

Evidence-based practice in autism educational research

Guldberg, Karen

DOI:

[10.1080/03054985.2016.1248818](https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2016.1248818)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Guldberg, K 2016, 'Evidence-based practice in autism educational research: can we bridge the research and practice gap?', *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 149-161.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2016.1248818>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Oxford Review of Education* on 28th November 2016, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/03054985.2016.1248818>

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.



Evidence Based Practice in autism educational research: can we bridge the research and practice gap?

Journal:	<i>Oxford Review of Education</i>
Manuscript ID	CORE-2015-0111.R2
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	Evidence Based Practice, autism educational research, autism intervention research, bridging research and practice

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Title:** Evidence Based Practice in autism educational research: can we bridge
4
5 the research and practice gap?
6
7

8 **Introduction**

9
10 Debates around Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) in education highlight that
11
12 teachers should be focusing on 'what works,' that research favours certain
13
14 teaching methods for maximising pupil learning outcomes (Hattie, 2008), and
15
16 that further work is needed to address how to best apply research to practice
17
18 (DfE, 2014). Thus the Department for Education (DfE) in the UK allocated
19
20 £135 million to improve quantitative data in education as well as adopting a
21
22 framework for conceptualising EBP focusing on the use and application of
23
24 research evidence in schools (DfE, 2014). Meanwhile, the US institute of
25
26 Education Sciences takes a clear stand that education researchers need to
27
28 develop interventions that are effective in raising student achievement and to
29
30 validate the effectiveness of those interventions using rigorous methods
31
32 (Lundahl, 2013). The 'Individuals with Disabilities Education Act' (IDEA,
33
34 2008), ensures that services to children with disabilities require teachers to
35
36 use EBPs by mandating the scientifically based research concept in education
37
38 through the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) Act of 2001. This is now
39
40 enshrined in law, with the NCLB addressing the need for standards and
41
42 measurable goals with reliance on scientifically based research for
43
44 interventions and teaching methods.
45
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 Within this context, autism educational research is dominated by experimental
53
54 research designs that should inform decisions teachers make on the ground.
55

56
57 When the US National Research Council (NRC) conducted a rigorous
58
59
60

1
2
3 assessment of intervention research studies in the field of autism, for
4
5 example, studies needed to employ particular methodologies in order to be
6
7 considered an EBP and these included randomised, quasi-experimental or
8
9 single-subject design studies. In a relatively recent National Professional
10
11 Development Centre (NPDC) review of autism intervention research, 40% of
12
13 studies used multiple baseline design, with 8% based on RCTs (Wong et al.,
14
15 2014). Current research in autism is largely Single Subject Experimental
16
17 Designs (SSED) with group designs becoming more common (Kasari &
18
19 Smith, 2013) and there is a clear dominance of empirical and technical
20
21 instrumental research that is modeled on the natural sciences (see Dingfelder
22
23 & Mandell, 2011; Odom et al., 2005).
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 The above hegemony of experimental designs has led to heated debate over
31
32 the last few years about the way in which EBP is perceived, and the
33
34 relationship between research and practice in autism educational research
35
36 (de Bruin, 2015), with much discussion focusing on how to generate a positive
37
38 relationship between educational research and teaching knowledge and
39
40 practice (Tatto & Furlong, 2015; Pampaka et al., 2016) whilst recognising that
41
42 there is a persistent gap between research and practice in autism education
43
44 (Parsons & Kasari, 2013).
45
46
47
48

49
50 In this paper, I focus on the particular form the gap between research and
51
52 practice takes in the autism field, and I identify the methodological re-
53
54 adjustments that are needed, recognising that broader discussions around
55
56 'what works' have been problematic in both practice and theory, as well as in
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 methodology (Smeyers & Depaepe, 2010). I focus on the need to broaden the
4
5 range of methodologies used so the field can draw on a wider knowledge
6
7 base, as practice needs a much wider knowledge base than policy. By
8
9 addressing the need for a plurality of methodologies, and for further dialogue
10
11 about what kind of knowledge we value in the field of learning disabilities
12
13 (Gallagher, Connor & Ferri, 2011), autism educational research exemplifies
14
15 the methodological reorientation that is needed in educational research more
16
17 generally.
18
19

