



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Ensuring rigour and trustworthiness of qualitative research in clinical pharmacy*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/109163/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Hadi, MA orcid.org/0000-0003-0108-7833 and Closs, SJ orcid.org/0000-0002-3257-5277
(2016) Ensuring rigour and trustworthiness of qualitative research in clinical pharmacy.
International Journal of Clinical Pharmacy, 38 (3). pp. 641-646. ISSN 2210-7703

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11096-015-0237-6>

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

1 **Introduction:**

2 Qualitative research is a diverse group of interpretative methods which aim to explore,
3 understand and explain people's experiences using non-numerical data [1]. Although
4 still dominated by quantitative research methodology, the use of qualitative research
5 methodology in clinical and healthcare research has grown steadily in the past couple of
6 decades [2]. Qualitative research methodology typically involve interviewing and/or
7 observing people who are central to the research topic. The data produced are usually
8 (though not always) in the form of text, reporting what interviewees said and/or did. The
9 data are then analysed, often by the person who interviewed or observed, leading to the
10 likelihood of subjectivity and bias. Therefore, qualitative studies have often been
11 criticized for lacking rigour, transparency, justification of data collection and analysis
12 methods being used, and hence the integrity of findings [3].

13 The issue of "judging the quality" in qualitative research has been one of the most
14 debated topics among methodologists and until recently there has been little consensus
15 on what constitutes a good and trustworthy qualitative study [4-9]. Rolfe postulates that
16 three opinions exist in the literature on how best to judge the quality of qualitative
17 research [4]. The first view, although not a popular one, advocates for the adoption and
18 application of positivist terminologies like validity and reliability to describe rigour in
19 qualitative research [5]. The second view (realist), the most popular view among
20 healthcare researchers, rejects the potential applicability of positivist reliability and
21 validity criteria because of differences in the theoretical and philosophical paradigms
22 underpinning quantitative and qualitative research [6,7,10]. This view therefore,
23 promotes the use of alternative terminologies such as dependability, credibility,

1 conformability and transferability instead of their quantitative equivalents reliability,
2 internal validity, objectivity and generalizability respectively to describe rigour
3 (trustworthiness) in qualitative research. Methodological techniques (explained in detail
4 later) such as the audit trail, member checking, negative case analysis, triangulation,
5 prolong engagement with participants and peer debriefing have also been proposed in
6 the literature to ensure dependability, credibility, and transferability in qualitative studies
7 (Refer to Table 1 for brief description of these terminologies) [6,7,10]. However, not all
8 these strategies are applicable in all types of qualitative studies [8,9]. The third and final
9 view held by some methodologists (interpretivist) have challenged the very idea of
10 having a single pre-determined criterion for evaluating the quality of diverse approaches
11 within qualitative research. Qualitative research encompasses a number of different
12 research methods underpinned by different research paradigms and theories thus
13 making single evaluative criteria impossible to develop and apply [4]. Methodologists
14 belonging to each of these paradigms have their arguments to support their positions.
15 The most important thing to note here is that the term paradigm refers to a discrete set
16 of beliefs and researchers are free to choose any paradigm (constructivist, realist,
17 feminist) but they need to be transparent about the choices that they have made
18 aligning with a specific paradigm and avoid mixing of paradigms.

19 Until recently there has been little guidance available for assessing the quality of
20 published qualitative research, but COREQ (Consolidated criteria for reporting
21 qualitative research) provides a 32 item checklist now widely used by medical and
22 health journals, to aid reviewers [11]. Subsequently two more checklists have been
23 developed based on wide ranging reviews, both producing a 21-item list, one for

1 qualitative studies [12] and another for qualitative research syntheses [13]. However,
2 while these papers identify standards for reporting, they do not go into the rationale for
3 selecting and undertaking strategies for ensuring rigour.

4 Unlike other healthcare disciplines, the subject of “quality” in qualitative research has
5 not been discussed much in the clinical pharmacy discipline. Perhaps this is because
6 the quality issue has been discussed extensively in other disciplines, allowing clinical
7 pharmacy researchers to rely on the available literature. Being predominantly trained
8 within a “positivist” paradigm, pharmacists may find debating this issue “out of their
9 comfort zone” or, simply, they may just not be interested. The aim of this paper is not to
10 propose another checklist to evaluate the quality of qualitative research but to highlight
11 the importance of rigour, present different philosophical standpoints on the issue of
12 quality in qualitative research and to discuss briefly key strategies to ensure
13 methodological rigour. Finally, an illustration of strategies reported by clinical pharmacy
14 researchers in a random sample of papers published recently to show how rigour in
15 qualitative research is presented.

16 **Strategies to ensure trustworthiness**

17 A number of strategies have been proposed to ensure trustworthiness of qualitative
18 findings. It has been suggested that at least two of these strategies should be used in
19 any particular qualitative study [14]. A brief description of commonly used strategies is
20 given below.

