

11-15 Quality Assessment - Practical

Andrew Booth, Reader in Evidence
Based Information Practice, ScHARR,
University of Sheffield

Before You Begin...

- Consider how you will use judgements of quality (cp. 50% of published Cochrane Quantitative Reviews performed quality appraisal but did not make it clear how judgements were used!)
 - To exclude or to moderate?
- Will chosen instrument militate against certain types of research?
- Quality of reporting or quality of study?

Variability in Current Practice

21 papers did not describe appraisal of candidate studies

6 explicitly mentioned not conducting formal appraisal of studies

5 papers did a critical appraisal, but did not use a formal checklist

7 described modifying existing instruments

1 used an existing instrument without modification

Dixon-Woods, Booth & Sutton (2007)

Appraising research quality

- 1. Epistemological criteria:** Judgement of 'trustworthiness' requires criteria tailored to different research 'paradigms'.
- 2. Theoretical Criteria:** Explicit theoretical framework shaping the design of the study and informing claims for generalisability
- 3. Prima facie 'Technical' criteria:** Used to assess 'quality' common to all research traditions e.g.:
 - Sufficient explanation of background;
 - Method appropriate to question;
 - Succinct statement of objectives/research questions;
 - Full description of methods include approach to analysis;
 - Clear presentation of findings including justification for interpretation of data etc.

Noyes J (2005)

Two dimensional approach to appraising qualitative research

Technical markers – CASP	Epistemological and theoretical markers – Popay et al
Technical Quality High	Description – thicker <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Privileges Subjective experience and meanings•Use of theory to build explanations
Technical Quality Low	Description - thinner <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Imposed pre-determined framework on respondents narratives.•Limited/no/inappropriate use of theory, little explanatory insight

Noyes J (2005)

Available Tools - 1

- **CASP – 10 questions to help you make sense of qualitative research**
http://www.phru.nhs.uk/casp/casp_qualitative_tool.pdf
- **Joanna Briggs Institute - Critical Appraisal Checklist for Interpretive & Critical Research**
http://www.jbiconnect.org/agedcare/downloads/QARI_cri_t_apprais.pdf
- **National Centre for Social Research. Quality in Qualitative Evaluation: A Framework for Assessing Research Evidence.** London: National Centre for Social Research/UK Cabinet Office, 2003
http://www.policyhub.gov.uk/docs/a_quality_framework.pdf

Available Tools - 2

- Dixon-Woods M, Shaw RL, Agarwal S & Smith JA (2004) The problem of appraising qualitative research. *Quality & Safety in Health Care*, 13, 223-5.
- Popay J, Rogers A & Williams G (1998) Rationale & standards for the systematic review of qualitative literature in health services research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 8, 341-51.
- Seale C & Silverman D (1997) Ensuring rigour in qualitative research. *European Journal of Public Health*, 7, 379-84.

CASP – Technical/Procedural Tool

Screening Questions

1 Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research? Yes No
Consider:

- what the goal of the research was
- why it is important
- its relevance

2 Is a qualitative methodology appropriate? Yes No
Consider:

- if the research seeks to interpret or illuminate the actions and/or subjective experiences of research participants

Is it worth continuing?

Detailed questions

Appropriate research design

3 Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research? Yes No Write comments here
Consider:

- if the researcher has justified the research design (e.g. have they discussed how they decided which methods to use?)

Sampling

4 Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research? Yes No Write comments here
Consider:

- if the researcher has explained how the

Data collection

5 Were the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue? Yes No Write comments here
Consider:

- if the setting for data collection was justified
- if it is clear how data were collected (e.g. focus group, semi-structured interview etc)
- if the researcher has justified the methods chosen
- if the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview method, is there an indication of how interviews were conducted, did they use a topic guide?)
- if methods were modified during the study. If so, has the researcher explained how and why?
- if the form of data is clear (e.g. tape recordings, video material, notes etc)
- if the researcher has discussed saturation of data

Reflexivity (research partnership relations/recognition of researcher bias)

6 Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered? Yes No Write comments here
Consider whether it is clear:

- if the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during:
 - formulation of research questions
 - data collection, including sample recruitment and choice of location
- how the researcher responded to events during the study and whether they considered the implications of any changes in the research design

Ethical Issues

7 Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? Yes No Write comments here
Consider:

- if there are sufficient details of how the research was explained to participants for the reader to assess whether ethical standards were maintained

JBI – A Theoretical Tool

QARI_crit_apprais.pdf (application/pdf Object) - Mozilla

Save a Copy Search Select 122% Search Web Y! Adobe Reader 7.0

JBI QARI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Interpretive & Critical Research

Reviewer _____ Date _____
Author _____ Year _____ Record Number _____

	Yes	No	Unclear
1. Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice-versa, addressed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1 of 1

start 10 Unused Desktop Shortcuts blueyonder broadband I... blueyonder Instant Supp... 20:27

Appraising qualitative research for inclusion in systematic reviews

- Structured approaches did not appear to yield higher agreement than unprompted judgement. Qualitative analysis revealed reviewers' dilemmas in deciding between potential impact of findings and the quality of research execution or reporting practice.
- Structured instruments appeared to make reviewers more explicit about reasons for their judgements but structured approaches may not produce greater consistency of judgements about whether to include qualitative papers in a systematic review.

(Dixon-Woods et al, 2007)

Key Issue

- What are you going to use the quality assessment for?
 - From quantitative assessment we know authors frequently say they do it – but they don't incorporate it into results
 - Is it technical proceduralism gone mad?
 - Or can we use the assessments to improve our synthesis and subsequent interpretation?

References

- Attree, P & Milton, B (2006) Critically appraising qualitative research for systematic reviews: defusing the methodological cluster bombs. *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, 2 (1): 109-126.
- Dixon-Woods, M. et al (2007) Appraising qualitative research for inclusion in systematic reviews: a quantitative and qualitative comparison of three methods *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy*, 12 (1): 42-47.
- Dixon-Woods M, Booth A, Sutton AJ. Synthesizing qualitative research: a review of published reports. *Qual Res* 2007; 7:375
- Daly J et al (2007) A hierarchy of evidence for assessing qualitative health research. *J Clin Epidemiol.* **60**(1):43-9. Epub 2006 Sep 28.

Workshop - Approaches

- Prompts (cp Intuitive Judgement)

versus

- CASP

versus

- Cabinet Office