

**Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the  
Null and Negative Findings Gone?**

**Panelists:**

Robin Perry

Katharine Briar-Lawson

Matthew Stagner

Joan Zlotnik

*Please note: The following is a direct transcription and has not been edited.*

---

Speaker 1: Good morning and welcome to the session, The REST of the Evidence; where have all the Null and Negative Findings Gone? I just want to make a few introductory comments before I introduce our esteemed panel here, now some of you may know although a recent New Yorker article serves the impetus for this presentation. The topic is one that has been surfaced or has surfaced and has resurfaced from time to time across all fields of study and research. Typically within the broader context of discussions about publication bias and positive results bias and the cultures in context that reinforce such, philosophical or epistemological questions and discussions regarding the value and role of verification versus falsification as part of the scientific method, study design and data considerations and trends including researcher biases and analyses practices that contribute to these trends, the perceived role of evaluations of interventions and utility of generating findings, the role of academic culture in reinforcing these biases and the intersection and interaction of politics and research.

Reporting or publication bias just one principle element of the New Yorker article has been addressed by a number of scholars over the last 30 years. A small highlight, some of, which you maybe familiar with, if you go back to the 1970's, late 1970's, and Robert Dr. Rosenthal who was in the field of psychology's perspective and research that showed and I think he coined the phrase File Drawer effect or File Drawer Problem demonstrating that many significant or I shouldn't say I see, I would say significant but, very rigorous study sometimes sat in the drawers failing to be published due to the inability to show statistically significant results. In the late 80's, and in the early 90's, they were some very well publicized articles in Lancet as well as Controlled Clinical Trials, that's again raised this issue about publication bias and biases that impacted the, in fact I think it was the Easterbrook article that demonstrated that sometimes there was a greater likelihood of very poor study showing significant findings getting published versus more rigorous studies in medical research that showed null findings being published within medical journals.

For those who are in the field of social work, which is my field of study, many of us are probably aware of William Epstein's research that demonstrated Confirmational Response Bias among Social Work Journals. And I think more recent sort of article that expands or goes beyond confirmational based bias and publication bias but, gets into more details and I think in a much more critically mannered way is Ian Estes [*phonetic*] [00:03:02] article why most published research findings are false where he looks at some

**Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the  
Null and Negative Findings Gone?**

of the methodological issues and argues that many research claims are depend upon the study of power and bias and suggests a more as you say a different method that looks at the ratio of true to no relationships among relationships probed in each scientific field as a better gauge of the value and utility of generative findings on any particular topic. So this topic has been the focus and has been an emphasis of focus among many scientific and social scientific fields, the American Association for Science, an organization to, which I belong, has been very, very critical of these developments within the biomedical and the scientific fields.

So much so that in 2008, the AAAS award for scientific freedom responsibility went to Dr. Drummond Renee from the Health Policy Study Institute at the University of California, San Francisco and if any of you are familiar with some of his works and his writings, he has been a very strong advocate that's been advocating for scientific integrity, criticizing scientific misconduct and exposing it, advocating for much more research accountability and looks at the interrelationship of these things with publication as well as research bias and I suggest you to read some of his editorials. But some of the examples that I have provided you have been in a variety of different sets of field, none of, which actually of these examples are in the child welfare field. In this panel today, we will ask and we will explore if the same concerns holds true for child welfare research. We have today at our panel a very distinguished panel. First, I would like to introduce on the far right as many of you may know, all of these people already is Dr. Matt Stagner who is the executive director of Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago. And you see next to him is Dr. Joan Zlotnik who is the director of the National Association of Social Worker's Policy Institute and last but, not least to my immediate right, Dr. Katharine Briar-Lawson who is Dean and Professor of the School of Social Welfare at the State University of New York and Albany.

So we have people who are leaders in our field, leaders in research and leaders in their own right. What we are going to do today, the format for this panel discussion is going to be as such, each presenter will be provided with ten minutes to provide an overview of their perspective in this particular issue in response to the question that's posed by the title of this particular session. This will be followed by an opportunity have the audience inputting questions of the comments that they have made, have a critical discussion in dialog, after all it's that objective role of critical discussion for, which we advance knowledge closer to the truth, and this sets my philosophical bias. Then each presenter will have an opportunity to highlight the specific action steps, because remedies and action steps are very important discussing this issue for addressing issues denoted in their perspective and also given the feedback that they have had in critical questions that you've posed as an audience. And this will be followed by an additional time to address audience questions and dialogs. That said I would like to provide opportunity, Dr. Stagner will be going first.

Dr. Matt Stagner: Great, thank you, and it's great to see such a good turnout for this panel, I think it's a very important topic, I am not sure I have much to add to it, but, I will talk for a few minutes and then we are really looking forward to an exchange with the audience on this topic. So my perspective on this comes primarily from three vantage

### Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?

points. So one was being a federal project officer and trying to generate research on child welfare topics while I worked in the federal government in the 1990's. In the early 2000's, I worked in the early days of the Campbell Collaboration and had some experience attempting to do Campbell reviews and dealing with the kinds of issues that come up in that Julia Littell, and many of you know that Bryn Mawr has really been the primary child welfare person working on the Campbell Collaboration, but, its attempts to synthesize work led me to understand some of these issues that we are talking about today in more detail.

And then working back at Chapin Hall again and thinking about process of both investigator driven research and funded or contractual research and the differences between those two. So I think others on the panel can probably speak better to that issue of investigator driven research and what happens, so I will talk more about those first two. The one framework for me on this is what, coming from Chicago I think of the Siskel and Ebert effect that when we do programs, we expect to get two thumbs up, two thumbs down or sometimes one thumb up and one thumb down. And then we move onto the next thing and both in movie reviews and social policy research, there is generally much more to learn and just what direction the thumb is going, and I think we don't do that as much we should and I will talk a little bit more about ways that we might do that.

The problem of disappearing null results and the Campbell perspective on that I think child welfare is both blessed and cursed by the lack of research evidence that we have, so most of the science that Robin was talking about really comes from places, which just have produced over the last few decades, many more findings some of, which have disappeared. So I think that is a good news story in the sense that we can do better as we generate more but, it's also a sad state of the field that we have not done as much as we should and that we probably face this problem just, I guess my perspective would be, it may not be as dire in child welfare simply because there is less out there but, an interest to debate that proposition.

Related to the problem of not studying things, I think is the, once is not enough phenomenon that we often think if we study something once and we get the thumb up or the thumb down then we move on to the next thing, and I think we need as a field to think about why we do that, part of that is the policy, focus disease that we get excited about something and we put a big effort into studying it, and by the time those results come out, we've gotten excited about another thing and we've moved on, but, I also think it does really to this scientific process in the discouragement of a null result that leads us then to instead of saying this is still an important problem, this intervention may not have fixed it, let's double down, change what we are doing, move forward, I think we as a field are very quick moving a new direction or that we redefine a new direction, so that we are not accumulating the kind of data that in the Campbell world, how many of you know what a funnel plot is, have you seen a funnel plot, Mark has seen a funnel plot, Mark confess to be, Mark is hallucinating.