21 **Triangulation**

1 Triangulation is a widely used method to ensure credibility and conformability of
2 qualitative studies [14]. Triangulation involves using at least two related data sources,
3 data collection methods or researchers with the aim of reducing inherent bias
4 associated with a single source, method or researcher [5]. Triangulation should not be
5 seen as a tool to check the validity of data and labeling data as “true” or false” but to
6 ascertain the validity of the inferences derived from multiple data sources [15].

7 **Self-description/Reflexivity**

8 Self-description and self-reflection is very important in qualitative research to
9 acknowledge and reduce researcher bias, a common criticism of qualitative research.
10 Self-reflection will enable qualitative researchers to discuss their position within the
11 study and how their personal beliefs and past training have influenced the research
12 findings [5, 15]. Qualitative researchers should be encouraged to make field notes and
13 maintain a reflective journal in order to recognize and make explicit any personal biases
14 [15]. Self-description promotes credibility and conformability of research findings

15 **Member checking**

16 Alternatively known as respondent validation, this is often described as the single most
17 important method to ensure a study’s credibility [7], and refers to checking of study
18 findings and conclusions by the respondents from whom the data (interview,
19 observation) were originally obtained [5]. The aim of member checking is to ensure
20 dependability and credibility of qualitative studies. However, some methodologists have
21 raised concerns about the usefulness of member checking as qualitative data do not
22 only consist of interview/observational data but also include field notes, the author’s

1 reflective journal and non-verbal signs which the respondents may not “own as their
2 personal views” [5,15]. Furthermore, study results are often synthesized from data
3 obtained from interviewing/observing a number of participants, making it difficult for
4 individuals to recognize his/her own view. Any forced attempt to accommodate
5 respondents’ concerns may make the result more “descriptive” and “close to data”, an
6 undesired outcome in almost all of the qualitative research designs [8]. Therefore,
7 member checks should not be seen as a verification strategy to judge accuracy of data
8 analysis.

9 **Prolonged engagement**

10 Prolonged engagement with study participants and community is recommended in order
11 gain their trust and establish rapport [14]. This is likely to enable the researcher to get
12 more in-depth information from the respondents and identify pertinent characters in the
13 community concerning the issue being studied in order to focus on them in more detail
14 and ensure that the research topic is explored comprehensively [14]. Prolonged
15 engagement may promote the credibility of a qualitative study

16 **Audit trail**

17 Audit of decision trails should enable readers to make their own judgments about the
18 quality, transferability and worth of a study [17]. The reader may then follow the
19 authors’ decision trail and associate it with their own conclusions which they have drawn
20 from the information provided. Audit of the decision trail involves detailed description of
21 sources and techniques of data collection and analysis (interview/observation),

1 interpretations made, decisions taken, and influences on the researcher with the aim of
2 demonstrating truthfulness within the findings [17].

3 **Peer debriefing**

4 Peer debriefing also known as “analytic triangulation” [18], is a method in which the
5 researcher discusses the research methodology, data analysis and interpretations
6 continuously throughout the research process with his/her peer who is not directly
7 involved in the research project [7]. Ideally, the peer debriefer should be a skilled
8 qualitative researcher who can meaningfully question the researcher’s interpretations,
9 provoke critical thinking, and provide alternative/additional perspectives and
10 explanations. Peer debriefing enhances credibility and trustworthiness as it gives the
11 researcher an opportunity to ensure that emergent hypotheses, themes or theories are
12 derived from the data and are sensible and conceivable to a disinterested debriefer [18].
13 For research students, their supervisors can act as debriefers. Other forms of peer
14 debriefing include: presentation of research findings at conferences; regular discussions
15 with an expert qualitative researcher; and presenting preliminary findings to interested
16 groups [5].

17 **Thick description**

18 Providing rich and thick description is used to obtain external validity (transferability)
19 [5,14]. It also promotes study credibility as well. It requires the researcher to give
20 sufficient details about settings, inclusion/exclusion criteria, sample characteristics, and
21 data collection and analysis methods, so that the reader can evaluate the extent to

1 which the conclusions made by the authors are transferable to other settings, situations,
2 and populations.

3 **A mini-review of strategies used to ensure trustworthiness of qualitative research** 4 **in Clinical Pharmacy**

5 To illustrate the points made above, a mini review was undertaken. This explored the
6 strategies reported by clinical pharmacy researchers to ensure rigour in their qualitative
7 studies, but not to judge the quality of qualitative research which is a relatively broad
8 and fiercely debated area. Study selection and data extraction was conducted by the
9 first author (MAH).

