

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 Practice - 1

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)

Variability in Current Practice - 1

23 papers did not describe critical appraisal

5 papers explicitly pleaded against quality assessment of papers or provided valid reason for not conducting quality appraisal.

Criteria used varied between detailed descriptions of relevant items in existing or modified checklists to a set of broad criteria evaluating, for example, rich description of data, credibility or relevance of the original study.

Hannes and Macaitis (2012)

Variability in Current Practice - 2

One team used overall judgement (Smith et al., 2005).

Five opted for self-developed assessment instrument

Three used previously developed checklists to create own.

Two mentioned critical appraisal, but did not specify tool.

Most used existing instruments/frameworks. 24 different assessment tools identified:

Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP)	(<i>n</i> = 18)
--	------------------

Mays and Pope criteria	(<i>n</i> = 6)
------------------------	-----------------

Popay criteria	(<i>n</i> = 6)
----------------	-----------------

Joanna Briggs Institute	(<i>n</i> = 4).
-------------------------	------------------

Hannes and Macaitis (2012)

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.

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.casp-uk.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/CASP_Qualitative_Appraisal_Checklist_14oct10.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.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/a_quality_framework_tcm6-38740.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_Appraisal_Checklist_14oct10.pdf - Adobe Reader

File Edit View Window Help

Tools Sign Comment

CRITICAL APPRAISAL SKILLS PROGRAMME

Making sense of evidence about clinical effectiveness



10 questions to help you make sense of qualitative research

These questions consider the following:

- Are the results of the review valid?*
- What are the results?*
- Will the results help locally?*

A number of italicised prompts are given after each question. These are designed to remind you why the question is important. There will not be time in the small groups to answer them all in detail!

©CASP This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Screening Questions

1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?	
<i>Consider:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>What the goal of the research was</i><i>Why is it important</i><i>Its relevance</i>	
2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?	
<i>Consider:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>If the research seeks to interpret or illuminate the actions and/or subjective experiences of research participants</i>	

Detailed questions

3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	
<i>Consider:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>If the researcher has justified the research design (e.g. have they discussed how they decided which method to use)?</i>	
4. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?	
<i>Consider:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>If the researcher has explained how the participants were selected</i><i>If they explained why the participants they selected were the most appropriate to provide access to the type of knowledge sought by the study</i><i>If there are any discussions around recruitment (e.g. why some people chose not to take part)</i>	

8.27 x 11.69 in

JBI – Theoretical Tool

QARI_crit_apprais.pdf (application/pdf Object) - Mozilla

Save a Copy Search Select 122% Search Web 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

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

	Quality assessment of reporting instrument	CASP Checklist
Article 1 (Carnes et al, 2008) [BMJ Qualitative Study]	Group A	Group B
Article 2 (Milder et al, 2011) [Age & Ageing Qualitative Study]	Group C	Group D

NB. All Participants also receive Handout 3 – Dixon-Woods “Prompts” and Extract from Cabinet Office Framework