20
21 I discuss the fact that whilst the 'what works' debate is designed to find
22
23 rigorous ways of using evidence to improve practice, the dominance of
24
25 experimental designs in autism education contribute to a schism between
26
27 research and practice in this field (Parsons & Kaskari, 2013; Parsons et al.
28
29 2015). This substantial gap between research and practice in autism
30
31 educational research is problematic (Damschroder et al., 2011; Parsons &
32
33 Kasari, 2013) because long-term outcomes for individuals with autism remain
34
35 poor (Magiati, Tay & Howlin, 2012), leading to a need for practical solutions
36
37 for education and life skills (Pellicano, Dinsmore & Charman, 2014).
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 My paper therefore discusses the preconditions for developing better
45
46 frameworks and tools for understanding variation across different contextual
47
48 factors (Klingner & Boardman, 2011), and it underscores the need for a more
49
50 balanced range of studies and research designs. It highlights that the field
51
52 needs to become better at recognising that evidence applicable to education
53
54 will occur in diverse forms and therefore needs to be gathered through diverse
55
56 means. This includes objective measures obtained from controlled trials, *and*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 subjective perspectives that are grounded in professional understanding,
4 experiences and interpretations of teachers, in conjunction with approaches
5 that focus on methodologies and methods that respect and value both
6 researchers and practitioners (BERA-RSA, 2014).
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14 The aims are therefore to i) highlight how the dominance of experimental
15 designs leads to a schism between research and practice in this field; ii)
16 discuss how to develop better frameworks and tools for understanding
17 variation across different contextual factors and iii) put the case for
18 recognising that evidence applicable to education needs to take different
19 forms and therefore needs to be gathered through different means. In taking
20 the reader through this argument, I start by highlighting the range of
21 interventions that are present in the autism field and examine current attempts
22 to address the gap between research and practice, before putting the case for
23 a paradigm shift in autism education.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **A broad range of interventions with different theoretical underpinnings**

40 A quick online search for 'autism interventions' gives over 38 million links so
41 there are clearly many strategies, approaches, therapies and interventions for
42 improving the lives of autistic people. 'Research Autism', a website dedicated
43 to researching the wide range of 'treatments' and 'interventions' in autism,
44 currently lists over a thousand of those in the field of autism along with
45 indications of the evidence base (Milton, 2014). These have a number of
46 different underlying theoretical perspectives. In autism, as in broader disability
47 studies, there are three main theoretical approaches (Arduin, 2015): the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 medical model through which autism is viewed through the lens of a
4 pathological or flawed existence (Hughes, 2000); the social model, which
5 posits that concepts of disability are culturally relative and the consequence of
6 particular cultural conditions (Corker & Shakespeare, 2002) and the
7 interactionist, human rights or transactional model which focuses on human
8 rights, and disability as being part of diversity, with difficulties arising from an
9 interaction between the individual and the environment (Prizant, 2015).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 Within these theoretical traditions, much of the emphasis on experimental
22 designs and quantitative studies around EBP in autism education tend to
23 emanate from a deficit based medical model, in which disability is defined as
24 'a physical or mental impairment' (DfE, 2014), with a high proportion of
25 intervention studies focusing on intensive behavioural interventions (Howlin,
26 2010) that are based on a normative focus on 'correcting deficits' (Milton,
27 2014).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 The above theoretical perspectives have a bearing not only on views about
40 how pupils learn, but also on how to conduct research, as they lead to
41 different foci in terms of the developmental areas they focus on, which in turn
42 affect how progress is measured (Howlin, 2010). Researchers with varying
43 theoretical perspectives will see the world differently and will therefore differ in
44 the questions they ask, what they examine in research as well as the
45 methodologies they consider valid for measuring pupil progress (Poplin,
46 2011). Hence, behaviourists will tend to define the behavior that is considered
47 desirable, then count the behavior, and reinforce it; cognitive theorists shift
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 this to strategic academic behaviours they believe underpin academic
4 performance whilst constructivist focus the lens on the process of facilitating
5 an individuals construction of meaning (Poplin, 2011).
6
7
8
9