10 Medline was searched to identify qualitative studies using the keywords “qualitative”
11 AND “pharmacist” OR “pharmacy” published during 2014 and 2015 in the English
12 language. Studies published in non-pharmacy practice/clinical pharmacy journals were
13 excluded. A database of the first 30 articles meeting inclusion and exclusion criteria was
14 created and finally ten articles [19-28] were randomly chosen using random numbers for
15 quality evaluation. The search strategy was not designed to identify all qualitative
16 papers in the field of clinical pharmacy but to minimize authors’ bias towards study
17 inclusion.

18 Of the 10 studies reviewed, four studies used individual semi structured
19 interviews, two used focus groups, another two used combinations of both semi
20 structured interviews and focus groups and one used online survey (including open
21 ended questions) as the means for data collection. For data analyses, five studies
22 employed thematic analysis and four framework analysis. Thick description (n=9)

1 followed by peer-debriefing (n=5) were the most commonly reported strategies used to
2 establish rigour. Surprisingly, only two studies discussed the application of various
3 strategies (member checking, peer debriefs etc.) in relation to establishing
4 trustworthiness/rigour in their studies. Although all the studies described in detail
5 inclusion/exclusion criteria, participant recruitment, participant characteristics and topic
6 guide content, the process of data analysis was not described in detail in almost half of
7 the studies. Only three studies used at least two strategies, excluding thick description,
8 to establish trustworthiness. None of the studies reviewed reported using either member
9 checking or reflexivity to ensure rigour. Although this is a 'snapshot', these findings
10 clearly indicate that there is a need to increase awareness
11 among clinical pharmacy researchers of the importance of demonstrating rigour when
12 publishing qualitative research. Peer-reviewers should also stress rigour, in addition to
13 other aspects of a qualitative study during the peer-review process as it may be that the
14 authors have used strategies to ensure rigour but did not report them. An independent
15 section/sub-section in the methods or discussion section reserved for detailing
16 strategies to ensure rigour will encourage clinical pharmacy researchers to explain
17 these strategies. However, there are certain limitations to the above findings which need
18 to be carefully considered. First, studies were only included from various leading
19 pharmacy practice journals (International Journal of Clinical Pharmacy, International
20 Journal of Pharmacy Practice, Canadian Pharmacists Journal, Research in Social and
21 Administrative Pharmacy, Pharmacy Practice, Journal of American Pharmacists
22 Association), however, studies published in non-pharmacy practice journals were not
23 included, therefore, the findings may not be transferable to qualitative studies published

1 by clinical pharmacy researchers in non-pharmacy practice journals which may have
2 different reviewing processes. Second, although the word limit for qualitative research is
3 relatively generous compared to quantitative research, the word limit imposed by
4 journals might have influenced the authors either not to report or abridge the details of
5 the strategies used to ensure rigor and trustworthiness. Finally, all the selected papers
6 have been peer-reviewed prior to publication and the authors' description of methods
7 may have been edited, shortened or removed during the peer review process.
8 Therefore, the above findings are based on what has been reported in the final paper
9 rather than what the authors "intended" to publish.

10 **Conclusion**

11 As with any other research methodology, demonstrating rigour in qualitative studies is
12 essential so that the research findings have the "integrity" to make an impact on
13 practice, policy or both. Although different viewpoints exist in the literature on the issue
14 of quality judgment, it is important for clinical pharmacy researchers to declare their
15 philosophical stance, justify their selection of particular methods in relation to the
16 research question and avoid method slurring. As suggested by Creswell [14], clinical
17 pharmacy researchers should incorporate at least two different strategies to ensure
18 rigour depending on the type of qualitative research design. Clinical pharmacy
19 researchers should also provide detailed accounts of data analysis to enhance the
20 transparency of the research findings and strengthen the conclusions drawn. Failure to
21 undertake rigorous qualitative research has negative implications in terms of its impact
22 on pharmacy practice and policy, future development of pharmaceutical services and
23 most importantly, the qualitative research methodology itself. Since this mini review only

1 focused on the strategies employed by clinical pharmacy researchers to ensure
2 trustworthiness, future research should explore the quality of qualitative research in
3 clinical pharmacy research and, if required, propose recommendations for quality
4 improvement. Pharmacy practice journals should also extend their word limits for
5 qualitative papers, to allow authors to report methodological processes in detail

