



Quality Indicator Checklist: Qualitative Studies

Reference (enter reference in correct APA format): 			
Before determining quality, all qualitative studies must meet the following initial criteria (if study does not meet these initial criteria, then no need to code further)			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Focused on transition related themes (e.g., student perceptions of transition planning, parent expectations)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Youth with disabilities ages 11-26	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Meet initial criteria- continue coding
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Does not meet initial criteria- indicate why:
Credibility Measures			NOTES
1. Qualitative Research Design (choose one): Researcher acknowledges methodology			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Ethnography</i> : prolonged engagement in the field; description/interpretation of a cultural or social group or system; typically includes observations, interviews, and document analysis.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Grounded Theory</i> : empirical-research done to generate or discover a general theory or analytical hunch based on study of phenomena in a particular situation(s). (traditional: no a priori variables; constructivist: some a priori theorization and questions)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Case study</i> : exploration of a bounded system (group, individual, setting, event, phenomenon, process); can include life history or narrative research and biography.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Action research</i> : researcher brings ideas for practice to fieldwork to have an impact on the setting/participants while collecting data, participants are directly involved in research process.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Phenomenology</i> : studies the meanings people make of their lived experiences.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Other</i> (please describe):		
Triangulation (select all that apply): documentation of methods used to establish trustworthiness and credibility are specific and clear; search for convergence of, or consistency among, evidence from multiple and varied data sources (e.g., observations/interviews; one participant & another; interviews/documents)			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Data triangulation</i> —use of varied data sources in a study.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Investigator triangulation</i> —use of several researchers, evaluators, peer debriefers		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Theory triangulation</i> —use of multiple perspectives to interpret a single set of data		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Methodological triangulation</i> —use of multiple methods to study a single problem		
3. Member checks: having participants review and confirm the accuracy (or inaccuracy) of interview transcriptions or observational field notes.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	taking transcriptions to participants prior to analyses and interpretations of results or taking analyses and interpretations of data to participants (prior to publication) for validation of (or support for) researchers' conclusions		
4. Disconfirming evidence: also known as negative or discrepant case analysis.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	after establishing preliminary themes/categories, the researcher looks for evidence inconsistent with these themes (outliers, for example individual interview results that		



	say the opposite of the majority of responses) <i>Note: the term disconfirming evidence may not be written explicitly in the manuscript/proposal, as the process of doing this can vary depending on the units of analysis</i>	
5.	Researcher reflexivity: being forthright about position/perspective	
	<input type="checkbox"/> researchers attempt to understand and self-disclose their assumptions, beliefs, values, and biases (i.e.,)	
6.	Thick, detailed description, particularizability	
	<input type="checkbox"/> reporting sufficient quotes and field note descriptions to provide evidence for researchers' interpretations and conclusions, so readers can determine the degree of transferability to their own situations	
7.	Data Analysis: were data sorted, coded, and integrated in a systematic and meaningful way?	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Coding schema are explained	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient rationale is provided for what was (or was not) included in the report	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions are substantiated by sufficient quotations from participants, field notes of observations, and evidence of documentation inspection.	
Data Collection Method (choose and complete for the method(s) used [i.e., interviews, observation, document analysis])		
8.	Interview Study (or interview components of study)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate participants were selected: (Purposefully identified, effectively recruited, adequate number, representative of the population of interest)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Interview questions are reasonable (clearly worded, not leading, appropriate and sufficient for exploring domains of interest)	
9.	Observation Study (or observation components of study)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate setting(s) and/or people are selected for observation	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Role of researcher as observer is adequately explained	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Field notes systematically collected (videotaped, audiotaped, written during or soon after observation)	
10.	Document Analysis	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Meaningful documents (e.g., texts, artifacts, objects, pictures) are found and their relevance is established	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Documents are sufficiently described and cited	
Overall Quality Determination		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Met Acceptable Quality (all studies must meet <i>must meet 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; If interview study must also meet 8; If observation study must also meet 9; and/or If document review must also meet document analysis 10</i>)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Did not Meet Quality (Item#(s): _____)	

Quality indicators for qualitative research adapted from:

Brantlinger, E., Jimenez, R., Klingner, J., Pugach, M., & Richardson, V. (2005). Qualitative studies in special education. *Exceptional Children, 71*, 195-207.

Trainor, A. A., & Graue, E. (2014). Evaluating rigor in qualitative methodology and research dissemination. *Remedial and Special Education, 35*, 267–274.