

## The Six Quality on Qual Prompts: questions and considerations

	The expectation	Questions and considerations
1	<b>Aims and questions:</b> Are there clearly identified aims and evaluation questions. Have they shown awareness of other relevant studies?	Inclusion of clear evaluation goals. Discussion of why study is thought to be important and relevant. Reference to its contribution to wider knowledge and research.
2	<b>Methodology &amp; design:</b> Have you included a transparent approach to your methods, including justifying why a qualitative design is relevant to answer your questions?	Description of methods, methodology and design, and how they match the evaluation question and research strategy. Justification of the use of a qualitative approach. Inclusion of what form of data used (e.g. transcripts for interviews, focus groups). Discussion of limitations of research design.
3	<b>Sample &amp; recruitment:</b> Have you provided a clear plan for how participants will be selected and recruited? Is there an explanation for why some people have been chosen?	Defence of the choice of sample design and target sources of evidence? Explanation of how the participants were or will be selected. Discussion around recruitment, including why some people chose not to take part.
4	<b>Ethics &amp; relationship with evaluator:</b> Have you set out how you will manage confidentiality and informed consent? Has the evaluator considered their own relationship with the participants and personal biases?	Consideration given to ethical issues including sensitivity about contexts and potential harm to participants. Participants provide informed consent which is (or will be) documented? How to deal with participant distress, wellbeing, concerns regarding safeguarding etc. Discussion of anonymity, confidentiality of data and procedures for protecting it, Examine the evaluators' own role, potential bias and influence throughout the study.
5	<b>Analysis &amp; reporting:</b> Is there an in-depth and nuanced description of the analysis process?	Discussion of how/why particular significance is given to specific aspects of the evidence. Communication of the nuance, depth of the complexity and richness of the data? Analysis of different alternative, contradictory or diverse views. Analysis of the relationship and potential bias of researcher. Mention of any analytical concepts or links to other concepts and theories?
6	<b>Findings &amp; conclusions:</b> Are the claims credible, not 'over-claiming' but offering plausible arguments that can be traced to the methods and evidence generated? The reader can see how the researcher arrived at his/her conclusions.	Presentation of findings clear and explicit, and related to the research aims and questions. Discussion of the evidence both for and against the evaluators' arguments and findings/conclusions. Plausible arguments that are not 'over-claiming' but show link between data, interpretation and conclusions – so the reader can see the route to any conclusions be seen. Findings linked with other knowledge and experience, from other data sources, wider research literature, or from peer review. Discussion of the credibility of findings, such as corroborated with other research, input from stakeholders, or use of more than one evaluator.

## Annex 4

# Common Pitfalls in Qualitative Research

The US Robert Wood Foundation has provided a helpful table of common mistakes for their [Qualitative Research Guidelines Project website](#). They looked at rejected manuscripts submitted to a health research journal and examined reviewers comments listed some of the errors made – and links to resources to help avoid those pitfalls. Some of the mistakes are more related to qualitative social science research (such as the mistake of being 'too jargony') – but is applicable to evaluators. The table is reproduced below. The review of literature and some analysis is produced in a subsequent academic journal by one of the lead researchers (Cohen & Crabtree, 2008).

**Table 5: Common pitfalls in qual research**

Common pitfalls	Examples from reviewers' comments	Link to topic on Robert Wood Foundation website 'qualres'
Lacks focus	Unclear focus	Guidelines for Conducting, Analyzing and Reporting Qualitative Data
Too jargony	Use of unfamiliar terminology without providing adequate definition	Guidelines for Conducting, Analyzing and Reporting Qualitative Data
Sample insufficient	Lack of iterative sampling process/saturation Inadequate description of the sample	Sampling Issues Iterative Sampling Common Research Methods
Analysis lacks depth	Superficial Analysis Data don't support the results Analytical Categories are unclear Coding decisions are not clear	Common Analytic Approaches See also Miles and Huberman Qualitative Data Analysis
Methods lack adequate description	Each step of the sampling, data collection, and analysis is not described in sufficient detail	Evaluative Criteria Audit Trail Malterud's article in The Lancet is very useful
Data Quality Concerns	Imposes categories or ways of seeing on participants that may be irrelevant for them Evidence that wrong method was used Evidence that method was implemented suboptimally	Common Methods Constant Comparative Method Coding Data

(Robert Wood Foundation, 2008)