6 **Conflicts of interest:**

7 None declared

8 **Funding:**

9 No funding from any governmental or non-governmental agency was obtained for this
10 paper.

11

1 **References:**

- 2 1. Denzin NK, Lincoln YS. (eds.) The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research,
3 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 2005.
- 4 2. Pope C, Mays N. Reaching the parts other methods cannot: an introduction to
5 qualitative methods in health and health services research. *BMJ* 1995; 311:42–
6 45.
- 7 3. Anderson C. Presenting and evaluating qualitative research. *Am J Pharm Educ*
8 2010; 74 (8)6: Article 141
- 9 4. Rolfe G. Validity, trustworthiness and rigour: quality and the idea of qualitative
10 research. *J of Applied Nurs* 2006; 53:304-310
- 11 5. Long T, Johnson M. Rigour, reliability and validity in qualitative research. *Clin*
12 *Effect Nurs* 2000;4:30-37
- 13 6. Cohen DJ, Crabtree BF. Evaluative Criteria for Qualitative Research in Health
14 Care: Controversies and Recommendations *Ann Fam Med*. 2008 Jul; 6(4): 331–
15 339.
- 16 7. Lincoln YS, Guba EG. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage, Beverly Hills , CA. 1985
- 17 8. Sandelowski M. Rigor or rigor mortis: the problem of rigour in qualitative research
18 revisited. *ANS Adv Nurs Sci* 1993;16:1-8
- 19 9. Morse JM, Barrett M, Mayan M, Olson K, Spiers J. Verification strategies for
20 establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *Int J Qual Meth* 2002;
21 1:13-22
- 22 10. Noble H, Smith J. Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research. *Evid*
23 *Based Nurs* 2015; 18:34-35

- 1 11. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative
2 research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. Int J
3 Qual Health Care 2007; 19: 349-357.
4
- 5 12. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting
6 qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. Acad Med 2014; 89: 1245-
7 1251.
8
9
- 10 13. Tong A, Flemming K, McInnes E, Oliver S, Craig J. Enhancing transparency in
11 reporting the synthesis of qualitative research: ENTREQ. BMC Med Res
12 Methodol 2012;12:181
13
- 14 14. Creswell JW. Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five
15 approaches. 2nd Edition Sage. Thousand Oaks, CA. 2006
16
- 17 15. Hammersley M, Atkinson P. Ethnography: Principles in practice, 2nd Edition.
18 Routledge, London. 1995
19
- 20 16. Shenton AK. Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research
21 projects. Edu Inform 2004;22:63-75
22
- 23 17. Sandelowski M. The problem of rigor in feminist research. ANS Adv Nurs Sci
24 1986;8:27-37

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

18. Nguyen TST. Peer debriefing. The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods. 2008 Available at <http://srmo.sagepub.com/view/sage-encyc-qualitative-research-methods/n312.xml> [accessed June 5, 2014]

19. Ogunbayo OJ, Schafheutle EI, Cutts C, Noyce PR. A qualitative study exploring community pharmacists' awareness of, and contribution to, self-care support in the management of long-term conditions in the United Kingdom. *Res Soc Adm Pharm* 2015; doi: 10.1016/j.sapharm.2014 [Published online Feb, 2015]

20. Shiyanbola OO, Mort JR. Exploring consumer understanding and preferences for pharmacy quality information. *Pharm Pract* 2014; 12:1- 11

21. Murphy A, Szumilas M, Rowe D et al. Pharmacy students' experiences in provision of community pharmacy mental health services. *Can Pharm J* 2014;147: 55-65.

22. Ryder H, Aspden T, Sheridan J. The Hawke's Bay Condom Card Scheme: a qualitative study of the views of service providers on increased, discreet access for youth to free condoms. *Int J Pharm Pract*. 2015 Feb 25; doi: 10.1111/ijpp.12178

- 1 23. Ziaei Z, Hassell K, Schafheutle EI. Internationally trained pharmacists' perception
2 of their communication proficiency and their views on the impact on patient
3 safety. *Res Soc Adm Pharm* 2015; 11:428-441
4
5
- 6 24. Hasan S, Stewart K, Chapman CB, Hasan MY, Kong DCM. Physicians' attitudes
7 towards provision of primary care services in community pharmacy in the United
8 Arab Emirates. *Int J Pharm Pract* 2014 doi: 10.1111/ijpp.12157
9
- 10 25. Marquis J, Schneider MP, Spencer B, Bugnon O, Pasquier SD. Exploring the
11 implementation of a medication adherence programme by community
12 pharmacists: a qualitative study *Int J Clin Pharm* 2014; 36:1014–1022
13
- 14 26. Swain L, Griffiths C, Lisa Pont L, Barclay L. Attitudes of pharmacists to provision
15 of Home Medicines Review for Indigenous Australians. *Int J Clin Pharm* 2014;
16 36:1260–1267
17
- 18 27. Brazinha I, Fernandez-Llimos F. Barriers to the implementation of advanced
19 clinical pharmacy services at Portuguese hospitals *Int J Clin Pharm* 2014;
20 36:1031–1038
21
- 22 28. Odukoya OK, Stone JA, Chui MA. Barriers and facilitators to recovering from e-
23 prescribing errors in community pharmacies. *J Am Pharm Assoc* 2015; 55:52-58.
24