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Protocol critique April 26, Protocol critique Response to research methodology by Tammi Edwards Even though the methodology section identifies some of the necessary contents through developed headings of subsections, contents of the methodology section identify many weaknesses. Definition of the research participants is comprehensive and can allow for independent identification of the research participants for implementing the study. The number of research participants and gender identity of the participants are particularly used to describe the research participants. A large portion of the section was however used for describing the proposed research design and this has two implications. Describing research design such as defining case study and its characteristics are not relevant to research participants and should not have been included in the section. A researcher should also assume that the target audience are informed of research approaches and not focus on basic features of research design. The section also dedicates just a little portion of its content to discussing research participants and this reduces relevance of the section to the protocol. The research location section also lacks precision, as most of the section’s content does not relate to the heading. Only a single sentence refers to research location and discussion in the section focused on such issues as data collection instrument, interviews, forms of questions to be asked, research purpose, and data collection procedure. In addition, the instrumentation section fails to serve its purpose in a research protocol. The section should discuss proposed research instruments for a study and justify selection of the instruments such as through stating advantages of interviews and features of interviews that makes them suitable for implementing the study (Holtz, 2008; Dunn, 2008). The pilot study section also fails to describe a pilot study. Even though the protocol discusses research design and data collection protocol, information on these is included in other sections. Key elements of a methodology are discussed and can be followed to implement the study but the discussion lack precision and organization. a pilot study is however not discussed.   
Analysis of protocol 2   
The methodology section is comprehensive and precise on each of the specific elements. Using a template, each element of the methodology section is discussed and answering questions on the template could have informed the effectiveness. The design section, for example, identifies use of ethnography and rationale for using the design. The protocol also succeeds in identifying research participants, ethical scope of the study, and demographic factors of the study’s sample. Issues of confidentiality, interview room and observation details, and need to participants’ consent prior to participation were all included under research location. Information on data collection, limitation, and validation, was also comprehensive under instrumentation, however, context of research questions are not well defined. Specification, if no research question was used is necessary but misses from the protocol. The protocol also seems to confuse between research questions and questionnaire questions. Like in the actual study, research participants, and not a researcher, participate in a case study (Bhandari and Joensson, 2011). The protocol identifies a few weaknesses such as wrong discussion on research questions and research participants in the pilot study. Its other aspects, however, meet expectations of standard protocol.   
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