

3. Ansøgninger om udvikling og afprøvning af indsatser

Kritikpunkter fra peer reviewerne:

"Udviklingen og/eller valget af indsats bygger på en meget snæver læsning af forskningslitteraturen."

"De professionelle og de organisationer, der skal levere indsatsen, er i utilstrækkelig grad tænkt ind."

"Det foreslåede forskningsdesign understøtter ikke valid kausal inferens. Dvs. den interne validitet er for ringe."

"Der mangler en styrkeberegning."

"Den forventede effektstørrelse, som styrkeberegningen er baseret på, er ikke velmotiveret."

"Styrkeberegningen tager ikke højde for, at der er tale om et RCT baseret på clustre ikke individer"

"Der er ingen eller utilstrækkelige planer for at bruge statistiske metoder til at korrigere for skævt bortfald og/eller kompromitteret randomisering ex post"

"Valget af outcome variable tilhørende måleinstrumenter og deres psykometriske egenskaber er undermotiverede og utilstrækkeligt beskrevet."

"Randomiserings-proceduren er ikke beskrevet i tilstrækkelig grad."

"Projektet risikerer ikke at kunne rekruttere et tilstrækkeligt antal deltagere indenfor den planlagte tidsperiode, fordi rekrutteringsplanerne er for rudimentære, mangler og/eller, de er ikke pilottestede"

Mulige kilder til svar på disse kritikpunkter:

Athey, S. & G.W. Imbens (2017): *"The Econometrics of Randomized Experiments"*. Chapter 3 in Handbook of Economic Field Experiments, vol. 1, p. 73-140.

"Att göra effektutvärderingar." (2012) Red. Knut Sundell. Socialstyrelsen och Gothia Förlag AB.

Chaplin, D.D. et al (2018): *"The Internal and External Validity of the Regression Discontinuity Design: A Meta-Analysis of 15 within-study comparisons."* Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, vol. 37, iss. 2, p. 403-429.

"Common Guidelines for Education Research and Development" (2013) A Report for the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education and the National Science Foundation.

Cook, T.D., W.R. Shadish & V.C. Wong (2008): *"Three conditions under which experiments and observational studies produce comparable causal estimates: New findings from within-study comparisons"*. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, vol. 27, iss. 4, p. 724-750.

Gerber, A. & D.P. Green (2012): *"Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation"*. W.W. Norton.

Glennerster, R. & K. Takavarasha (2013): *"Running Randomized Evaluations: A Practical Guide"*. Princeton University Press.

- Gottfredson, D.C., T.D. Cook, F.E.M. Gardner, D. Gorman-Smith, G.W. Howe, I.N. Sandler & K. M. Zafft (2015): *"Standards of Evidence for Efficacy, Effectiveness, and Scale-up Research in Prevention Science: Next Generation."* *Prev Sci*, 16(7); 893-926.
- Gueron, J. (2008) *"The politics of random assignment: implementing studies and impacting policy"*, *Journal of Children's Services*, Vol. 3 Issue: 1, pp. 14-26
- "Handbook of Economic Field Experiments"* (2017) Elsevier.
- Imbens, G.W. & D.B. Rubin (2015): *"Causal Inference for Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences: An Introduction"*. Cambridge University Press.
- John, P. (2017): *"Field Experiments in Political Science and Public Policy: Practical Lessons in Design and delivery"*, Routledge.
- Karlan, D. & J. Appel (2016): *"Failing in the Field"*. Princeton University Press.
- Medical Research Council (2006): *"Developing and evaluating complex interventions: new guidance"* [er under opdatering]
- Michie, S., M.M. van Stralen & R. West (2011): *"The behaviour change wheel: A new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions."* *Implement Sci*, v.6; 42.
- Michie, S., Ashford, S., Sniehotta, F.F., Dombrowski, S.U., Bishop, A. and French, D.P. (2011). *A refined taxonomy of behaviour change techniques to help people change their physical activity and healthy eating behaviours: The CALO-RE taxonomy.* *Psychology & Health*, volume 26 (11): 1479-1498
- Pearl, J. (2009): *"Causality. Models, Reasoning, and Inference."* Cambridge University Press.
- Sherman, L.W. (2006): *"To develop and test": The inventive difference between evaluation and experimentation"*. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 2:393-406.
- Sherman, L.W. & H. Strang (2004): *"Experimental Ethnography: The Marriage of Qualitative and Quantitative Research"*. *Annals, AAPSS*, 595, p. 204-222.
- "The Systematic Screening and Assessment Method: Finding Innovations worth evaluating."* (2010) L.C. Leviton, L. Kettel Khan & N. Dawkins (Eds.). *New Directions for Evaluation*.
- Torgerson, D.J. & C.J. Torgerson (2008): *"Designing Randomised Trials in Health, Education and the Social Sciences – An Introduction."* Palgrave Macmillan