

# **LEGEND: EVIDENCE APPRAISAL OF A SINGLE STUDY**

## **– MEANING/KAB: QUALITATIVE STUDY –**

KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDES, BELIEFS

**PROJECT / TOPIC OF YOUR CLINICAL QUESTION:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Today's Date (mm/dd/yy):** \_\_\_\_\_ **Final Evidence Level:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Article Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Year:** \_\_\_\_\_ **First Author:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Journal:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Do the study purpose/objectives and inclusion/exclusion criteria assist in answering your clinical question?**

Yes  No  Unknown

• Study Purpose/Objective: \_\_\_\_\_

• Inclusion Criteria: \_\_\_\_\_

• Exclusion Criteria: \_\_\_\_\_

**Is a qualitative study congruent with the author's study purpose above?**

Yes  No  Unknown

*Comments:*

When reading the bolded questions, consider the bulleted questions to help answer the main question.

If you are uncertain of your skills in evidence evaluation, please consult a local evidence expert for assistance:

CCHMC Evidence Experts: <http://groups/ce/NewEBC/EBDMHelp.htm>

Unfamiliar terms can be found in the LEGEND Glossary: <http://groups/ce/NewEBC/EBCFiles/GLOSSARY-EBDM.pdf>

## **GENERAL QUESTIONS**

**1. Was a qualitative design clearly identified?**

Yes  No  Unknown

• What was the qualitative design?

Ethnography

Focus Group

Grounded Theory

Narrative

Phenomenology

Other\*:

*\* Case studies and descriptive studies with open ended questions provide qualitative information, but are not qualitative studies. Terms defined in EBP Glossary.*

*Comments:*

**2. Is the area of study (domain of inquiry) clearly stated in one sentence?**

Yes  No  Unknown

*Comments:*

**3. Was the design appropriate to explore the domain of inquiry being studied?**

Yes  No  Unknown

*Comments:*

**4. Was the theoretical framework identified?**

Yes  No  Unknown

*Comments:*

**5. Was the theoretical framework appropriate for the domain of inquiry being studied?**

Yes  No  Unknown

*Comments:*

## LEGEND: EVIDENCE APPRAISAL OF A SINGLE STUDY

### – MEANING/KAB: QUALITATIVE STUDY –

#### KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDES, BELIEFS

6. Was the setting clearly identified for the domain of inquiry being studied?  Yes  No  Unknown

- Was the setting appropriate for the domain of inquiry being studied?

Comments:

7. Was the context of the participants analyzed using the words of the participants?  Yes  No  Unknown

Comments:

## EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR QUALITATIVE STUDIES

### CREDIBILITY: ARE THE FINDINGS CREDIBLE?

8. Was the researcher known and trusted by the participants?  Yes  No  Unknown

- How was trust developed among the participants?
- How long was the researcher in the environment of the participants prior to collecting data?

Comments:

### CONFIRMABILITY: ARE THE FINDINGS VERIFIED WITHIN THE CONTEXT?

9. Did the researcher report how findings (themes) were confirmed?  Yes  No  Unknown

- How were themes confirmed?
  - Key Participants
  - General Participants
  - Reflections with Participants throughout Study
  - Use of Field Notes

Comments:

### MEANING IN CONTEXT: ARE THE FINDINGS REPORTED WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE AREA OF STUDY?

10. Does the researcher discuss the themes within a socio-cultural context?  Yes  No  Unknown

- Were the findings reported in terms of the context:
  - of the participants
  - of the culture / subculture
  - of the environment

Comments:

### SATURATION: WAS THE DATA COLLECTED UNTIL THERE WAS NO NEW INFORMATION COMING FORTH?

11. Was saturation of data discussed and reached?  Yes  No  Unknown

- If yes, what was the sample size (number of participants)? \_\_\_\_\_
- If no, were there at least 10 participants ( $N \geq 10$ )?  Yes  No  Unknown
- Was the sample size justified in the discussion?  Yes  No  Unknown

Comments:

**LEGEND: EVIDENCE APPRAISAL OF A SINGLE STUDY**

**– MEANING/KAB: QUALITATIVE STUDY –**

**KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDES, BELIEFS**

**RECURRENT PATTERNING: IS THERE CONSISTENCY IN REPEATED PATTERNS, THEMES, & ACTS OVER TIME?**

**12. Was the data analysis method identified?**  Yes  No  Unknown

*Comments:*

**13. Were the themes reported in terms of the theoretical framework?**  Yes  No  Unknown

- Were the themes supported by raw data?
- Did the raw data fall into patterns?
- Were patterns reported as themes?

*Comments:*

**TRANSFERABILITY: ARE THE FINDINGS TRANSFERABLE?**

**14. Is this information gained from the study applicable to similar groups and contexts?**  Yes  No  Unknown

*Comments:*

- What is applicable to my patient population?

*Comments:*

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR CONCLUSIONS (“TAKE-HOME POINTS”):** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**QUALITY LEVEL / EVIDENCE LEVEL**

- Consider each “No” answer and the degree to which this limitation is a threat to the rigor of the results, then check the appropriate box to assign the level of quality for this study/article.
- Consider an “Unknown” answer to one or more questions as a similar limitation to answering “No,” if the information is not available in the article.

**THE EVIDENCE LEVEL IS:**  **Good Quality Qualitative Study** (2a)  
 **Lesser Quality Qualitative Study** (2b)  
 **Not Applicable or Credible**

TABLE OF EVIDENCE LEVELS					
DOMAIN OF CLINICAL QUESTION	TYPE OF STUDY / STUDY DESIGN				
	Meta-Synthesis	Qualitative Study	Cohort – Prospective	Cross – Sectional	Expert Opinion Case Reports Guidelines
Meaning / KAB <sup>+</sup>	1a 1b	2a 2b	3a 3b	4a 4b	5a 5b

<sup>+</sup> **KAB** = Knowledge, Attitudes, and Beliefs

## **LEGEND: EVIDENCE APPRAISAL OF A SINGLE STUDY**

### **– MEANING/KAB: QUALITATIVE STUDY –**

#### **KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDES, BELIEFS**

Development for this appraisal form is based on:

1. Guyatt, G.; Rennie, D.; Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group.; and American Medical Association.: Users' guides to the medical literature : a manual for evidence-based clinical practice. *Users' guides to the medical literature : a manual for evidence-based clinical practice*: "JAMA & archives journals." Chicago, IL, 2002
2. Denzen, N. & Lincoln. Y. (2005). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California.
3. Freshwater, D. (2004). *Deconstructing Evidence Based Practice*, Routledge: New York: New York.
4. Guba, Y. & Lincoln, E. (1989). *Fourth Generation Evaluation*, Sage Publications: Newbury Part, California.
5. Leininger, M (1991). *Culture care diversity and universality: A theory of Nursing*, National League for Nursing Press: New York
6. Leininger, M. & McFarland, M. (2006). 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. *Culture care diversity and universality: A worldwide nursing theory*. Jones & Bartlett Publishers: Sudbury, Mass.
7. Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*, Sage Publications: Newbury Park, California.
8. Morse, J., Swanson, J., & Kuzal, A. (2001). *The Nature of Qualitative Evidence*, Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California.
9. Phillips, et al: Oxford Centre for Evidence-based Medicine Levels of Evidence, 2001. Last accessed Nov 14, 2007 from <http://www.cebm.net/index.aspx?o=1025>.
10. Fineout-Overholt and Johnston: Teaching EBP: asking searchable, answerable clinical questions. *Worldviews Evid Based Nurs*, 2(3): 157-60, 2005.