**Appendix 9: A 15-Point Checklist of Criteria for Good Thematic Analysis Process (Braun and Clarke, 2006)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Transcription | 1. | The data have been transcribed to an appropriate level of detail, and the transcripts have been checked against the tapes for ‘accuracy’. |
| Coding | 2. | Each data item has been given equal attention in the coding process. |
|  | 3. | Themes have not been generated from a few vivid examples (an anecdotal approach) but, instead, the coding process has been thorough, inclusive and comprehensive. |
|  | 4. | All relevant extracts for all each theme have been collated. |
|  | 5. | Themes have been checked against each other and back to the original data set. |
|  | 6. | Themes are internally coherent, consistent, and distinctive. |
| Analysis | 7. | Data have been analysed rather than just paraphrased or described. |
|  | 8. | Analysis and data match each other – the extracts illustrate the analytic claims. |
|  | 9. | Analysis tells a convincing and well-organised story about the data and topic. |
|  | 10. | A good balance between analytic narrative and illustrative extracts is provided. |
| Overall | 11. | Enough time has been allocated to complete all phases of the analysis adequately, without rushing a phase or giving it a once-over-lightly. |
| Written report | 12. | The assumptions about ThA are clearly explicated. |
|  | 13. | There is a good fit between what you claim you do, and what you show you have done – ie, described method and reported analysis are consistent. |
|  | 14. | The language and concepts used in the report are consistent with the epistemological position of the analysis. |
|  | 15. | The researcher is positioned as *active* in the research process; themes do not just ‘emerge’. |

(Braun and Clark, 2006, p37)