10 11 **Methodological critiques of current intervention research**

12
13 Although a number of studies have provided some reliable knowledge about
14 which interventions 'work' and have helped practitioners make decisions in
15 selecting suitable interventions, reviews have highlighted that there is not
16 enough evidence to promote a specific form of intervention given the lack of
17 robust evidence coupled with the wide range of interventions in the field of
18 autism (Parsons et al. 2011; Odom et al., 2005; Howlin, 2010). Furthermore,
19 as well as intervention research involving many different strategies, there is
20 often a limited range of outcomes measured (Pasons et al., 2011). Effects of
21 interventions often impact on a narrow range of skills so a programme to
22 improve non-verbal communication will narrowly focus on that without
23 examining its effect on broader cognitive functioning, for example (Howlin,
24 2010).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Furthermore, whilst current intervention research clearly represents a desire
44 to apply a rigorous and systematic approach to produce knowledge that can in
45 turn enable generalisation (de Bruin, 2015), the underlying assumption that
46 these designs infer causality and should be able to support professionals to
47 make decisions about 'what works' are problematic as there are clear
48 methodological challenges. Although many reviews and meta-reviews have
49 been undertaken in the field, the groups define different literature, use
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 different definitions of EBP, lump or split interventions at different levels of
4 specificity and come to different conclusions (see Mesibov & Shea, 2010 and
5 Parsons et al., 2011). Furthermore, sample sizes tend to be limited, most
6 examine relatively short-term gains and there are problems sorting out
7 intervention effects compared to other variables (Horner et al., 2005). In
8 addition, most pupils receive more than one intervention at any one point in
9 time, making it difficult to separate out a particular element or type of
10 approach (Parsons et al., 2011).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22
23 The perceived weaknesses of current intervention research have therefore led
24 to calls for more methodologically rigorous research (Parsons et al.; 2011;
25 Charman et al., 2011) with attempts to counter the narrow focus on specific
26 research designs as the only legitimate way of conducting research in the field
27 and with proposals for assessing the quality of a variety of research designs
28 (see Horner, et al., 2005 and Reichow et al. 2008).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **The problem with applying experimental designs to school settings**

40 The field is currently dominated by efficacy studies that report the success or
41 failure of interventions in 'ideal' conditions that are carefully controlled. As a
42 result, arguments have been put forward for countering the narrow focus on
43 specific research designs as the only legitimate way of conducting research in
44 the field (see Horner, et al., 2005 and Reichow et al. 2008). This stems from
45 the recognition that it can be quite a challenge to gather efficacy for particular
46 methods as there are so many variables that can be difficult to pin down and
47 measure. Efficacy studies also tend to lack the flexibility that would allow one
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to capture and to understand what happens naturally or to predict all of the
4 many and varied consequences of a particular course of action due to the
5 context specific nature of education, as much of what happens depends upon
6 chance and dynamic combinations of different starting points, teacher skills
7 and understanding, the school context, and learning objectives (Biesta, et al.,
8 2014).

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 Although efficacy studies contribute important new knowledge to the autism
19 field, we therefore need to stay mindful of the fact that even when there is
20 evidence for specific interventions in the highly controlled contexts in which
21 they were studied (Kasari & Smith, 2013), these might not be applicable to
22 educational contexts where individual teachers make judgements based on
23 available evidence. If intervention research is to have both scientific validity in
24 design and implementation as well as social validity within the broader
25 community, the field needs to find better ways of ensuring interventions are
26 evaluated in the area in which children are based, such as mainstream
27 primary schools (NAC, 2009). This has led to calls for conducting more
28 effectiveness studies, which focus on the sustainability of the intervention and
29 the importance of it to those participating in it in everyday conditions (Weisz &
30 Jensen, 1999; Kasari & Smith, 2013).

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50 The question is then whether this will go far enough in changing the fact that
51 University based autism intervention research is not evident in the child's
52 school in most schools in the UK and US, or if it is, it is changed so much that
53 it is different from the original intervention (Kasari & Smith, 2013).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Practitioners rarely alter their practice by drawing on the evidence base from
4 research (Lather, 2004) despite schools being under increasing pressure to
5 implement EBPs in order to meet the diverse needs of pupils with autism, with
6 many continuing to use practices that are unsupported by such research
7 (Burns & Ysseldyke 2009; Carter et al., 2011). Teachers have reported that
8 they view researchers as being out of touch with the realities of today's
9 classroom contexts (Greenwood & Abbott, 2001), whilst being less concerned
10 about EBPs and more interested in how the given solutions might fit with the
11 needs of individual children (Guldberg et al., 2011).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 Researchers have therefore begun exploring the barriers to implementing
26 studies in schools (Locke et al., 2014). These barriers have been seen as
27 relating to 'incompletely developed interventions, limited evidence of their
28 utility in promoting long term and meaningful change and poor fit with school
29 environments' (Kasari and Smith, 2013, p1). More specifically, barriers have
30 been linked with lack of training of teachers (Dingfelder & Mandell, 2012), the
31 competing priorities of staff, policies surrounding break times, lack of school
32 support, and difficulty finding resources and time for implementing
33 interventions in the school day (Locke et al., 2014). Whilst a focus on barriers
34 to implementation is important, I go on to argue that a more fundamental
35 paradigm shift is needed than current debates indicate.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **The knowledge transfer model orthodoxy**

53
54 The debates around efficacy, effectiveness and implementation problems in
55 schools highlight that there is an assumption that effective practices have
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 been produced, but that the issue is that teachers are not implementing these
4 EBPs. This narrative sees the problem as a 'translational one' in which
5 research dissemination is perceived as a linear, top-down transmission model
6 from which practitioners should draw knowledge. Research should then flow
7 from the journal to classroom practice without any real and sustained
8 engagement with teachers or pupils (Greenwood & Abbott, 2001). This model
9 posits the researcher as the "expert" and the teacher as simply the vehicle for
10 delivering the intervention (Trent, Artiles, & Englert, 1998).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 This 'knowledge transfer' model in autism education research can be
24 illustrated by the National Autism Centre's (2009) systematic review of both
25 SSED and group designs, identifying eleven 'treatments' for which they claim
26 there is evidence of effective practice, and moving from this to producing a
27 manual for EBP in schools and recommending a specific set of best practices
28 such as visual schedules and self management techniques (NAC, 2009).
29 Meanwhile, the National Professional Development Centre identified a larger
30 set of practices and made steps to operationalise these by producing step-by-
31 step reviews (Wong et al., 2014), focusing on the necessity of translating
32 scientific results into intervention practices or practitioner friendly summaries
33 so that users can be informed by those (Reichow, 2008), whilst also providing
34 'professional development and support for implementing the practices with
35 fidelity' (Wong et al., 2014, p. 34).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **The need to take onboard different ways of knowing**

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The above solutions do not take account of the fact that a teacher's choice of
4 educational programmes tends to derive from a combination of educational,
5 behavioural and developmental research and theory (Howlin, 2010) resulting
6 in them employing an eclectic mix of strategies (Guldberg, 2010). Whilst the
7 science behind research-based instruction and intervention studies requires
8 fidelity of implementation, teachers tend to view good teaching as involving
9 innovation and an eclectic sampling from a variety of instructional or teaching
10 models (Greenwood & Abbott, 2001).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Unfortunately the prevailing research culture of knowledge transfer in
24 evidence-based research diminishes the potential contributions of teachers
25 and pupils by prioritising particular ways of knowing. It ignores important
26 aspects of professional knowledge (Rynes, Bartunek & Daft, 2001) and the
27 situated nature of the experiences and expectations of teachers and children
28 in schools (Parsons et al., 2013), as well as the complex nature of schools
29 where it is often difficult to implement more rigid, experimental research
30 designs requiring strict adherence to planned protocols (Kasari & Smith,
31 2013).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 As far back as 1996, Guba noted that stakeholders should inform an integral
46 part of knowledge and that they would feel no obligation to abide by
47 knowledge if they do not have ownership of it (Guba, 1996). Yet the
48 prevailing culture of knowledge transfer puts agency in the hands of policy or
49 the intervention whilst there is actually a need to allow variation and mediation
50 between teachers, thus giving more agency of the whole process to the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 schools, pupils and their families (Gallagher et al., 2011). The issue of agency
4 is a crucial one in that it highlights the need to introduce methodologies that
5 position not only teachers, but also individuals with autism and their families at
6 the center of inquiry and knowledge. This can enable research to be both
7 practical in terms of day-to-day practice and modifiable to meet diverse pupil
8 needs.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 In order to identify the goals that are important for the autism community, for
20 families and for practitioners, meaning therefore needs to be found in lived
21 experiences, and research needs to invest in working *with* those stakeholders
22 rather than *on* them (Freire, 1972), with a concomitant reorientation towards
23 human subjectivity (Allan, 2011). It is difficult to see how a practice can be
24 effective at generating improvement if we do not also gain an understanding
25 of the way that the world is viewed and experienced by the individuals whose
26 outcomes we are aiming to improve. This is particularly pertinent as autistic
27 adults feel that 'research fails to speak to the reality of their lives in the here-
28 and-now' (Pellicano et al., 2014, p. 5). Individuals with autism have simply not
29 been involved in setting the agenda of working out what is important to focus
30 on (Pellicano et al. 2014) and this has led to a large mismatch between what
31 individuals with autism say they need in terms of what constitutes positive
32 outcomes, and what research tends to focus on.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Wittemeyer et al., (2011) found that a good adult outcome needs to be
53 considered within the context of individual needs and aspirations; enabling a
54 person to make choices and giving them access to the right support when
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 needed was seen as crucial. Milton (2014), an autistic sociologist, has echoed
4 this through advocating that care must be taken to ensure that structures are
5 put in place to encourage the learner's autonomy and reduce their stress.
6
7 Evidence Based Practice therefore needs to take into account what it should
8 work for and who should have a say in determining the latter (Biesta, 2013).
9
10
11
12
13

14
15
16 Given that findings from studies indicate that autistic individuals place
17 importance on outcomes that support choice and autonomy (Wittemeyer et
18 al., 2011; Pellicano et al., 2014; Milton, 2014), it is troubling that outcomes
19 such as these, which can seem loose and fuzzy, are seldom focused on in
20 autism research, with the consequence that interventions are limited to those
21 whose goals can be measured. We know very little about how changes in
22 standardised measures reflect changes in everyday life though and variables
23 that lend themselves to measurement and statistical analysis may not be
24 important for some of the long-term goals and outcomes of people with autism
25 such as life satisfaction, community participation and personal relationships
26 (Wittemeyer et al., 2011). A further a limitation of current research methods is
27 that we do not have objective measures that enable successful identification
28 and research on outcomes that support choice and autonomy.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Many studies involving Early Intensive Behavioural Intervention, for example,
48 have used IQ as a principal outcome measure, yet even statistically significant
49 increases in IQ do not necessarily lead to improvement in other, more
50 practical day to day skills (Howlin, 2010). Neither does statistical significance
51 in controlled trials necessarily mean that pupils have improved in ways that
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 are reflected in their everyday functioning (Mesibov and Shea, 2011). The
4 dangers of this approach are summed up by Poplin, who argues that 'when
5 the human sciences use only quantitative data, we end up with a narrow,
6 piecemeal view of reality' (Poplin, 2011, p150). She goes on to argue that
7 both inductive and deductive research is vital to understanding educational
8 contexts (Poplin, 2011) and it is this question I turn to next.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **The argument for both inductive and deductive research**