The concept of the funnel plot is that if you have many studies and you look at the published literature, you should be seeing a tighter set of findings as sample size

### Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?

increases. So there is still going to be variation and on average there might be a positive effect or a negative effect, as the sample size gets smaller, there is going to be more variation. So if you plotted 100 studies, you should see random variation across all of those that begins to look like a funnel, and a lot of fields have taken a look at an issue and seen that, if you look at the published results, half or a third of the funnel is missing. The null results, especially the null results in the upper end where the sample sizes are small never appear, probably not because the studies weren't done but, because they have never saw the light of day. So there is an interaction between the publication of null results and the size of the study.

And I guess from my perspective that's also the question of the dollars put into the study and the funder of the study. So if someone who has done a lot of federal work both on the inside and the outside, it's very hard to hide from defense. You have a contract that is publicly known that there is a contract, there are reporting mechanisms that generally get to the federal government and then get out into the light of day, so those are bigger studies and once that have mechanisms that make it hard for you not to engage even when you have a null result. So you are filling in the bottom part of the funnel and at least my own personal experiences often with sadly non-positive results but, those are at least made public, it's more in the exploratory small sample size and potentially again investigator initiative. So what we can do about this and I will come back to this when we have had some more discussion and talk about action steps. But I think why do we see the null results is then a separate question from or what can we do when we find them versus what about these missing studies from the funnel plot. I think we are still not doing enough with null results both during the course of study as well as after studies to understand everything that we can.

Generally, I think we are, not understanding the treatments well enough, but, my concern is becoming increasingly that we don't understand the control group condition or the counterfactual well enough. So we have a null result, but, we really don't know whether we had an effect is just a youth and child welfare are exposed to so many other interventions, something else is having an eco effect. So we are saying we have a null effect when compared to nothing we might be having a positive effect that's a hypothesis, because we just, we usually don't put the efforts into studies to really understand the control group, and we presented yesterday on the set of findings from the multi-site evaluation of foster youth services or the Chafee study as we call it, mostly null findings and often because the control group reported receiving a very similar service. We were guilty of basically asking them one question, did you receive a service like this but, the fact is so many of them said, yes, made us think, we should have done much more to understand what was the service they received and even though we went into a thinking this intervention was unique or powerful or more than usual, I think often it's not. So again those are the results that have disappeared because of the nature of the study but, we are not getting enough to move science forward based on the null results. So we both need to dig in and gather more data during the process but, we also need afterwards to really dig in and understand the data not just say this was a negative result, let's move on to the next thing, in particular the point of the counterfactual and understanding there, so I will stop there and we will continue the conversation.

### Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?

Dr. Joan Zlotnik: Oh, great, I am going to take another tack on this topic and talk a little about how role might relate to how one uses research and how one uses sort of positive or negative or null findings in that context, and I was going to think about this in terms of my 20 some years working in the National Social Work Organizations and what I was looking for and I was going to talk about it in terms of like some negative terms maybe like cherry picking and things like that, however one of the sessions yesterday that Vivian Singh from W. T Grant that she talked about something was the tactical use of research.

And that just sounds so, so much better than cherry picking and also, one of the other things I had came up in that session yesterday is our research doesn't speak for itself, so the role of sort of interpreting research, whatever the findings is becomes very important and that very much relates to what Matt was mentioning around the counterfactuals. So I just wanted to talk a little about my role and therefore how research might be used and accessed. A little about where I see negative findings occurring in child welfare research and then maybe in terms of some recommendations later, getting back to the issue of systematic reviews, but, in order to have systematic reviews that are meaningful you also have to have research in the first place, and so this sort of issue of the dearth of bodies of child welfare research is critical and something that we need to address and I think as Rick Barr said yesterday in the plenary, if that sort of more of a culture evaluation in child welfare than we've had a research and one of the other things I discovered in number of years ago is even sometimes when things has positive findings they don't always make their way into publications.

And I encountered that with a relatively prestigious child welfare journal where three different people contacted me to say that they submitted something to this journal and it was around workforce issues, and that it got sent back to them without ever getting reviewed basically kind of saying our readers really aren't interested in this. And luckily there was a change in editors of that journal and I talked to the new editor and he said, ah are you kidding me, well tell people to re-submit those articles and one of the people was a relatively new, recent doctoral person, I have known what her research was, when she was working on her doctorate and I said to her, did you ever publish it, and she said, no I got this depressing letter from the editor of the journal kind of saying you know we're not really interested in this and I never did anything with it and luckily with some encouragement she did get it published in another journal. So that's sort of one piece in terms of some levels of bias that you might not even see unless there are in some position where people come to you with their problems, and you discover that, you have several colleagues who have had the same exact problem.

So that's a little of my role, the other role is, I have spent all these years working for National Social Work Organizations, so what am I looking for, what am I paid to look for, I'm paid to look for things about the effectiveness of social work, not so easy to find because there is few intervention studies that are specifically looking at, this social worker did a better job than this other person partly because there was so many intervening variables, level of training, who the other people were, who the clients were, what the organizational climate was and such but, when I started out back in the late 80's,

### Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?

early 90's I pretty much just looked for things that said social work made a difference, social workers were more likely to stay in the agency, an agency that had people with MSWs, had less turnover and I actually didn't look at things that didn't say that because I needed to pull together those briefs that said that social work was important because that's what I was getting paid for, and I was you know, we have been doing that for a long time, but, sort of in the middle of that, I went to like I got my doctorate. And I began to read more than the little abstract or the sort of two page brief that someone had done on something and discover that there was often you know much more in the whole study or even in the whole article than they are, had been.

However I still I am looking for that information about how does social work make a difference, and so when I see things that come out about that, I pay attention, but, then I also learned I better pay attention to those things or those people who say it doesn't make a difference because if I don't pay attention to it and begin to understand it, it's going to come up as some congressional hearing or somewhere else and they are going to say, well you are saying this, but, Dr. Stagner who has the high level of respect, he has been at ASP, he has been at Urban, he has been in Chapin Hall says that and I am going to be like, I wasn't aware of that those studies. So the, it became incredibly important to know, and it also became important to know well what was the outcome that people were looking for, having started the first family preservation program in the state of Virginia, when the study came out from ASP, from the folks at Chapin Hall saying that family preservation wasn't more effective than other ways because these kids still ended up in foster care, I remember immediately calling Julia Littell, I didn't really know at the time and saying but, what exactly did you look at it and did you, did the evaluation plans before the services got started.

And so maybe they ended up in foster care but, maybe they were there for less time, maybe the placement was more meaningful, maybe and I sort of went through all of the maybes just as, I sort of have a pretty good handle on retention studies in child welfare and some studies say, well if you have someone within MSW they stay longer and some studies say if you have some within MSW they stay shorter or what are they doing, where are they going, are they going to serve those same people but, in another setting, do any of us keep the same job for a long time, we've all known each other a long time and we have all been in a bunch of different places in that time, is that not necessarily bad so, so when we get null findings. First of all null doesn't mean that it didn't work, it just didn't work any better than something else. Where we get negative findings, we need to really understand what those might mean and really be able to explain and understand it.

