

Qualitative research: a valuable contribution to midwifery knowledge

This edition contains a discussion paper on evaluation research methods and four research papers on descriptions of traumatic birth, women's experience of early motherhood, postnatal support in the community and the philosophical foundations of normal birth.

Most papers presented use qualitative research approaches, the aim of which is to: 'Produce a coherent and illuminating description of and perspective on a situation that is based on, and consistent with detailed study of the situation' (Ward-Schofield, 1993: 202).

Qualitative researchers try to understand the meaning individuals ascribe to their life experience and in this case their experience of birth, life after birth and the role of the midwife in their lifeworld. These studies describe, map, analyse and detail the patterns of everyday experiences for the women who come to us for care during their childbirth experience – narratives and stories that are embedded in the social fabric of the everyday world of midwives. As midwife researchers there is a burden of truth-telling to bear for each insight gained and it is the researcher who is ultimately responsible for the rigour of the research.

Every qualitative account is unique yet the findings and interpretations must be sufficiently detailed to allow the reader to walk through the research process – 'walk the talk'. The reader must be convinced by the written word that conveys insightful descriptions of the data trail, veracity and confirmability of meaning attributed to the insight gained from the complete research process.

The written quality of the work is a key component in the value judgements attributed to individual pieces of research. Hammersley (1987) alluded to this factor when stating that qualitative data is often judged on how well it represents the features of the phenomenon that it sets out to describe.

Descriptive accounts are foundational pillars for those who are charged with the task of resource allocation and capital planning. Outcomes from health services research will be used by the government to shape and target services and therefore it is worth investing in evaluation research that will enable us to develop frameworks and processes for reporting and analysing qualitative research that will maximise impact.

Sandelowski and Barroso (2003) would argue that despite the prominence and applicability of health service research using qualitative methodologies, the value of this research is limited due to the need to integrate the findings from the collective research. They propose that the future value of qualitative research will be greatly enhanced through a rigorous and analytic process of qualitative meta-synthesis. This approach values the unique contribution of individual research studies, while combining their collective outputs.

Moving midwifery forward requires us to focus on improving public, professional and organisational confidence in the outputs from qualitative research and therefore we need to begin to write about our research with the expectation that it will be subject to analytic techniques such as meta-analysis and meta-synthesis.

References

- Hammersley M. (1987) Some notes on the terms 'validity' and 'reliability'. *British Educational Research Journal* 13: 73-81.
- Sandelowski M, Barroso J. (2003) Writing the proposal for a qualitative research methodology project. *Qualitative Health Research* 13(6): 782-814.
- Ward-Schofield J. (1993) *Increasing the generalisability of qualitative research*. In: Hammersley M. (Ed.). *Social research: philosophy, politics and practice*. Sage: London: 200-5.

Marlene Sinclair
Editor

Evidence Based Midwifery editorial panels

UK editorial panel

Dr Barbara Bale, University of Glamorgan, Wales, and acting chief executive, Health Professions Wales

Dr Soo Downe, University of Central Lancashire, England

Dr Billie Hunter, University of Wales Swansea, Wales

Dr Margaret Maguire, midwifery development officer, NHS Scotland

Dr Marianne Mead, University of Hertfordshire, England

Professor Jane Sandall, King's College, London, England

Chair: Louise Silvertown, RCM deputy general secretary

Dr Marlene Sinclair (professional editor), University of Ulster, Northern Ireland

Dr Hora Soltani, Derby City General Hospital, England

Dr Andrew Symon, University of Dundee, Scotland

Emma Godfrey (editor), McMillan-Scott

Polly Kerr (assistant editor), McMillan-Scott

International editorial panel

Professor Cecily Begley, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland

Associate Professor Debra Erickson-Owens, University of Utah, US

Dr Heather Hancock, University of South Australia

Professor Edith Hillan, University of Toronto, Canada

Petra ten Hoope-Bender, secretary general, International Confederation of Midwives

Dr Helen Lugina, Muhimbili University College, Tanzania

Dr Mallavarapu Prakasamma, director, Academy for Nursing Studies, India

Editorial advisory panel

Joseph B Cunningham, lecturer in research methods and statistics, University of Ulster, Northern Ireland

Frances Day-Stirk, RCM director of learning, research and practice development

Professor William Dunlop, president, Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists

Catherine McCormick, midwifery officer, Department of Health, England

Andrea McGlynn, nurse-midwife, Illinois, US

Dr Rhona McInnes, University of Glasgow, Scotland

Sue Macdonald, RCM education and research manager

Simon Morrison, RCM head of communications and marketing

Helen Spiby, University of Leeds, England

Cathy Warwick, chair, midwifery committee, Nursing and Midwifery Council, UK

Matthew Pulzer, managing editor, McMillan-Scott