OPEN ACCESS

Saudi Journal of Medicine
Abbreviated Key Title: Saudi J Med
ISSN 2518-3389 (Print) | ISSN 2518-3397 (Online)
Scholars Middle East Publishers, Dubai, United Arab Emirates
Journal homepage: https://saudijournals.com

Review Article

Methodological Framework for the Validation of Qualitative Questionnaires

Mohammad Shibly Khan[1]*, Elmuez Eltayeb Elnaiem[1], Manal A Elimam[2]

[1]King Salman Hospital, Riyadh First Health Cluster, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
[2]Directorate of Health Program and Chronic Disease, Ministry of Health, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36348/sjm.2026.v11i06.005 | **Received:** 14.04.2026 | **Accepted:** 06.06.2026 | **Published:** 09.06.2026

***Corresponding Author:** Mohammad Shibly Khan
King Salman Hospital, Riyadh First Health Cluster, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Qualitative empirical research relies heavily on instruments such as semi-structured interview protocols and focus group guides to capture complex human experiences. While quantitative instruments leverage established statistical metrics for psychometric validation, qualitative data collection tools frequently lack transparent, standardized validation frameworks, leaving them vulnerable to peer-review scrutiny and researcher bias. This concept note presents a systematic, four-phase methodological framework specifically tailored for the rigorous validation of qualitative questionnaires intended for peer-reviewed scrutiny. The proposed framework integrates conceptual blueprinting, expert panel reviews for content validation, and cognitive interviewing (utilizing think-aloud protocols and verbal probing) to ensure linguistic precision, structural neutrality, and conceptual depth. Implementing this structural approach establishes a clear audit trail, mitigates structural leading bias, and ensures the generation of high-quality, rich thematic data.

Keywords: Validation, Qualitative research, content validity, methodological framework.

INTRODUCTION

The foundational integrity and subsequent calibre of qualitative empirical inquiry are fundamentally contingent upon the rigor of its data collection instruments [1]. Within qualitative methodologies—such as phenomenology, grounded theory, and qualitative description—the semi-structured interview guide or focus group protocol serves as the primary mechanism for eliciting the lived experiences, perceptions, and belief systems of participants [2,3]. Despite its critical role, the development of qualitative questionnaires is frequently treated as an intuitive or informal exercise rather than a formal, systematic methodology [4,5]. This lack of standardization often results in instruments compromised by implicit researcher bias, technical jargon, culturally insensitive phrasing, or double-barrelled questions that inadvertently restrict or manipulate participant responses [5,6].

In the contemporary peer-reviewed publishing landscape, qualitative researchers face heightened scrutiny regarding the trustworthiness, credibility, and confirmability of their methods [7,8]. While quantitative questionnaires are frequently used in Knowledge & awareness surveys [9-12], the qualitative surveys are designed to explore the opinions of the participants on a given research topic. Quantitative research possesses universally accepted psychometric validation standards, such as Cronbach's alpha for internal consistency and exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis for structural validity. Conversely, qualitative instrumentation cannot rely on statistical coefficients to prove reliability [8]. In some instances, the use of Cronbach's has also been challenged for measuring the reliability of quantitative questionnaire especially when the questionnaire incorporates the use of established models such as Kano model for consumer behaviour [13], however, its' been used in health system research to report the patient satisfaction [16]. The qualitative validation must focus entirely on maximizing linguistic precision, achieving structural neutrality, and ensuring deep conceptual alignment with the underlying research questions [1, 15].

To bridge this methodological gap and satisfy stringent editorial standards, researchers must provide a transparent, step-by-step account of how their qualitative tool was developed, tested, and refined [16,17]. A documented validation process demonstrates that the final questionnaire is not merely a reflection of the researcher's preconceptions, but a highly calibrated tool designed to capture authentic data [1,17]. This concept note details a robust, replicable four-phase framework that bridges the gap between raw conceptual ideas and a peer-review-ready qualitative instrument, ensuring that

the collected data possesses the thematic depth necessary for high-impact journal publication.

Validation Framework and Methodological Steps

Phase 1: Conceptual Blueprinting

Alignment Matrix: Does every open-ended question map directly back to the study's central research questions or specific theoretical constructs [2,5]. Novice researchers often make the mistake of drafting interview prompts based on casual interest or broad topical relevance [15]. This uncalibrated approach creates "scope creep," resulting in large volumes of unstructured data that do not actually address the study's primary objectives [2, 7]. An alignment matrix forces a direct, traceable connection between three distinct levels of research architecture [5]; the Overarching Research Questions (ORQs) which are the macro-level inquiries driving the study, the Theoretical or Conceptual Framework referring to the specific constructs, nodes, or variables derived from established literature [2] and finally the micro-level interview prompts which are the actual words spoken to the participant [17].

