

**About “The Quality of Life in Late-Stage Dementia (QUALID) Scale”****Bagherzadeh R<sup>1</sup> and Farahani MA<sup>2</sup>**<sup>1</sup>English Department, School of Health Management and Information Sciences, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Iran<sup>2</sup>Nursing Care Research Center, Medical-Surgical Nursing Department, School of Nursing and Midwifery, Iran University of Medical Science, Iran**\*Corresponding author:**

Rafat Bagherzadeh,  
 English Department, School of Health  
 Management and Information Sciences, Iran  
 University of Medical Sciences, Iran,  
 E-mail: bagherzadeh.r@iums.ac.ir,  
 rbagher@yahoo.com

Received: 16 Feb 2022

Accepted: 04 Mar 2022

Published: 11 Mar 2022

J Short Name: AJSCCR

**Copyright:**

©2022 Bagherzadeh R. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and build upon your work non-commercially.

**Citation:**

Bagherzadeh R, About “The Quality of Life in Late-Stage Dementia (QUALID) Scale”.

Ame J Surg Clin Case Rep. 2022; 4(7): 1-2

**Editorial**

We are writing with regards to the paper entitled “The quality of life in late-stage dementia (QUALID) scale” by Myron Weiner published in your prestigious journal in November 1999. We are conducting a translation and psychometric research in Iran. Since we wanted to adopt the questionnaire developed by Dr. Weiner, we contacted him and explained the purpose of our study. He was so kind to provide us with the questionnaire which was then, according to WHO guidelines translated into Persian and then back-translated. At the pilot testing, the questionnaire was administered to 10 individuals from the target population (here, caregivers from family members) who were not among the research population. The purpose was to find out if the language of the questionnaire was at the level of their understanding and to better identify potential errors, thus the participants were asked to feel free to express their opinions about the ‘ambiguity’, and ‘difficulty’ of the items. The individuals encountered some problems in understanding the meanings of some items. The items were reviewed and checked again and the issue was raised in a meeting with our colleagues at English department and native-like speakers, and they unanimously confirmed the ambiguity of the phrases. Therefore, the problems encountered by caregivers were not in fact due to the translation of the items but due to the vague expressions in the original questionnaire. Moreover, some options consist of two or three different adverbs of frequency and of course with different meanings at the same time.

For example, in parts A – H, the phrase “less than once each day” is used. The problem that we encountered is the abundant use of such expression which we have rarely heard or read in any En-

glish academic texts. The use of such phrases are misleading and ambiguous for the participants. Items, as stated by Korb (2012) [1], must be written clearly and should not be misunderstood by participants. Another problem raised regarding parts L and J where the items are simultaneously measuring two conditions. According to the pilot sample (care givers), items, such as “more than half the time; sometimes”, “half the time; never”, “less than half the time; often or frequently”, consist of two different adverbs of frequency. They are quite different in nature and refer to different time intervals. People perceive two different meaning from these two adverbs. These are in line with what Streiner et al. (2015) [3] stated that adjectives can be interpreted differently by different people. He also believed that a part of the problem is the vagueness of the terms themselves. Moreover, adjectives have different meanings in a variety of contexts. Likewise, according to Parducci (1968) [2], respondents’ interpretation of quantifiers is intensely affected by their own frequency of engaging in such behaviours. Consequently, if these types of adjectives or adverbs of frequency are used, the researchers according to Korb (2012) [4] embark on measuring participants’ understanding of an event phenomenon, which does yield a reliable and valid study.

Therefore, it is difficult to make comparisons of people’s perception of ambiguous adverbs of frequency. In these situation as Streiner et al. (2015) stated using the actual numbers would be the best and most precise means of measuring participants’ understanding.

Therefore, researchers should be cautious and experienced in creating instruments which is a really time-consuming task and needs a lot of effort in the process of producing a reliable and valid tool. The participants should have the same understanding of all items.

As Korb (2012) stated researchers are responsible for taking participants' perception and understanding into consideration while designing measurement tools since any words and expressions which cause a wrong answer from the participants is considered an error and it should be avoided. Taken together, the researcher must devote significant time for designing, revising, pilot testing, and correcting the instrument in order to guarantee that everything is clear and understandable to the target population.

## References

1. Korb KA. Conducting educational research: Writing questionnaire items. 2012.
2. Parducci A. Often is often. *American Psychologist*. 1968; 23(11): 828.
3. Streiner DL, Norman GR, Cairney J. *Health measurement scales: a practical guide to their development and use*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2015.
4. WHO, WHOQOL User Manual. Geneva: WHO, 2012.