# Title of project / assignment question

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **Year** | **Country of Origin / Fieldwork** | **Research Purpose / Design / Setting**  What are the aims of the study? | **Sample**  What and/or who is being studied? | **Methods**  How was it studied? What was done? | **Findings**  What was found?  What are the main conclusions or contributions? | **Notes**  Add your analysis of the credibility and relevance or implications of the source for your question or enquiry and themes | | | |
| **Strengths** | **Limitations** | **Relevance**  to my project, context, and/or discipline | **Themes** |
|  |  |  |  |  | The strengths and limitations are where you overlay your critique to identify the validity and reliability factors.  What is good about this research or paper and what could be developed to strengthen the argument, evidence, or claim? |  |  |  |  | This column is where you start to identify patterns and recurring themes (e.g. similarities across the data / literature).  These themes become your main points of discussion (or sub-titles in a literature review) in your work. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | If you just write up this extraction side (the ‘normal’ data extraction table), then you will probably get feedback that your review is “too descriptive”.  In other words, you are simply telling your reader what the papers ‘said’ rather than using them to substantiate your points and build your argument |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |