

Can “Debrief” Reports Expedite Qualitative Studies? A Post-Hoc Analysis of VOICE-D Trial Data (Abstract #300)

Jane M. Simoni, PhD¹, Kristin Beima-Sofie, PhD¹, K Rivet Amico, PhD²,
Sybil Hosek, PhD³, Mallory O. Johnson, PhD⁴, Barbara Mensch, PhD⁵

¹University of Washington, Seattle WA, ²University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI, ³Stroger Hospital of Cook County, Chicago IL,
⁴University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco CA, ⁵Population Council, New York, NY

BACKGROUND

- Use of written “debrief” reports (DR) to summarize qualitative interviews is an increasingly employed method to expedite the sharing of key observations within research teams.
- When collected and reviewed in an on-going manner, as qualitative interviews are implemented, use of DR may:
 - Identify potential problems with trial implementation or engagement
 - allow for adaptations to interview guides and leverage interviewer expertise
 - capture high-order themes in specific content areas
- Utility of DR depends on text accuracy, which could be eroded by:
 - bias in inclusion or exclusion of highlights
 - inability to retain and convey important information
 - other factors that ultimately distance the data in DR from the complete transcripts.
- We examined accuracy of DR from VOICE-D, a qualitative study of former VOICE participants in South Africa, Uganda, and Zimbabwe.

METHODS

- A random sample ($N=20$) of 88 VOICE-D in-depth interview transcript and DR pairs, conducted by 5 interviewers, were compared for concordance/discordance by trained social and behavioral scientists.
- DR for VOICE-D contained interviewer observations of three main IDI themes. This analysis focused on “motivations for joining the VOICE trial” and “study product adherence.”
- Two raters reviewed each DR-transcript pair to identify content (1) in DR and transcript and (a) accurately represented or (b) lacking specific nuance; (2) in DR but not found in transcript; or (3) in transcript and of relevance but not in the DR
- DR were rated as superior (1), acceptable (2), or unacceptable (3)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Ariana Katz, Elizabeth Montgomery, Ariane van der Straten and the Microbicides Trial Network for access to the data. This work was supported in part by AI027757 and funding from the National Institute of Mental Health.

Adherence 2017, June 4-6, Miami, FL. Contact: Jane Simoni at jsimoni@uw.edu.

RESULTS

Inter-rater Reliability

- 13 of 20 pairs of raters gave the same DR-transcript concordance score
- Among the 7 that diverged, all were 1 point or less apart
- Discrepancies were resolved by discussion after re-review of transcripts and DR

High Quality of DR

The majority of DR accurately described the interview with only 1 interview-DR pair receiving an unacceptable score. Only a few critical discrepancies were noted, resulting in a less than superior score.

- Superior ($n=8$)
- Acceptable ($n=11$)
- Unacceptable ($n=1$)

Suggestions for Optimizing DR Form

- Have clear and specific purpose for DR
- Structure DR to reflect ordered sequence of interview if possible
- Include specific headings in DR to reflect interview guide or specific target questions of interest

Suggestions for Optimizing DR Process

- Deliver adequate training on how to complete DR
- Conduct ongoing quality assessment of DR
- Have a trained note taker present during interview
- Complete DR immediately after interview to facilitate accuracy

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, DR performed well at capturing the main themes of in-depth interviews. We noted only a few critical items missing from DR that might influence interpretations of interview data or inform study adaptation. As few investigators have time to review study transcripts, well-designed and implemented DR may expedite the impact of qualitative interviews.