And I think that the other piece that having spent nine years running the institute for the advancement of social work research that developing a stronger research enterprise and sort of more focus on interventions is critically important because a lot of our research has not been intervention related, and sort of studying treatments and even in our looking at social work effectiveness, it's not necessarily related to client outcomes, it's often related to issues that are sort of agency focused, it is about retention, it's about organizational culture and climate, it's about supervisory support, so we need to do sort of a better job when we are asking some of our questions and sort of trying to figure out,

### Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?

can we sort of get to those issues about what makes the difference for kids and families and when we have this sort of evaluation culture and much of the evaluation is post, *[indiscernible]* [00:23:26] if you look at some of Mary's Collins where going back and looking at evaluating the interment moving programs, well they haven't started out with the same measures or metrics and I think the children's parents are doing a lot better job of that now. We really need to better understand I think what we are looking at in terms of the research and evaluation enterprise overall and to really understand how we can sort of build the bodies of research and know that those negative findings can be very important.

Because otherwise someone else might do the same thing you were going to do because they didn't know someone else tried it because it never got published. I was doing a presentation or a workshop recently, because I knew I was going to do this, and I asked the people in the group, I said, you know if you are working on a study and you don't actually find that the intervention worked the way you thought, do you submitted for publication and all these people said, oh no because it didn't work. So I said, well we have the problem, and some people think they are not going to submit it because of the file drawer problem and no one else is going to publish it and they only want to publish positive things. So we need to also know where the fugitive literature is also, because everything doesn't get published, so we need sort of a good cohort that's where places like they tell off the information gateway are a great resource because they have collected all of those things, that mean I had been published might have been done besides the other things that sometimes have been done and not been published and sit on a shelf, so well I will stop there.

Dr. Katharine Briar-Lawson: Thank you, I think both of you really set the stage for a wonderful discussion, hopefully we can build an agenda that's far more robust because of just the stimulating comments you offered, you also make my job a little easier because I can say ditto to so many things. I just a spend a minute kind of unpacking the notion of the differential between having negative effects or a null hypothesis that's proven but, you have positive effects with both the control and the experimental design. So I think that there is a lot of richness in that discussion. Also I wanted to talk as the others did about the need for much more aggressive developmental research than traditional event intervention research, and then finally to build on Joan's points about infrastructure, so hopefully that will lead to some even further good discussion. So the wonderful question about what do we do with outcomes that suggest no difference, leads to a really thoughtful unpacking that was done recently in the last couple of decades if you will by Kim Hoagwood when the very important Bickman's study of Fort Bragg's continuum of care now a part of the systems of care study showed that the Fort Bragg study compared to the comparison site had no differential positive effects, in other words the difference wasn't substantiated and the intervention was more powerful than the comparison or control group.

Well here is Kim Hoagwood at NIMH who said now wait a minute, you know we have been working on this trajectory, really building coordinated care systems you know better of comes from vulnerable children and families, let's unpack this, and she did and she

### Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?

said, let's look at the fact that these positive effects were both the comparison group and the intervention group experiment that was showing positive effects invite us to drill down and look at what level of variables, what were the key components in the comparison of the control side that needed to be understood and I think that this gets to Matt's point that very often I don't want to say we were clear but, we think we have got a good comparison or control. And we have not thoughtfully looked at the dense variables in that comparison or control group, but, may actually have some of the same differential positive outcomes that were seen or hope to see in the experimental group.

Hoagwood went on to say, let's take a minute and look at whether or not the, in this landmark Fort Bragg study whether the theory of intervention was correct, whether the theory of a continuum of care now systems of care was correct, whether the variables looked at that were systems levels should have included clinical level variables, so as she impacted, she basically set the stage for not just inviting many more studies but, not throwing the baby out with a bath, and I think given the paucity of group research in child welfare and the absence both of the science of social work and signs of child welfare and the more we can unpack what we may see as these null effects, it may give us a chance to look at what worked for whom, which in the end is really what we care about particularly as we look at disparities and disproportionalities.

When I think of the incredible work that was done in family preservation and the fact that home builders would keep coming up with data that would show at least when I was a commissioner in the State of Washington that families of Color were doing the very best with family preservation services at least the home builder's model, and I look at our debate and I think, no we need to go back to some of those early homebuilder studies and better understand disproportionality in view of whether or not families are getting the quality of services, why don't we call them in these times that they were getting them. It also really digs the question of and we talked about Julia Littell's work so important, in her critic of multiple systemic therapy as well as the whole question of how do, we transport it to our field finding some other fields, motivational interviewing for sometime with seniors just not really appropriate. Now it's hard to find a state that's not looking at motivational interviewing as a very important intervention.

So when we look at the first blessed findings, it's easy to throw the baby out with a bath and I think that what Kim did for systems of care, we now need to be mindful of our role in doing for other areas of promising, but potentially not very robust differential outcomes. That really leads to them the question and built on Matt's point that the paucity of really rigorous research, intervention research and Joan's as well in child welfare invites us to rethink how we've setup our enterprise.

As in the science of child welfare, science of social work, we're not going to see the outcomes that we pledged to create for the 21st century. And so it allows us to ask the question, do we want to continue a conventional research design, which separates as I guess, we said yesterday, the evaluation from the intervention process or do we want to consider the old developmental research design, first introduced to us by Thomas and Rothman and we've seen it a number of research areas, task under practice and so forth,

### Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?

where instead of the two being segregated and then the report sits on a shelf or may be it gets published, but it still doesn't see the light of day.

Do we want to look at developmental research where instead of all these experimental conditions, where the everything is about control with the hypothesis don't change, the intervention doesn't change and just look at differential outcomes, comparison our control group and the experimental group, do we want to look at developmental research where we spend a lot of time in design, development and research and the researcher is very connected to the intervention process.

And the design is an ongoing corrective, iterative, feedback driven series and improvement and the research is both formative and summative. And then the methods are multiple, it's not just quantitative, it's also qualitative. And many of the variables build down to the voices of those being served, so you really clear that the intervention has that the impacts that hopefully we want to see. And we also look at the conditions to facilitate what outcomes are so potentially positive.

Now more recently Samsa [*phonetic*] [00:33:06] and others have fostered studies that get us beyond the pilot, they get us beyond the one time study and have overtime said, let's do more developmental research. And so as we look at the need to really shift, I want to just bring it home to our academics and too many of our researchers and say that, absent in infrastructure to focus on intervention or developmental research. It's going to be very hard to get to this rigor that we seek to the science that we seek to even get to the point where we can debate, you know, some of the known issues. When I look at how much money goes in to child welfare, and I look at the fact that many practitioners think themselves as pioneering in testing new approaches, but there were never is framed as the clinical researcher, as the clinician scientist as, you know, field units, as test and design labs for developmental research. It really invites us to think about our agencies and our schools of social work in partnership as hubs of research, it invites us to share as I've had one faculty member who has actually been presenting here, our faculty as informatics professors.

It invites us to think about tenure in very different ways, where the intervention researcher, the faculty member designing testing developmentally improving overtime he is going have probably half the number of publications that somebody who is just minding secondary data will have, so it invites us to think about an overhaul not just of how you do social work, and the academy and our research partners but also what our agencies look like.

And when I sort of nurture the development of the public child welfare in a fairly new journal, it was in fact because I had heard about so many studies that were rejected not just because of null issues, we simply didn't have enough outlets. There is so much research going on in child welfare, much of it and my estimation at that time was probably 80% of certain kinds of studies were not seeing the light today. So the Public Child Welfare journal is a fairly new journal, it doesn't answer the question of how do we generate the rigor that we're seeking, but it does at least give us another venue.

**Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the  
Null and Negative Findings Gone?**

I think finally we need to be also working with journal reviewers, and all of them need to be much more rigorous in sending back an article saying, okay, you know, we've got null results here, but let's find out who had worked for, under what conditions because there may be serendipities and at the end of the day, we are all as researchers looking for serendipities that may actually be the lead to a whole new genre of research. So there is no time to talk about implementation science, transitional research, but I think that's also part of the robust rollout.

Speaker 2: Thank you very much. What we're going to do now. We're going to take about 10 minutes or so, open up the floor to questions and comments before we go back to our panelists at which point in time they are going to provide us some more detailed action steps. And then we'll have another opportunity for discussion and debate including some questions from myself as well.

If you are going to ask a question, I like you to please take the mic, I've been reminded to ask people to please speak in to the microphone, if you have any question at this time for any of our panelists or for myself.

Speaker 3: I'm Sharon Newburg-Rinn; I'm from Children's Bureau. And I would just like to know if you the panelists or anybody else in the room has an idea, if the federal government can or should be doing anything about this issue?

Speaker 4: That pushes us that takes away all my action steps, because a few of them were directed toward the federal government. So I will have less to say later. So again I think it is useful to think about federal contracted research as a different enterprise than investigator driven research where the federal government may be one possible funder. And so at Children's Bureau Grant Program or the NIH world, I think it has some different ideas and I'll speak mainly to the first and then others might speak more to the second.

So partly I think it's, there certainly are not going to be great new research resources in the coming years. We have to do better with what we have or possibly even a little bit less, so it's the reallocation of some of those resources, I think toward the requirement in the contract world of a little bit getting away from the separation of research and intervention encouraging even contracted researchers to work more upfront with interventionists to understand those interventions.

I think the general form of the contract is assume the intervention is what it's going to be come in and put a research structure on top of it, be nice to them, so that at least let you in the room, but don't really roll up your sleeves and get the amount of time you need upfront to understand and adapt the research to the questions of the intervention.

Then I think, secondly is I said again and again, understanding the control condition or the counterfactual in more depth and that takes a lot of resources. So in general we put our resources in to measuring an outcome instead of measuring the process but we need

### Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?

to both measure the process on the intervention as well as on the other side and that's so complicated when it's not at all happening in one place.

The intervention tends to channel youth or families or kids in to one place where you can really see a process, the control group is usually going off in a 100 different directions. So allocating resources to more of the front end, more of the process and I think more of the back end, so that even an individual contractor could be asked to do the type of work that Katharine talked about with Kim Hoagwood.

So now do the report, but also you have six more months to critic your own report, get the data out there, have other people look at it, instead of letting it disappear, which is usually the dollars and the project are coming together at the end and you are barely getting a final report in and then people are off on to something else, so putting more resources in to those areas, which necessarily probably means, taking resources from other parts of the study.

Speaker 5: I guess the other thing that I would sort of want to say in that respect has to do with how the different parts of the government work together, so there is a number of people who have been funded, say doing child maltreatment research through the National Institutes of Health or through CDC or work of, work of the Children's Bureau since the Children's Bureau used to have kind of what was their sort of research and discretionary funds and that appropriation was eliminated in 1996.

So you know there sort of an advocacy piece on, you know, could it ever return, it was kind of funneled the way in to the end score study. So you know, how you build within the Children's Bureau sort of more of a researcher initiated program but then how did the different federal partners potentially work together to look at that sort of crossover of sort of how child welfare and public health intersect, so that people who are doing research in the child welfare fields can, it can occur in as rigorous way as possible, and you know, I very much agree sort of on my list of recommendations also that those evaluation or research questions and the data points and I'll need to kind of get established in the beginning and not afterwards.

Speaker 5: I think the question is a wonderful one and it really invites us to think about investing and reengineering of systems and practice and we can't do that with one study, it's got to be developmental, iterative tenures, I remember that years ago, ASP had funded me to do a pilot in Florida with substance exposed newborns and their families and the interventions weren't working.

And suddenly we found that the interventions that might work, might be parents themselves who were in recovery, doing all the outreach, while everybody else, all these professionals same race with resources could be consultants to these parenting who are in recovery and obviously at power house.

Well, they gave me permission to change my intervention to test a whole different set of what interventions would work best. And so that was ASP thinking about a

### Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?

reengineering process rather than just holding me to the original design. So I think overtime if our paradigm shift in terms of what the relationship is of the researcher to the intervention process and the period of investment gives rise to reengineering process, we might see not just the impacting around null issues but iterative improvements to proximate the angle that we see, which is really good outcomes and understanding why they worked and for whom.

Speaker 2: And if I could comment, I think the federal government is already doing a lot and I think one of the best things it can happen is that any federally funded project, any data that generates from that is made available for others to inspect and utilize, I think it was mentioned, I think that Matt had mentioned and this is a big issue that the lack of replication as well as reexamination of existing data is a big issue that sometimes impacts upon I think the value utility of generated findings.

I think it goes back, I think the best changes where the change is most needed is in a culture, is in a cultural values about what knowledge is and how do we advance knowledge at when you have budding researchers in the universities that are being trained to be researchers, be scientists and so forth and more importantly the cultural change, it permeates in academia and it diffuses over in to the review process. It diffuses over to politics and the priorities that people establish for themselves in terms of what they research, you know, anyways that's where I think a lot of the changes needs to take place from a cultural standpoint and philosophical standpoint.

And those cultural changes I think take place when there are reinforcements for looking at knowledge in a different way not from a verification standpoint and also for us to be sensed to what those cultural and sociological influences are on methods of enquiry and dissemination of findings and there has been so much writing, you think about Merton's book on the sociology of science. And you think about the debate that's happened philosophically, you know, given Kuhn's perspective on paradigms and paupers, you know, refutation of that or attempt to refutation in terms of his notion about the incommensurability of paradigms, and I think that Kuhn's research is very, very important in terms of understanding if there are sociological influence that impact upon what we examine, how we examine that and what evidence we accept as being validation when in fact there may, it may not necessarily be so.

Speaker 5: Mark Testa. As you were talking, it occurred to me, I'm thinking about what you were saying that the sources of the null findings breakdown in to three parts, I think implementation failure, they just didn't implement it in the way they should have with fidelity. Katharine, that's what you're really focusing in on that, how developmental research and informative research could be done more carefully to make sure that before your subject test through some of the evaluation, you have a good indication that you have some at least statistical validity to what you want to find.

On the translational side, you have taken an evidence supported practices and translating it to a different context. The translational failures that we discover have to be solved by taking a more multi-method approach as I think we've heard a lot of people talk about.

**Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the  
Null and Negative Findings Gone?**

There is a lot of research that does well here in the US that doesn't translate well to other countries, I'm familiar with the failure of this leadership experiment replicate MST.

