

# **We11-15 Quality Assessment** (Introduction and Practical)

Andrew Booth, Reader in Evidence  
Based Information Practice, Co-  
Convenor – Cochrane Collaboration  
Qualitative Methods Group

# 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

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

**Noyes J (2005)**

# Available Tools - 1

- CASP – 10 questions to help you make sense of qualitative research  
[http://www.phru.nhs.uk/Doc\\_Links/Qualitative%20Appraisal%20Tool.pdf](http://www.phru.nhs.uk/Doc_Links/Qualitative%20Appraisal%20Tool.pdf)
- Joanna Briggs Institute - **Critical Appraisal Checklist for Interpretive & Critical Research**  
[http://www.jbiconnect.org/agedcare/downloads/QARI\\_cri\\_t\\_apprais.pdf](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.civilservice.gov.uk/Assets/a\\_quality\\_framework\\_tcm6-7314.pdf](http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/Assets/a_quality_framework_tcm6-7314.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? 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? 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? 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? 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? 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% 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

# Key Issue

- How are you going to use the quality assessment?
  - 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?

# Workshop - Approaches

- Prompts (cp Intuitive Judgement)

*versus*

- CASP

*versus*

- Cabinet Office