

Tool 2

Tool 2: QUESTIONNAIRE for the evaluation grids for qualitative research (intended for peer users)

Professor Marie Santiago Delefosse
Project Director
CerPsa, University of Lausanne
marie.santiago@unil.ch, www.unil.ch/cerpsa

Professor Lazare Benaroyo
Co-Director
Centre Ethos, University of Lausanne
<http://www.unil.ch/ethos>

Dr. Alain Kaufmann
Co-Director
Interface Sciences et Société, University of Lausanne
<http://www.unil.ch/interface>

PART I. Introduction and explanation of the research

Dear Colleague,

The Health Psychology Research Team at the University of Lausanne (www.unil.ch/cerpsa) invited health researchers using qualitative research, to participate in our research¹. The objective is to establish, by “means of consensus”, those criteria that are most useful in evaluating qualitative research, through an analysis of criteria in the context of their use.

Being a professional expert in your field, you are sometimes requested to appraise qualitative work (reviewing research papers, research projects, ethical protocols, etc.). Thus, we request your cooperation in our research as a “peer user”.

Your task is to:

- Choose one document that you have or had to review (e.g. research paper, research project, protocol to an institutional board, etc.)
- Apply each grid that you received to review this document
- Fill in this questionnaire (Parts I and II) and:
 - o For the first grid, fill in parts **IIIa and IVa** (pp. 4-8)
 - o For the second grid, fill in parts **IIIb and IVb** (pp. 9-13)

-

return this, no later than June 30th, 2013, to:

.....
.....
.....

As we value your contribution to this research, and unless you state otherwise, we would be acknowledging your participation (name and organisational affiliation), as a peer user/expert in the field, in all publications stemming from this research. This signifies our gratitude to the expert contributors of this research.

With warm greetings and thanking you, in advance, for your participation,

Professor Marie Santiago Delefosse²,
Project Director
CerPsa, University of Lausanne
marie.santiago@unil.ch, www.unil.ch/cerpsa

Professor Lazare Benaroyo, Centre Ethos de l'Université de Lausanne, <http://www.unil.ch/ethos>

Dr. Alain Kaufmann, Interface Sciences et Société, Université de Lausanne, <http://www.unil.ch/interface>

¹ This research is financed by the Swiss National Science Foundation, www.snf.ch

² Actively involved in this research are Christine Bruchez and Sarah Stephen (Research Fellows of Swiss National Science Foundation) and Amaelle Gavin (Student Assistant).

Also participating are members of the Assessment Panels, which meets regularly throughout the duration of the research and represents the various fields of health sciences: Ariane Ayer (Lex Publica, CH), Murielle Bochud (CHUV, CH), Dana Castro (Ecole de Psychologues Praticiens, FR), Alain Giami (INSERM, FR), Elisabeth Hirsch-Duret (UNIV of Applied Sciences and Arts Western Switzerland HES-SO, CH), Jean-François d'Ivernois (UNIV Paris-XIII, FR), Claire Julian-Reynier (INSERM, FR), Irene Maffi (UNIL, CH), Jean-Christophe Mino (Centre National de Ressources Soins Palliatif, FR), Stéphanie Monod-Zorzi (CHUV, CH), Diane Morin (UNIL, CH), Véronique Mottier (UNIL, CH ; UNIV Jesus College Cambridge, GB), Francesco Panese (UNIL, CH), Janet Richardson (UNIV Plymouth, GB), Lorraine Sherr (UNIV College London, GB), Irina Todorova (Health Psychology Research Center, BG ; UNIV Harvard, US).

PART II. General Information

1. Name and surname (optional):

2. Organisational affiliation (optional):

3. Agrees to be mentioned in the acknowledgements: yes no

4. Gender

- Male
- Female

5. Qualification and professional level (multiple responses possible)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> PhD | <input type="checkbox"/> Junior Researcher |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Post-Doc | <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Researcher |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Professor or Lecturer | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

6. Domain of expertise in the field of health (multiple responses possible)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medicine or Biology | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nursing Sciences | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Economics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Social Sciences | <input type="checkbox"/> Psychology or Psychiatry |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | 0 |

7. Major field of work (multiple responses possible)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> Editorial board |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Research | <input type="checkbox"/> Clinical Practice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | 0 |

8. General context of using qualitative methods (multiple responses possible)

-

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> reviewing research projects | <input type="checkbox"/> writing qualitative research (research papers and/or projects, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> reviewing research papers | <input type="checkbox"/> no direct utilisation of qualitative methods |
| <input type="checkbox"/> reviewing for ethics committees | <input type="checkbox"/> other:..... |

9. For how long have you been using qualitative methods (or how long have you been appraising/reviewing qualitative work)?

- Less than 5 years
- Between 5 and 10 years
- More than 10 years

PART IIIa. General evaluation of the first grid

10a. Number of the grid applied:

11a. Description of the “grid”

In my opinion, the applied grid is presented as:

- grid (e.g. table/box format)
- text (e.g. mainly written description)

12a. Readability of the grid

This grid is easily comprehended.

- Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

13a. Purpose of the grid

What is the explicit/implicit purpose of this grid?

.....

.....

13a.1. Is the grid widely applicable for different purposes?

- Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

13a.2. Why? (state reasons for your response to question 13a.1.)

.....

.....

14a. Type of document on which the grid was applied

- Research paper
- Research project/Protocol to an Institutional Board
-

Other:..... O

15a. Length of the document on which the grid was applied

- Less than 9 pages
- Between 10 and 19 pages
- Over 20 pages

16a. Applicability of the grid

This grid is easily applicable for evaluating the document.

- Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

17a. Perceived utility of the grid

This grid facilitates the expert’s work on assessing the document.

- Facilitates very much Facilitates Does not facilitate Impairs the work

18a. Coherence

This grid permits evaluating the coherence of the arguments presented in the assessed document.

- Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

19a. Relevance of the method

This grid permits evaluating the relevance of the methods presented in the assessed document.

- Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

20a. Time spent

How much time was spent in applying this grid on the examined document?

- Less than 30mins [
- Less than 60mins [

20a.1. Is this duration of time acceptable/suitable in the context of your work?

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

20a.2. If no, what duration of time would you consider to be acceptable/suitable?

.....
.....

21a. General comments on the first grid

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

PART IVa. Evaluation specifically on the criteria in the first grid

- The two grids being evaluated may have presented criteria as major criteria and minor criteria. Answer the following questions by including all criteria that compose this first grid.

22a. Definition of the criteria that compose the grid

The criteria seem to be self-explanatory.

- Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

23a. Relevance of the criteria that compose the grid

The proposed criteria are relevant to the context in which you assess qualitative work (whether research papers, research projects, ethical protocols, etc.).

- Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

23a.1. Why?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

24a. List criteria present in the grid that appear to be most important for your work as an expert

-
-
-
-
-

24a.1. Why?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

25a. List criteria present in the grid that do NOT seem to be relevant in the context of your work as an expert

-
-
-
-
-

25a.1. Why?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

26a. Which important criteria could be missing from the grid? (i.e which criteria should have been stated in the grid?)

- | | |
|---|---|
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |

27a. Exclusive criteria

Based on your experience so far (i.e. not restricted to those stated in this grid), which criteria are more exclusive to certain types of qualitative research? (10 maximum)

Criteria	Types of qualitative research
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

28a. “Most important” shared criteria

Based on your experience so far (i.e. not restricted to those stated in this grid), which criteria would be generally useful in the evaluation of all qualitative research in the field of health sciences? (10 maximum)

-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-

29a. Number of criteria

Based on your experience, what is the minimal number of criteria for adequately evaluating the quality of qualitative research?

- Between 1 and 4
- Between 5 and 10
- Between 11 and 15

30a. Other comments on the criteria that compose the grid

PART IIIb. General evaluation of the [second](#) grid

10b. Number of the grid applied:

11b. Description of the “grid”

In my opinion, the applied grid is presented as:

- grid (e.g. table/box format)
- text (e.g. mainly written description)

12b. Readability of the grid

This grid is easily comprehended.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

13b. Purpose of the grid

What is the explicit/implicit purpose of this grid?

.....

.....

13b.1. Is the grid widely applicable for different purposes?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

13b.2. Why? (state reasons for your response to question 13b.1.)

.....

.....

14b. Type of document on which the grid was applied

- Research paper
- Research project/Protocol to an Institutional Board
-

Other:

15b. Length of the document on which the grid was applied

- Less than 9 pages
- Between 10 and 19 pages
- Over 20 pages

16b. Applicability of the grid

This grid is easily applicable for evaluating the document.

- Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

17b. Perceived utility of the grid

This grid facilitates the expert’s work on assessing the document.

- Facilitates very much Facilitates Does not facilitate Impairs the work

18b. Coherence

This grid permits evaluating the coherence of the arguments presented in the assessed document.

- Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

19b. Relevance of the method

This grid permits evaluating the relevance of the methods presented in the assessed document.

- Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

20b. Time spent

How much time was spent in applying this grid on the examined document?

- Less than 30mins [
- Less than 60mins [

20b.1. Is this duration of time acceptable/suitable in the context of your work?

- Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

20b.2. If no, what duration of time would you consider to be acceptable/suitable?

.....
.....

21b. General comments on the second grid

.....
.....
.....
.....

.....

.....

PART IVb. Evaluation specifically on the criteria in the second grid

- The two grids being evaluated may have presented criteria as major criteria and minor criteria. Answer the following questions by including all criteria that compose this second grid.

22b. Definition of the criteria that compose the grid

The criteria seem to be self-explanatory.

- Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

23b. Relevance of the criteria that compose the grid

The proposed criteria are relevant to the context in which you assess qualitative work (whether research papers, research projects, ethical protocols, etc.).

- Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

23b.1. Why?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

24b. List criteria present in the grid that appear to be most important for your work as an expert

-
-
-
-
-

24b.1. Why?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

25b. List criteria present in the grid that do NOT seem to be relevant in the context of your work as an expert

-
-
-
-
-

25b.1. Why?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

26b. Which important criteria could be missing from the grid? (i.e which criteria should have been stated in the grid?)

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| - | - | - |
| - | - | - |
| - | - | - |
| - | - | - |
| - | - | - |

27b. Exclusive criteria

Based on your experience so far (i.e. not restricted to those stated in this grid), which criteria are more exclusive to certain types of qualitative research? (10 maximum)

Criteria	Types of qualitative research
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

28b. “Most important” shared criteria

Based on your experience so far (i.e. not restricted to those stated in this grid), which criteria would be generally useful in the evaluation of all qualitative research in the field of health sciences? (10 maximum)

-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-

29b. Number of criteria

Based on your experience, what is the minimal number of criteria for adequately evaluating the quality of qualitative research?

- Between 1 and 4
- Between 5 and 10
- Between 11 and 15

30b. Other comments on the criteria that compose the grid

Thank you for your participation and time.

Marie Santiago Delefosse,

Full Professor, Qualitative Health Psychology, University of Lausanne

www.unil.ch/cerpsa

marie.santiago@unil.ch