Not because MST didn't work, but the control group improved just as much as the MST group because the treatment as usual in Sweden is so different than treatment as usual in North Carolina. *[Laughter]* But the critical link, what I'll call the counterfactual failure, the failure to approximate the counterfactual through the most rigorous design to randomize control trial, as I think the most troublesome part of this failure to replicate or come up with findings that can sustain critics of trusted validity.

And I'm concerned that as the federal government eliminated the waiver program, which was the single source of funding, larger source of funding, or rigorous randomized controlled trials, we lost that in 2006 I think. And then the efforts to bring it back have so far resulted in competing types of legislation in the house and the senate, with the senate bills, I read it, and I hope I'm wrong, and I think I've read it correctly they would exclude randomized control trials from the evaluation methods that would be used to test promising practices.

So I think one thing we need to first of all is to restore to us the capacity to conduct those rigorous some of the evaluations in order to achieve a lot of the objectives you've outlined, and two, we have failed in a way to convince administrators as well as congressional staff that the solution to some of the problems we're talking about is not to water down the expectations about rigor, but rather to invite more rigorous evaluations.

So I'm just curious about why you think the debate is potentially lost in congress that we need to improve the rigor of that evaluations, now that we have a senate bill, which seems to say you can't use randomize control trials because you will be denying services to a population.

Speaker 4: I guess my immediate thought is that due to the successful push for rigor and understanding the value of random assignment we've almost created to artificially separate camps that don't need to be in a destructively separate that random assignment now has become the mantle, some people carry at the expense of all other things and those who want other things needlessly dismiss the appropriate use of random assignment.

So we need to worked out and the people understand the continuum of approaches, the value of certain approaches to solve certain problems but the value of other approaches and may be that goes back to behind that then you need some system that sorts these things out and says, we're matching the right approach to the right question, because and that's going to be nuance uncomplicated instead of simply it has to be a random assignment study or you can't do it or you can't do random assignment studies, you have to do something else. But I think we have, in part it's been the success of the push for rigor that's created those two camps in an odd way. But I don't know what other panelists think about that.

**Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the  
Null and Negative Findings Gone?**

Speaker 3: We'd also assume that in randomization you are going to do harm. And when you've got, I mean the Bickman study showed that both groups had good outcome, so you are doing no harm, I think that this gets to a lot more of the understanding of what is that comparison to control group offering and is there any chance for any child in this case or family to experience harm that is knowable in advance, leading us then to the question can we also get it through our *[indiscernible]* [00:50:55] and these are the review boards in our universities. So it's not just congress, it's also our universities getting very, very cautious and being really tenacious about ensuring that with randomization there is no harm to potentially to anybody. So I think it's a collective responsibility for us to ensure that we drill down Matt's point to what that controller comparison group looks like, what it's going to be getting and what are the differential cost benefits of randomization.

Speaker 4: One thing I would add to that is I think many of us ignored that earlier waiver focus was really randomization because of their concern about finances. It was really to understand the cost benefit side of this and make sure people weren't spending more money to get good outcome. So I think those of us who are interested in the outcomes including, but well beyond how much we spent sometimes forget that that was the OMB focus of insisting on randomization. And so then as we debate that again, we have an odd debate because we're not focused on that particular issue.

Speaker 5: Let me ask panelists, do you think rigor matters in terms of the likelihood that no findings would be reported?

Speaker 4: Well, since we're being recorded I want to say rigor matters.

Speaker 5: But within the context of the likelihood that null find, you know...

Speaker 4: Well, I guess one can...

Speaker 5: We can't turn it off, can we?

Speaker 4: No, but I do think we have to have a very frank and open discussion about this.

Speaker 5: Right. And I think sometimes we probably in this discussion we say well that study didn't get published because it had no findings. There are many recent studies don't get published. So that may be one of them, that may be at the investigator level, a reason why an investigator doesn't even submit it, but many studies are not published because they don't make it through review process. They have small sample sizes, they have poor retention rates, they have poor measurement.

So we need to unpack the rigor part from the lack of publication. And I think the concern has to be focused on rigorous studies that are not seeing the light of day because of null results as opposed to the fact that there is always going to be a variation in quality and we

**Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?**

hope that we know it's a flood system, I compare pre-review to what I guess Churchill said about democracy. It's the worst form of all governments except for all the others.

Pre-review is not perfect but we think it's a better way to judge quality when other systems that we come up with. But we have to recognize that there is a great variation in quality and rigor and that's why certain things aren't published. And then thinking about things like the synthesis and Campbell, the rules about what gets included become very important, you can get very different results by loosening the rules and purely that a fact of the study being randomized versus not I think is one of 10 things you should be looking at but there are nine others.

Speaker 2: Well, as always I agree with everything that Matt said and he took away some of my recommendations for the end.

Speaker 5: That's okay.

Speaker 2: But I also think that there is, you know, been a lot of effort also looking at randomization in terms of it, it doesn't have to be by individual client, it can be by group, it could be by counties, it could be an number of different ways and a few years ago NIH and CDC and AHRQ did some of very good meeting on sort of looking at levels of analysis and randomization.

So I don't think we want to throw it out, but we have to know that sometimes it's appropriate and sometimes it's not, and I think this sort of thought about the fact that people have divided up in to camps and we sort of see it particularly I think over some of home visiting issues is critically important because if you look at the request for information that came out about the levels of effectiveness for home visiting one other things that was totally missing was what did the community need it was all focused on, you know, how should we define which programs work but you can only look at the program working in the context of if we're looking at grandparents who are raising their infant grandchildren in terms of home visiting or people who have their pregnancy or whole set of things which, you know, the most rigorous model doesn't, it's not a model for that. That we need to sort of be really matching the sort of community need in terms of the intervention with what the intervention is.

And so we really need to be thinking about that in terms of our issues, I know this wasn't the session on sort of rating levels of evidence but it also fits with the issues of null and negative findings and who dropped out of the study and things like that. So the issue of transparency that Campbell systematic review calls for is just critically important, also who did the study.

Speaker 6: I have really quick comment and a quick question. My name is Nicolas, I'm professor at Texas Southern. And I think that the lack of rigor in research and evidence in child welfare, sometimes starts in the classroom and I had always wondered why at least in the social work programs why research methods was an isolated course?

**Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the  
Null and Negative Findings Gone?**

And then we have community practice, we have remediation, we have crisis intervention in which we teach theory and technique, but we don't teach the students how to evaluate. And so my question to the panel is what role do you see as research in the curriculum to strengthen it a little more?

Speaker 2: It's a great, great question. So one of the things that worked on for a number of years and IMH made a big sort of investment in it was something that was a curriculum development tool for faculty to use, to sort of infuse these research in to all the other parts of the social work curricula, is a great tool leading people in the field developed it. And it was done through a small business innovation research grant from NIH and I don't think very many people have used it.

So there are sort of things available to do that, I think some of the schools that have sort of moved towards more of a evidence based model in terms of their curricula have incorporated some of that, but I think you hit on a very real problem and you open up some textbooks and you are like, ha, this textbooks says what and all these students are reading it, oh my god.

Speaker 6: Right.

Speaker 1: Right.