Structural Progression; Funnelling and Chronological Sequencing: Has the questionnaire been organized chronologically, guiding participants from broad, low-stakes introductory questions to complex, deeply reflective prompts [15,13,16]. The structural progression of an interview protocol must be intentionally organized to manage the participant's anxiety, cognitive load, and psychological comfort [15].

Linguistic Calibration: Making sure that the formulation of the questions adequately incorporates open-ended syntax (e.g., starting with *"How..."* or *"Why..."*) while filtering out leading phrases or professional terminology [5,17]. Linguistic calibration involves the deliberate, item-by-item refinement of question syntax to guarantee semantic clarity, conversational naturalness, and absolute neutrality.

Phase 2: Content Validation via Expert Panel Review

Panel Assembly: Recruit a panel of 3 to 5 independent experts specializing in the target subject matter and qualitative methodology [3,8].

Structured Assessment Matrix: Instruct reviewers to grade every item on an explicit evaluation scale assessing four distinct criteria [18,19]:

Evaluation Criterion	Core Objective
Relevance	Does the question align with the scope of the study? [1,18]
Clarity	Is the sentence structure clear, explicit, and easy to digest? [3,19]
Neutrality	Is the phrase free from bias or leading vocabulary? [5,20]
Necessity	Does the prompt add value without creating redundancy? [17, 20]

Consensus and Revision: Modify, reword, or eliminate questions flagged by the panel to achieve uniform construct alignment and calculate content validity indices if applicable [18,19].

Phase 3: Cognitive Interviewing (Pilot Testing)

Sampling: Conduct qualitative testing sessions with a small pilot cohort of 5 to 10 individuals matching the demographics of the target population [21,22].

The Four-Stage Cognitive Model: Apply Tourangeau's cognitive model to assess how participants process each question:

- *Comprehension*: How do respondents interpret the phrasing? [21,24]
- *Retrieval*: What memories or experiences does the prompt pull from them? [22,23]
- *Judgment*: How do they determine if their retrieved thoughts fit the question? [22,25]
- *Response*: How do they articulate their final verbal answer? [23,25]

Elicitation Techniques: Combine think-aloud protocols (asking respondents to talk through their mental processing) with retrospective verbal probing (e.g., *"What specific experiences came to mind when I used the term 'workplace dynamics'?"*) [21,23].

Phase 4: Final Refinement and Audit Trail

- **Thematic Error Mapping**: Document instances of participant hesitation, confusion, or context misinterpretation during the pilot phase [21,25].
- **Optimization**: Rephrase problematic items, solidify transitions, and integrate explicit follow-up prompts [16, 17].
- **Audit Trail Compilation**: Archive all iterative changes from the initial draft to the final questionnaire, establishing methodological transparency for the manuscript's appendix [13,14].

CONCLUSION

The validation of a qualitative questionnaire is a fundamental necessity that bridges the gap between raw research objectives and credible empirical findings. Moving away from the misconception that qualitative tools only require casual assembly, this four-phase framework establishes a rigorous protocol entered on structural neutrality, linguistic calibration, and expert scrutiny. By embedding systematic content reviews and cognitive interviewing into the pre-fieldwork stage, researchers can effectively mitigate confirmation bias, identify structural vulnerabilities, and address participant comprehension barriers before formal data collection begins.

Ultimately, documenting this validation path provides peer-reviewed journals with a transparent audit trail that satisfies international standards for qualitative research rigor, specifically ensuring dependability, credibility, and confirmability. This framework ensures that the resulting qualitative questionnaire does not merely collect superficial responses, but serves as a high-fidelity instrument capable of generating rich and thematic data.

