, dissemination of results, or formulation of policy recommendations; or ensuring that children were informed about the outcomes of the study/article</i>)					
[106] The study (or article) carries tangible benefits for children and is not solely or largely concerned with furthering ideological or academic interests					
[107] The study (or article) directly considers the rights and needs of children independently of other groups (e.g. parents/carers)					
[108] The study (or article) recognises the uniqueness in children's experiences and support needs					
[109] The study (or article) directly considers the impact of the findings, conclusions or recommendations (as applicable) on children					
SCORE:					

Part 6: Relevance to Policy & Strategy concerning Children of Offenders

	Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
[110] The item provides information or knowledge that could usefully inform work at the policy or strategy level					
[111] The item makes direct recommendations for policy and/or strategy-level work					
[112] Where direct recommendations are made, the target audience(s) for these is clearly defined					
[113] Consideration has been given to the practical feasibility of recommendations for policy and strategy-level work (<i>HINT: bearing in mind financial and resource implications</i>)					
[114] Implications or recommendations are justifiable in the context of the methodological design, findings observations or commentary (as applicable) (<i>HINT: they are believable</i>)					
[115] Consideration has been given to adapting policy or strategy implications or recommendations to the local/national/regional context (as applicable)					
SCORE:					

Part 7: Relevance to Practice with Children of Offenders

	Low	Medium	High	Cannot say	N/A
[116] The item provides information or knowledge that could usefully inform practice					
[117] The item makes direct recommendations for practice					
[118] Where direct recommendations are made, the target audience(s) for these is clearly defined					
[119] Consideration has been given to the practical feasibility of recommendations (<i>HINT: bearing in mind financial and resource implications</i>)					
[120] Implications or recommendations are justifiable in the context of the methodological design, findings observations or commentary (as applicable) (<i>HINT: they are believable</i>)					
[121] Consideration has been given to adapting implications or recommendations for practice to the local/national/regional context (as applicable)					
SCORE:					

Part 8: Scoring and QAT Icons

Low = 0; Medium = 1; High = 2; Cannot say = 0; N/A = 0

*For methodological quality, items must score 50% or above on both parts to receive an icon (or 75% on both parts for icon+).

		Min score for icon (50%)	Min score for icon+ (75%)	Actual score?	Award icon? [tick]
Methodological quality	Primary – Experimental Design				
	Part 2a	24	36		<input type="checkbox"/> icon <input type="checkbox"/> icon+
	Part 2b	10	15		
	Primary – Quasi-experimental design				
	Part 2a	24	36		<input type="checkbox"/> icon <input type="checkbox"/> icon+
	Part 2c	8	12		
	Primary – Observational (qualitative)				
	Part 2a	24	36		<input type="checkbox"/> icon <input type="checkbox"/> icon+
	Part 2d	8	12		
	Primary – Observational (quantitative)				
	Part 2a	24	36		<input type="checkbox"/> icon <input type="checkbox"/> icon+
	Part 2e	8	12		
	Primary – Observational (mixed-methods)				
	Part 2a	24	36		<input type="checkbox"/> icon <input type="checkbox"/> icon+
	Part 2d, 2e, 2f combined	19	27		
	Secondary – Secondary data analysis				
	Part 3a	11	17		<input type="checkbox"/> icon <input type="checkbox"/> icon+
	Part 3b	5	8		
	Secondary – Meta-analysis				
	Part 3a	11	17		<input type="checkbox"/> icon <input type="checkbox"/> icon+
Part 3c	3	4			
Secondary – Systematic review & REA					
Part 3a	11	17		<input type="checkbox"/> icon <input type="checkbox"/> icon+	
Part 3d	7	11			
Secondary – Non-systematic review					
Part 3a	11	17		<input type="checkbox"/> icon <input type="checkbox"/> icon+	
Part 3e	3	4			
Theoretical/conceptual – Expert opinion(s)					
Part 4a	4	6		<input type="checkbox"/> icon <input type="checkbox"/> icon+	
Part 4b	6	8			
Child-centredness	9	14		<input type="checkbox"/> icon <input type="checkbox"/> icon+	
Policy and strategy relevance	6	9		<input type="checkbox"/> icon <input type="checkbox"/> icon+	
Practice relevance	6	9		<input type="checkbox"/> icon <input type="checkbox"/> icon+	

*For methodological quality, items must score 50% or above on both parts to receive an icon (or 75% on both parts for icon+).

Notes:



Barnardo's Registered Charity
Nos. 216250 and SC037605

In Partnership with



POPS Registered
Charity No. 1048152

Funded by