Speaker 6: I think that there is a bifurcation right now in schools of social work where Joan's said many are at the forefront of trying to faster not just evidenced in form curricula but field placements where 90% of the interventions have some kind of evidence link to them, students are trained to do critical thinking, but there is a bigger question about a campaign for the old clinician scientist where research has seen as a practice tool rather than something segregated and until we really get to this larger re-culturing of our field, of our partnerships with agencies, agencies as hubs, renewed research is generated, we probably won't get to your critical question about what do our classrooms look like.

Speaker 4: Yeah. And I think I agree with what both my colleagues have said, and I think I agree with you it does begin in the classroom that's part of that a culturalization issue and I think that we have to know that research is not something that's done to practice, but something that informs practice. And again it can vary from professors sometimes to next even despite a curriculum statements that sometimes made by departments in schools of social work. I think that it goes both ways in practice courses we really need to teach critical thinking, the foundation of critical thought and how that actually will generate skepticism and a need to know, so that we advance our knowledge, but what really work for the clients and then we can see the research is just one tool in that arena towards advancing knowledge and practice knowledge and so forth but at the same times we have to make sure that people that are teaching research actually infuse and integrate and show the pragmatic value of research as a very important tool and how there are variations and difference of methods that give us different results in terms of the validity and reliability of information that we can choose to use to inform practice or not.

### Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?

Speaker 7: Hi, my name is Mary Armstrong. And I have two comments, my first one and it's the elephant in the room for me, so I just thought I would bring it up. So in the beginning some of you mentioned investigator initiated research and how that different from funded. And my university may be different but we are trying to become a premier research university and investigator initiated research is really not supported.

Because it's all about how much dollars you bring in to the university, research dollars. So I just think that's another part of our climate at least at some universities today is that investigator initiated research not only isn't encouraged but it's also actively discouraged. So I think that's one factor that if anybody wants to comment in, I'm interested in it.

And then the second point and I think you were alluding to what a lot around this what works for whom, that you talked about especially Katharine, but I think what we also, you lose when we don't published, get published findings from studies whether it's the null hypothesis and whatever is that. There also may be issues with the research methodology that was used and I think we have a lot of work to do in child welfare research around methodology.

And it's very hard to get that funded. I think because we are so much focused appropriately on intervention research but we also need better methods that suite better the complex challenges that what children and families face. So I just wanted to, I think you guys know that we're assuming it, but I just also wanted to mention that as well.

Speaker 4: My one parallel, because I think one thing we haven't mentioned as much as we talked about on the phone when we talked about this session was learning from other fields and not allowing child welfare or child welfare social work to be isolated from this other fields.

But I think it's interesting to look at what happened in education over the last 10 years and the creation of the institute for education sciences and its support of investigator different types of investigator driven research and its focus on rigor and its funding of method studies and none of that is to say they've done it perfectly, there are lots of people who are upset with what that institution has done in the way it's done it. But it's really changed education research.

And I think we tend to say rather than having our own thing, we should figure out how can we get NIH money, some people are looking at IES money especially around issues of education and foster youth or some special populations. But we also probably aren't going to make much progress until we have something like that that doesn't mean it needs to look exactly like IES, needs to get started the same way but there needs to be a place where the science of child welfare and social work it can go regularly and I think we're always away from that.

Speaker 2: I agree, you know, just having these two child welfare evaluation summits has created something that sort of didn't exist before, but I always was struck by how the

**Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?**

welfare researchers kind of meet every year or other groups, and you know, that sort of it never happened, it's always about sort of grants and grants are sort often one time kinds of things and they are often about models that next time you have to do something different rather than sort of building on the knowledge base.

I think around the investigator initiated piece the way I see it is really much more in terms of the NIH model and then AHRQ and CDC and some other agencies try to emulate where the goal is to be that researcher who has, you know, 27 RO1s and when I started running the Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research, I have never heard the term RO1 before, I learned pretty, you know, quickly, what it is and then also there is mechanisms within the NIH system through R21s and RO3s to actually do methodology or you know, pilot and tool development and that kind of things. So that, you know, for many universities that's what they sort of look at is, you know, how many RO1s can you get and I think that's really infiltrated a number of schools of social work in recent years some do the better, some not do the better.

Because sometimes it's not realistic and you know, few years ago, when I had some funding from Casey Family Programs to look at university agency, some of our research partners, you know, the issue of the lack of a place to come to some extent people have used the society for social work and research for that, in recent years because sort of none of the existing child welfare conferences are necessarily research conferences.

CWA had tried to do that for a few years and that kind of went by the way sides. So there is just, you know, a number of issues to really need to think out in that context of what works and what is doable in terms of sort of building the enterprise where you could do like a research conference that would bring in young investigators.

You think like that NIMH services research conference as a model to do a child welfare services research conference where you had training and methodology, you had young investigators, you got post your sessions, you have the big people in the field really or there is information implementation conference that kind of model building that, you know, that something that the federal government can do.

Speaker 4: The welfare analogy that FDC TANF world goes back I think to something Mark said about the use of waivers of that field really took off in the 1980s because of waiver driven research and as I think languish now because in a TANF world there is much variation, much change, much innovation, but very little way to actually systematically study it. So thinking about if waivers are recreated in some way using that as part of the mechanism to build the field would be I think a useful thing.

Speaker 1: Let me ask the panelists right now. I know that we're going to talk about some action steps, it seems we have a lot of questions shall we take a couple of minutes to talk about action steps and come back to questions, or would you like to infuse those action steps and response to some of the questions.

Speaker 4: I think the latter, I think we should do...

**Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the  
Null and Negative Findings Gone?**

*[Overlapping Conversation] [01:07:40]*

Speaker 8: Okay. Hi, my name is Regal Allison with Weststat and I just have a comment and a question. In relation to what the federal government can do in this topic, I just wonder if we should be consider these demonstration grants that are only three years long, because it's just a lot, it's just not enough time to do to implement and intervention make sure it stabilized and then have the researchers come in and do this rigorous evaluation, impact evaluation and if you are looking at permanency outcomes, I mean, that take sometimes, so I feel like we're kind of setup to not fine, you know, not have a large enough sample to look at, you know, outcomes and so that was one comment.

And then a question, sometimes researchers are discouraged or prohibited from publishing negative or null findings from the agency that was involved or non governmental funders. And so I just wanted to *[indiscernible] [00:38:42]* wanted to speak on that.

Speaker 3: Let me jump in and just say, I totally agree with you, since our university and school are very involved in partnerships with state agencies and depending over the years who is governor and what the pressure points are and lightning rods are certain research never sees the light of day and it's very powerful intervention research. That said, your question about the timetable for research is a really good one.

If you have a developmental research agenda where the interventions are going to change, the hypothesis are going to change and some of the conditions will change and of course you're going to need more than three years. And so often we do set ourselves up to have poor outcomes because we, you know, we didn't even think about how long it would take for the intervention to be facilitated and even operable, so well said.

Speaker 4: I would note that even three years to policy makers is a life time or career or three careers and so there is a built-in tension of trying to get that extension to say, we're trying to build a field which is just it's a glacial pace in some ways and your job is to keep the field moving as opposed to find the answer immediately under your watch. And that's just an ongoing tension that has to be negotiated.

