

Critical Appraisal of a Questionnaire Study

Leonardo Roever*

Department of Clinical Research, Federal University of Uberlândia, Uberlândia, Brazil

*Corresponding author: Roever L, Department of Clinical Research, Av Pará, 1720 - Bairro Umarama, Uberlândia-MG-CEP 38400-902, Brazil, Tel: +553488039878; E-mail: leonardoroever@hotmail.com

Rec Date: 11 December, 2015; Acc Date: 18 December, 2015; Pub Date: 25 December, 2015

Copyright: © 2016 Roever L. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Introduction

6XUYH\ V DQG TXHVWLRQQDLUHV DUH DQ HVVHQWLDO FRPSRQH QW RI YDULRXV W\SHV RI UHVHDFK DQG JDWKHU LQIRUPDWLRQ IURP D VDP SOH RI TXHVWLRQV PDGH WR SDUWLFLSDQWV R70 EDD HS DUWKLFFZ\O DUK HW RSLF RKHFNOLVWV QHHGHG WR PDNH D FULWLFDO DQDO\VLV RI D TXHVWLRQQDLUH VW > @

Appraisal Questions
What information did the researchers seek to obtain? Was there a clear research question, and was this important and sensible? Was a questionnaire the most appropriate research design for this question, what design might have been more appropriate?
What was the sampling frame and was it sufficiently large and representative? Did all participants in the sample understand what was required of them, and did they attribute the same meaning to the terms in the questionnaire?
Were there any existing measures (questionnaires) that the researchers could have used? If so, why was a new one developed and was this justified?
Were the views of consumers sought about the design, distribution, and administration of the questionnaire?
Did the questions cover all relevant aspects of the problem in a non-threatening and non-directive way? Were open-ended (qualitative) and closed-ended (quantitative) questions used appropriately? Was a pilot version administered to participant's representative of those in the sampling frame, and the instrument modified accordingly?
What claims for validity have been made, and are they justified? (In other words, what evidence is there that the instrument measures what it sets out to measure?)
What claims for reliability have been made, and are they justified? (In other words, what evidence is there that the instrument provides stable responses over time and between researchers?)
Was the title of the questionnaire appropriate and if not, what were its limitations?

What formats did the questionnaire take, and were open and closed questions used appropriately?

Were easy, non-threatening questions placed at the beginning of the measure and sensitive ones near the end?

Was the questionnaire kept as brief as the study allowed? What was the response rate and have non-responders been accounted for?

Did the questions make sense, and could the participants in the sample understand them? Were any questions ambiguous or overly complicated?

Did the questionnaire contain adequate instructions for completion—e.g. example answers, or an explanation of whether a ticked or written response was required?

Were participants told how to return the questionnaire once completed?

Have the findings been placed within the wider body of knowledge in the field (e.g. via a comprehensive literature review), and are any recommendations justified?