

PONLOK CHOMNES

DATA AND DIALOGUE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN CAMBODIA

# A GUIDEBOOK ON QUALITY RESEARCH



## 10. ANNEXES

### ANNEX A: RESEARCH QUALITY STANDARDS

- RESOURCES**
- Research Quality Plus (RQ+) A Holistic Approach to Evaluating Research: <https://idl-bnc-idrc.dspacedirect.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/26d17914-e289-467a-b45e-2e139085156c/content>
  - Research Quality Plus (RQ+) Assessment Instrument: [https://idrc-crdi.ca/sites/default/files/sp/Documents%20EN/idrc\\_rq\\_assessment\\_instrument\\_september\\_2017.pdf](https://idrc-crdi.ca/sites/default/files/sp/Documents%20EN/idrc_rq_assessment_instrument_september_2017.pdf)

Research Stage	Bronze Standard (basic)	Silver Standard (good)	Gold Standard (high-quality, inclusive)
<b>Design research</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic problem identified – research question is clear but perhaps limited in scope</li> <li>• Limited review of literature</li> <li>• Methods described but lack substantive detail</li> <li>• Sampling based on convenience or ad hoc</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear research questions and objectives grounded in relevant literature</li> <li>• Methods and tools are appropriate for the research design, tool development and analysis plan explained</li> <li>• Sampling strategy clearly explained and includes diverse subjects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear research questions and objectives co-designed with input from target communities/policy actors</li> <li>• Sub-questions defined</li> <li>• Comprehensive literature review</li> <li>• Methods are tailored to the context, rigorous, and based in theory and best practice</li> <li>• Use of rigorous sampling strategy (e.g., stratified random sampling), sampling calculations explained, non-response strategy, rationale to sampling approach explained</li> </ul>
<b>Ensure research follows ethical guidelines</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Verbal consent sought</li> <li>• General awareness of ethical research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consent documented</li> <li>• Risk assessment conducted</li> <li>• Local ethics standards followed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal ethics review secured (IRB/NECHR)</li> <li>• Detailed consent protocols</li> <li>• Data Management Plan in place</li> </ul>
<b>Collect data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited pilot testing to refine tools</li> <li>• Possibly using pre-existing tools with limited adaptation to the research context</li> <li>• Ad hoc data quality checks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tools pilot tested and refined</li> <li>• Data collectors participate in basic training on rigorous data collection</li> <li>• Basic data quality control checks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High-quality, pilot-tested tools</li> <li>• Data collectors undergo thorough training</li> <li>• Structured data quality checks and monitoring</li> </ul>

<b>Analyse the data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic descriptive analysis</li> <li>• Limited insights to answer the research questions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis aligns with design</li> <li>• Some triangulation and validation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rigorous analytical techniques</li> <li>• Full triangulation</li> <li>• Results are validated with input from relevant communities/ stakeholders</li> <li>• Clear explanation of assumptions and limitations</li> </ul>
<b>Write report and develop</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Findings written up with limited discussion or context</li> <li>• General recommendations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report includes findings, limitations, and implications</li> <li>• Some tailoring to target audiences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report is clear, policy-relevant, and includes nuanced recommendations</li> <li>• Adapted to target audiences with clear messaging</li> </ul>
<b>Peer review and revision</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal team review only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review by external colleagues or partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal peer-review process (e.g., expert panel or journal); revisions clearly documented</li> </ul>
<b>Disseminate results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results shared internally or with donor only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dissemination to relevant networks and stakeholders</li> <li>• Presentations or briefings held</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear communications strategy</li> <li>• Public dissemination plan implemented</li> <li>• Findings shared with communities and decision-makers in accessible formats</li> <li>• Follow-up activities planned to increase probability of uptake</li> </ul>
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimal or limited monitoring activities.</li> <li>• Lacks monitoring plan</li> <li>• No predefined indicators</li> <li>• No clear or specific evaluation plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic monitoring plan that guides monitoring activities.</li> <li>• Pre-defined indicators</li> <li>• Lesson learning might be documented but not thematically applied.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive monitoring plan from the beginning.</li> <li>• Indicators in alignment with research objectives, regularly tracked.</li> <li>• Evaluation plan pre-defined, and implemented.</li> <li>• Learning objectives are set, and learning are used for adaptations.</li> <li>• Findings are used to inform future research.</li> </ul>