Speaker 3: Yeah. And one other things that struck me when you are saying three years is, oh gosh that's better than all of the grants that used to be 17 months. So you know, it's so right that it's longer and sort of the outcomes, I mean in one of the other issues that kind of goes back to the null, negative piece is, we don't often look at long term findings either we look at, you know, so what happened after three months and three months might not be a very relevant measure of what the actual impact or something was.

Speaker 4: And just I think actually *[indiscernible] [01:10:41]* speak to your first question more appropriately, but on your last one, your last question, this, what you acknowledge does happen, whether or not people want to openly acknowledge it or not, it

**Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the  
Null and Negative Findings Gone?**

does and I imagine there is many people here in the room who have dialogs with either funding sources not the federal government perhaps, but either a private funding source or state agency or county agency, we've had those dialogs I have had some of those ones.

And I think what we need to do as we need to reinforce researchers and evaluators to be courageous. Names unmentioned, I'm number one doing a study for funding source not the federal government where I was brought in to a room with the findings basically show that there is no effectiveness of this particular method. And one of the chief executive officer said, you know, this is not what we are expecting, can you go back and look at the data and see if you can find this or that, because this is what our agenda will be with the legislature.

At which point I said, are you asking me to fudge or cook the data or we didn't use those words Dr. Perry, I said, well, that's an essence what you are asking, so I'm going to tell you right now no, I'm not going to do that and it stands. And again if there is public funding involved then it becomes a public document and that's where it's very important to emphasize that. And to make sure that it's available for that public inspection but if it's a private source sometimes where they can say as, well we're not going to release this, we're going to pay the contract out and thank you very much for your research, but then that's you would say dollars wasted.

So it's very important for researcher to make sure when you sign the contract that there is some information and there is some I should say, freedom for dissemination of those findings, but in beginning courageous, you also have to be aware that there is sometimes can be, I'm speaking more on those sort of private based settings some potential sort of backlash. You may not get funded by these people again. They may talk to other people within the particular community that's a reality. I mean, it's not something we speak up very openly and I don't think in any way or shape perform it happens a lot, I think it very much so, it's a very minor sort of perspective, but when that very minor occurrence.

But when it does happen it can jade and restored and be the very demoralizing to you as a researcher, so still be courageous and because of your end goal, my end goal as a researcher is to advance knowledge, you know, for the betterment and for the well being of the people for which those programs are actually, are supposed to have an impact.

Speaker 3: And just a footnote, when you are in multiple states as I have been many of these dynamics transfer across all the states, there are probably a very few governor's offices that don't monitor carefully image as well as what's going to backfire and what they've just financed now showing questionable results hitting the headlines, so there is always a context for our science and that's just part of doing business, but I think when we get to action steps we got some solutions to those.

Speaker 9: Well, I'm Elissa Podolsky, I'm with the Children's Bureau and for the last several years I've really been working very intensively on a lot of evidence based and visiting works, so all these discussions definitely have come to the point many conversations. So the question I had was sort of suggestions from the panel about really

### Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?

how to manage expectations about research at multiple levels? So the reality is I think policy makers do at the end of the day I want to know did it work, should I invest these dollars in this program or this, and they want to know with limited resources what are the decisions that I need to make? The reality is that we all know the research is so much more complex, so much more nuanced, so the subgroup analysis there is all these other issues that unfortunately policy makers, program managers, agency directors sometimes really don't have the patience or the time to really navigate through all that information.

And I wonder what strategies you have around really sort of being upfront from the very beginning at the sort of design at the development base, you know, what are the things that really both policy makers, practitioners, consumers should expect from research and evaluation? And then this whole tying into, how can they be better consumers of the findings when they come in?

And then it strikes me that intervention, we've really been doing a lot around trying to do work around communications and reframing of the issue, so that people really shifting mindsets and really understand it in a different way and it strikes me that this whole issue around better understanding research and being much more critical thinking could use a lot more of the reframing for sort of the general high ends that we need to convince to give us more time to the kind of work to be able to provide the thoughtful recommendations for program about concern.

Speaker 3: Go ahead, you go ahead.

Speaker 4: Couple of thoughts on this. And one is I think researchers are sometimes responsible for expectation of overblown results. And in child welfare one issue that comes up I think is it we're often doing with very small sample sizes, it is not a big system and if you are looking at in intervention that's in particular county, for a particular age group or certain types of families, there aren't that many of them. So to find a statistically significant result we have to pretend we're likely to get an effect size that is unrealistic. But we want to do the study, we want to move ahead.

So we almost play in to some times that expectations that moderate interventions will lead to incredible results. So there is a review a couple of weeks ago, a book in the New York Times, book review about school reform and the reviewer made an analogy which I think is useful one for our field, which is that school reform doesn't have a solution it's not about teacher's unions, it's not about charter schools, it's not about any of those things.

It's more like the victories we've had in cancer research over the last three decades, there is no cure for cancer, but there are hundreds of ways things have improved, and they are different for different types of cancers, different types of situations, different types of interventions. So we've had a bunch of incremental success that's added up to some very dramatic improvements in life.

### Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?

But in child welfare I think we're still often saying we can prevent placement or we can solve reunification issues, or we can stop the drug abusing parents from abusing drugs. We are not very good at talking with policy makers about what to expect and how to keep a bunch of incremental improvements going that, may be aren't the kinds of things, you can run at your next, you've been a trial campaign on, but they will improve lives for some people and overtime there will be tremendous improvement.

Speaker 2: I think one of the elephants in the room is the trust issue between the public agency and researcher, or the research team, or the university. And so overtime it's a trust relationships built so can a long term collaborative research agenda incubating them much more of a developmental research approach, so yes, you are being funded to test something and even if they allows the results you can be that developmental research unit changing the intervention approximating some of the end goals looking at what worked for whom or what the barriers were that now become the new problematic.

So overtime in those of you in partnerships between your agencies and universities those should be, you know, forever partnerships where even how you are treated in terms of the IRBs at both settings reflect the fact that there is this deep nonnegotiable no reject kind of worrying it for long haul but with the end goal being approximating the desired goals rather than, you know, you fail today, you are out the door we're not going to ever punch you again. So we have the ability to incubate these relationships to support trust and support developmental research.

Speaker 3: I also think that different entities have some responsibility to help administrators and things like that to understand research so to understand research of your child welfare commissioner, you know, may be the national association of public child welfare administrators can have a role and sort of really helping people develop that capacity, or looking at models that have worked in some states that can be replicated in other states. So that there is an understanding and it becomes less about we're doing this individual thing, this is the person we use, we ended up liking them or didn't liking them or not liking them or we like what they have to say or didn't like what they have to say and sort of putting the whole sort of research agenda in a bigger context about what the role of government is and what the role of agencies are, there is one other thing that I sort of wanted to comment on.

We're talking about things of public or private funds the things we are done with public funds don't see the light of day either, you know, 10 years ago that 12 years ago, the Children's Bureau requested somebody to do, you know, study untitled for either looked at nine states, someone mentioned it in a federal meeting and the next day someone said we're not going to release that, since never been seen again.