REFERENCES

1. Brod M, Tesler LE, Christensen TL. Qualitative research and content validity: Developing robust instruments and methods in outcomes research. *Value Health*. 2009;12(8):1163–1170.
2. Creswell JW, Poth CN. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks (CA): SAGE Publications; 2018.
3. DeJonckheere M, Vaughn LM. Semistructured interviewing in primary care research. *Fam Med Com Health*. 2019;7(1):e000057.
4. Busetto L, Wick W, Gumbinger C. How to use and assess qualitative research methods. *Popul Health Manag*. 2020;23(5):359-366.
5. Castillo-Montoya M. Preparing for interview research: The interview protocol refinement framework. *Qual Rep*. 2016;21(5):811-831.
6. Sierpe A, Leyenaar JK, Saunders CH. Qualitative Approaches in Health Services Research: A Methodological Primer. Hospital Pediatrics. 2025 May 1;15(5):e222-6.
7. Agostinho S. Naturalistic inquiry in e-learning research. International Journal of Qualitative Methods. 2005 Mar;4(1):13-26.
8. Morse JM, Barrett M, Mayan M, Olson K, Spiers J. Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *Int J Qual Methods*. 2002;1(2):13-22.
9. AlGethami HJ, Altamran MA, Khan MS, Zaman KMN, Alswaied N. Awareness and Knowledge Towards Pediatric and Adult COVID-19 Vaccination: A Cross Sectional Community-based Study in Saudi Arabia. Mater Sociomed. 2021 Dec;33(4):262-268. doi: 10.5455/msm.2021.33.262-268. PMID: 35210948; PMCID: PMC8812373.
10. Panchsheel S, Shibly KM. Knowledge and awareness regarding hiv/aids among first year medical undergraduates: a cross-sectional study. International Journal of Medical Research & Health Sciences. 2015 Jan 1;4(4):868-71.
11. Alanazi MD, Alanazi KK, Alshaikh A, Alenazi DS, Khan MS. Knowledge and Awareness towards Mother to Child Infections among Married Women in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Int J Med Res Prof. 2021 Nov; 7(6): 30-34.
12. Alyousif AH, Tobail A, Khan MS, AlBrahim DH, Elnaiem EE, Alghatani NA, Alayed OA. Knowledge and Awareness Regarding Hazardous Waste Management Among Healthcare Workers in a Secondary Care Hospital in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Saudi J Med. 2026;11(5):160-5.
13. Lin FH, Tsai SB, Lee YC, Hsiao CF, Zhou J, Wang J, Shang Z. Empirical research on Kano's model and customer satisfaction. PLoS One. 2017 Sep 5;12(9):e0183888. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0183888. PMID: 28873418; PMCID: PMC5584930.
14. Howsawi AA, Althageel MF, Mohaideen NK, Khan MS, Alzahrani AS, Alkhadir MA, Alaqeel SM, Alkathiri MA, Hawsawi RA. Application of the Kano model to determine quality attributes of patient's care at the primary healthcare centers of the Ministry of Health in Saudi Arabia, 2019. Journal of Family and Community Medicine. 2020 Sep 1;27(3):178-85.
15. Kallio H, Pietilä AM, Johnson M, Kangasniemi M. Systematic methodological review: Developing a semi-structured interview guide for a qualitative study. *J Adv Nurs*. 2016;72(12):2954-2965.
16. Tsang S, Royse CF, Terkawi AS. Guidelines for developing, translating, and validating a questionnaire. *Saudi J Anaesth*. 2017;11(Suppl 1):S80–S89.
17. Majid MAA, Othman M, Mohamad SF, Lim SA, Yusof A. Interview Protocol Refinement: Fine-Tuning Qualitative Instruments. *Qual Rep*. 2018;23(11):2704-2715.
18. Polit DF, Beck CT. The content validity index: Are you sure you know what's being reported? Critique and recommendations. *Res Nurs Health*. 2006;29(5):489-497.
19. Lynn MR. Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nurs Res*. 1986;35(6):382-385.
20. Wynd CA, Schmidt B, Schaefer MA. Two quantitative approaches for estimating content validity. *West J Nurs Res*. 2003;25(5):508-518.
21. Willis GB. *Cognitive interviewing: A tool for improving questionnaire design*. Thousand Oaks (CA): SAGE Publications; 2005.
22. Tourangeau R, Rips LJ, Rasinski K. *The psychology of survey response*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2000.
23. Beatty PC, Willis GB. Research synthesis: The practice of cognitive interviewing. *Public Opin Q*. 2007;71(2):287-311.
24. Drennan J. Cognitive interviewing: Verbal data in the design and testing of questionnaires. *J Adv Nurs*. 2003;42(1):57-63.
25. Ryan K, Gannon-Slater N, Culbertson MJ. Improving survey methods with cognitive interviews in small-and medium-scale evaluations. American Journal of Evaluation. 2012 Sep;33(3):414-30.