

# Reflecting on Results



This project is made possible by a grant from the U.S. Institute of Museum and Library Services.

# Initial Quality Check

- Do the results appear **reasonable**? Are there obvious **gaps or flaws**? Anything indicating a mistake, misapplication of method, analysis error, etc?
- Do the results seem to **directly align with the research question**, user story, hypothesis, etc.? Do the **variables and categories in the results match the actual study design**? Do the results appear to reflect what was intended to be studied? Are they “enough” (**sufficiently valid and reliable**) to be adequate for making decisions or taking actions based on the results?
- Does the **research design** appear to have provided adequate and logical results? Do the reasons why particular approaches were selected still seem sound? Can you articulate why the design was used and does that explanation still match the actual deployment of the study? If a representative sample was part of the plan, did the actual study in fact deliver a representative sample?

# Treatment of Results

- Are the results presented as an integral part of a solution to a problem?  
Are they **sufficient** to be an integral part of a solution?
- Do the **techniques** used to analyze and present the data seem appropriate and effective?
- Are any **visualizations** of results accurate and appropriate?
- Do any **inferences** seem sound?
- Have inaccurate or irrelevant results been excluded with explanation?

# A First Pass at Making Meaning

- Stories present in the data
- Stories missing from the data
- Initial interpretations
- Data limitations
- Possible misinterpretations



# Considering Conclusions

- Do the initial conclusions serve to **answer the questions** or issues that are the focus of the study?
- Are the **conclusions clearly connected to the results**? Are the connections plain to readers of the results?
- Has thorough checking confirmed that **opinions that are unsupported by the results have not been included** (through bias or inadvertently)?
- Are all **limitations** clearly described?
- Are all **recommendations clearly linked to results**? If room for interpretation remains, is it explicitly articulated?
- Are the conclusions generalizable to a larger population? If not, is that explicitly stated?

# Common Mistakes

- **Broad, sweeping statements** without sufficient evidence
- Vague statements, lack of precision
- Weak organization or arrangement
- Less than full description of the research method and choices made
- **Gaps** between the results, the research question, and the original problem or need
- Adding new interpretations or conclusions at the end of the process that are not warranted by the design or data
- Writing conclusions to match what was intended to be studied or findings that were hoped to be identified rather than what was actually done and/or found

# Reflecting on Results

Was this content useful?

Please provide your feedback at: <https://forms.gle/YmaNaBeB9F2UJEEr8>