

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

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, 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
- Joanna Briggs Institute - **Critical Appraisal Checklist for Interpretive & Critical Research**
http://www.jbiconnect.org/agedcare/downloads/QARI_crit_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

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.
- Hannes K, Lockwood C, Pearson A (2010). A comparative analysis of three online appraisal instruments' ability to assess validity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*. 20(12):1736-43.
- 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

casp_qualitative_tool.pdf (application/pdf Object) - Mozilla

Save a Copy Search Select 66.67% Adobe Reader 7.0

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

2 of 4

start 9 Unused Desktop Shortcuts blueyonder broadband I... blueyonder Instant Supp... 20:30

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

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