

Therapeutic alliances in stroke rehabilitation: a meta-ethnography

LAWTON, Michelle, HADDOCK, Gail <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8116-7950>>, CONROY, Paul and SAGE, Karen <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7365-5177>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/11876/>

This document is the Accepted Version [AM]

Citation:

LAWTON, Michelle, HADDOCK, Gail, CONROY, Paul and SAGE, Karen (2016). Therapeutic alliances in stroke rehabilitation: a meta-ethnography. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 97 (11), 1979-1993. [Article]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Table 2: CASP analysis

	Gibbon 2004 ⁵⁹	Jones et al., 1997 ⁵⁵	Lawler et al., 1999 ⁴⁹	Leach et al., 2010 ⁵⁰	Levack et al., 2011 ⁵¹	Lewinter & Mikkelsen, 1995 ⁶⁰	Lloyd et al., 2013 ⁵²	Mangset et al., 2008 ⁶¹	Parry et al., 2004 ⁵³	Pound et al., 1995 ⁶²	Rohde et al., 2012 ⁵⁴	Simmons-Mackie & Schultz 2003 ⁶⁴	Slingsby et al., 2006 ⁵⁶	Sundin et al., 2001 ⁵⁷	Talvitie & Reunanen, 2002 ⁵⁸	Worrall et al., 2010 ⁴⁸	Wottrich et al., 2004 ⁶³
Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?	-	-	++	++	++	+	++	+	++	++	++	+	-	+	++	++	+
Is the qualitative methodology appropriate?	+	-	++	++	++	+	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	+	++	++	++
Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	-	-	+	++	++	-	+	+	+	++	+	++	+	+	++	++	+
Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?	++	-	++	+	++	-	++	+	-	++	-	-	+	+	-	+	-

Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?	-	-	+	++	++	-	+	+	+	+	+	++	+	+	++	+	+
Has the relationship between the researcher and participant been adequately considered?	-	-	-	+	-	-	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	-	-	-	++	++	-	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	-	-	+	++	++	-	++	+	+	-	+	++	++	++	+	++	+
Is there a clear statement of findings	+	-	++	++	++	+	++	+	-	+	+	++	++	+	+	++	++
How valuable is the research?	+	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	++	+	+	+	++	++	++	+
limited or no justification for a given issue (-), the issue was addressed but lacked elaboration (+), the issue was extensively justified or explained (++)																	