So it happens at many different levels and in many different ways and it is something that really needs to get thought out, when you are sort of talking about research that when you kind of go in to it, sort of work on what kind of agreement you have, so that it's not just tied to positive findings because the research enterprises in to verify positive findings, it's about having hypothesis and may be approve it or may be you don't.

**Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the  
Null and Negative Findings Gone?**

Speaker 1: Are there any other questions that people might have, or should we talk a little bit about some of the action steps we might have and then open up for other questions. We are, we do have limited time though. We have another 9, 10 minutes.

Speaker 4: Okay. I'll be quick. I have said earlier some suggested changes for the structure of federal contracted works, so I won't repeat that in all, steal one of Kathy's and then she will have to think up something new. I think we've come up in this conversation with the number of underlying infrastructure issues that may actually be much more important than the structure of any individual study.

And the relationship one is one that I think is really important how do we build, enhance and maintain research practitioner, research policy relationships that where than the individual things happen somewhat differently because of that and that we're better off with those longer term infrastructures. But it's hard to think of how to enhance those and support them and we need to work on that. But the answer is more likely in my mind to come from improving those than in changing the way individual studies are done.

Speaker 2: I guess one that I kind of go back over a few things and one sort of it has to do with, you know, looking at the measures and planning the research or planning the evaluation when you will begin thinking about it, I mean, I think there is a rule for community based participatory research.

And on this I think secondly I think the thing that kind of came out very strongly when I was working on this project on university agency research partnerships was the extent to which there is some kind of memorandum of agreement and some understanding in the beginning about publication who gets to publish also for many places the important sort of other than intermediary that it seem that some of those agencies that have sort of research director or something like that in the agency helped in that sort of communication and negotiation and sort of understanding of what works and sort of what that those roles and rules are.

I think thinking about even if one is not doing a systematic review, thinking about some of the principles that fit with the transparency of a Campbell review are really important in terms of understanding what exactly that study was, you know, we have, may be we have great findings and you want to report but it turns out it is only about 12 people and it wasn't the qualitative study either, it's a quantitative study.

So there is all these statistics that actually have very little real meaning so that issues of rigor high quality methodology studies that are done over multiple times and are not just sort of a cross sectional piece are all critically important and then the role and incorporation of sort of translational and dissemination and implementation science I think is critically important and I think it's something that I have said in the yesterday mornings plenary that for child welfare, we just might be at that effectiveness implementation science piece because studies are sort of the people we're working with and the studies we're doing are all pretty complex and we sort of should own that

### Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the Null and Negative Findings Gone?

complex and really think of building methodology around that rather than trying to incorporate a much, you know, more of a pharmaceutical medical trial kind of thinking and find that it doesn't work for child welfare and then we get into those silos that we're talking about before.

Speaker 3: I'd love to see a some of the takeaways from today actually drives some pilot initiatives where we talk about reengineering, where our next summit for child welfare has a whole section on intervention research, and on how that's let to developmental partnerships overtime the iterative improving constantly if you are changing interventions to approximate the end goals to get to the deeper partnerships where we're really embedded with trust relationships in an agency and looking at Mark, and what he has done over the years, our informatics professor who has been embedded in our child welfare system.

Until we've changed the infrastructure and even how we language our way through this, talk about evaluation but we're not talking about intervention research. We need to talk more about implementation and translational research. So I think we'll know in the next few years when we return as to whether or not we've started to re-culture ourselves giving ourselves a chance to really test some alternative models that may be more promising in the end.

Speaker 1: I think those are all fabulous suggestions, I would agree, but I'd like to ask the panel another question about action steps at the individual level, and perhaps you can share some experiences and anecdote without any identifying information what do you, have you ever come across the situation where as a researcher or a scientist or as an academic, as a professor. We're questioning whether or not there may have been some misconduct perhaps on the extreme level where there is actually outright intend to commit fraud.

We're at a very minor level where researcher or a student may be someone you know wanted or had a null finding but went back and changed the model or this is called cooking the data which may, you may not necessarily be lying, but you by omission you report on things for which there was significance even though there may be remotely or may be indirectly tied with your hypothesis. Having that information what does an individual do as an action step and I want to if you care to comment on that?

Speaker 2: Well, I will disclose because I have been a dean for 12 years that this is a predictable byproduct of doing business in a rigorous research environment and it means that I'm also not just gatekeeper but a facilitator of the gate keeping and in partnership with our institutional review board, you know there are extraordinary supports that are available.

And sometimes is an ill inform researcher may be a doctor or a student who didn't quite understand the rules and the remedies are often, you know, very easily facilitated and from time to time you will see disclosures in journals where a prior author does some corrective statement and you know there is a back story there, that's what deans are for.

**Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the  
Null and Negative Findings Gone?**

I'm not speaking of any of my faculty but I'm just telling you watch for the corrective statements.

Speaker 4: There is no total solution to this I think partly because of the many incentives involved, and I do think fraud is one thing, but the massaging of data is another thing which happens really all the time, that's a continuum rather than a hard and fast line which makes it difficult. But I think we all as a field need to be clear up front what question we're trying to answer not necessarily stay away from changing that but be clear when we're changing it and the process of that. So Kathy suggested that part of the problem is you got to get in to study and you got to be adaptive.

So we don't want to become so rigorous that we say, we were asking this question, a bunch of other interesting stuff came up and we're going to ignore it because now we're going to report out on this question. But we can't be more transparent I think about the evolution of questions and be skeptical of those things at the end, which really are fishing expedition.

So I think just as fisherman get permission to go out to a certain place and fish and/or supposed to stay there we are not, we should be cautious of people who are veering around the data looking for anything that will then please the client and agency or funder and we should hold them to that, but again it's a continuum, where we want to also be flexible about learning other things from studying. So we're going to keep struggling with this but saying more upfront and being clear upfront and holding ourselves toward is one way to control it.

Speaker 3: Either being a dean or researcher what I've thought about is the number of people I've known who have fallen on their sword who, you know, were the research director somewhere and suddenly one day they were gone either because they decided that something that they wanted to do no longer were supported by the foundation or the institution for which they worked often it relates to sort of publication and the reporting on something and so in my years I've seen that happen, actually more times than I would care to.

I think the other is, the personal thing I've had is actually stepping down from an editorial board of journal in a situation where I felt that there were publications in the journal because they met the desire of the editor and didn't meet what was put out as the purpose of the journal. And so it was something that, you know, got a lot, and I stepping down from the journal editorial board was not, but the article itself and something it got a lot of press.

It was in the Chronicle of Higher Ed, it was floating around all these people and I meet, but it was, to me it was bogus and it didn't fit with the journal, but it was something that sure was previewed, because if I'm a journal editor I can choose who pre-reviews things, and I do choose who pre-reviews things. And so I think the extent to which those things happen we've talked a little before about pre-review is the best we have but we're sure there are a lot of problems with it.

**Session 7.13 - The REST of the Evidence: Where Have All the  
Null and Negative Findings Gone?**

Speaker 1: I know the time is up, but I'm sure that all must be willing to sit here and have further discussion while we're in the break if you would like to talk a little bit more about this issue. I want to thank the panelists, I think it's a helpful discussion. I actually think it can probably go for couple more hours and get in to some more controversial issues, but again, you know, please feel free to come up and ask us some additional questions if you'd like.