20 Although much of the current autism research into interventions has come up
21 with information that is of general value, it has often been of little help in
22 deciding on a particular case (Jordan, 2005) as the classroom is very different
23 from an experimental or therapeutic setting. In classrooms that educate pupils
24 with autism, interventions need to be individualised according to pupil
25 characteristics, include real life outcome measures and be generalisable to
26 complex real-life conditions and multiple cultures and settings (Mesibov and
27 Shea, 2010). This means focusing the lens on the individual child, young
28 person or adult, rather than the 'model' or 'intervention' (Guldberg, 2010). The
29 teacher working with a child with autism needs to understand the child and
30 how autism impacts on the child and the family, before deciding which
31 strategies or interventions might work and how she might implement those in
32 the particular context in which she works (Jordan, 2005).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Implementation often relies on a number of factors, including choice of
52 educational approach, attending to the responses of the child or children
53 whilst approaches are being implemented, gauging how children are
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 responding to them, observing, reflecting and then possibly changing how an
4 approach is used depending on how the child responds (Guldberg et al.,
5 2011). This relies on knowledge and understanding of autism, values, tacit
6 judgements, experience, local knowledge, and skills (Parsons et al., 2015).
7 Furthermore, the ways teachers and pupils behave are strongly influenced by
8 one another and participants interpret and make sense of their world in
9 different ways (Biesta, 2013), with learning being situated and context
10 dependent (Wenger, 1998).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 This highlights that professional practice needs to move beyond the notion of
24 simply relying on 'what works', to ensuring that research can make a positive
25 contribution to each aspect of teachers' professional knowledge. This
26 professional knowledge embodies practical wisdom and critical reflection as
27 well as technical knowledge (Winch et al., 2015). Thus it is not enough to
28 purely focus on addressing how schools and teachers can become better
29 informed by data and robust evidence so they can access and interpret
30 different kinds of evidence and adapt it to their own settings and contexts
31 (Tatto & Furlong, 2015). Nor should discussion about the gap between
32 research and practice be too narrowly focused on the need for teachers to
33 develop research related skills and knowledge or to become better equipped
34 to engage with and become consumers of research.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Rather, there needs to be acknowledgement of the fact that the knowledge of
52 educators is rooted in immersion and reflection, resulting in cumulative
53 knowledge arising from an accumulation of understandings rather than an
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 accumulation of facts (Thomas, 2012b). This knowledge is practical and tacit,
4
5 based upon personal experience and learning from the experience of others.
6
7 Teachers deal with more than the simple application of strategies or
8
9 techniques to bring about predetermined ends (Biesta et al., 2014), and their
10
11 work is not necessarily open to objective assessment, neither is it technical
12
13 (Biesta et al., 2014). Our focus therefore needs to shift more towards ensuring
14
15 that the field gets a better understanding about what good teaching is and
16
17 how it leads to learning (Sahlberg, 2010), and therefore to notions of 'good
18
19 autism practice' in education. This means recognizing the importance of
20
21 focusing on what Sahlberg and Hasak describe as 'small data'- 'the diversity
22
23 and beauty that exists in every classroom, and the causation they reveal in
24
25 the present'. Thus a teacher will need to be able to draw upon both the
26
27 evidence base for research, such as the fact that many pupils with autism
28
29 need visual augmentative strategies, whilst also being able to reflect on how
30
31 those strategies are being implemented and responded to in the interactions
32
33 and relationships that are developing in the classroom.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 The proposed core principles flowing from this then need to become that
42
43 EBPs should have a cogent rationale for educational strategies. As Mesibov
44
45 and Shea (2010) argue, this latter focus is productive because it encourages
46
47 the use of diverse sources of information for developing and evaluating
48
49 educational approaches and encourages a focus on how to respond to the
50
51 varying needs of different pupils and what is feasible. This does not negate
52
53 the importance of drawing upon research evidence to shape and enhance
54
55 practice. Rather, it is about, as Pring and Thomas (2004) argue, questioning
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the nature of evidence and the potency assigned to particular types of
4
5 evidence.
6
7

8
9
10 What we therefore need more of in the field of autism intervention research, is
11 a 'move from a narrowly defined epistemic science to one that articulates a
12 social science that integrates context-dependency with practical deliberation'
13 (Lather, 2004). This is essential given that autism represents a complex
14 spectrum of different abilities and difficulties that cannot be narrowly defined.
15
16 It highlights the need for methodologies that stay close to the complexities
17 and contradictions of existence, with the goal of also fostering understanding,
18 reflection and action as well as translation of research into practice. This has
19
20 in turn led to several scholars articulating the need to value qualitative
21 methodologies on a par with the quantitative experimental designs that
22 currently dominate the field (Poplin, 2011) calling for the use of a broader
23 range of methods that allow us to look at phenomena in ways that reveal
24 many facets of human experience (Kazdin, 2008). This can include in-depth
25 evaluation, subjective views and how individuals react to their situations and
26 contexts whilst looking for genuine change in functioning, meaning,
27 experience and perception. It can include a whole range of methodologies
28 that enable this kind of study, from case studies to action research,
29 phenomenology or narrative research (Gallagher et al., 2011).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Furthermore, the field would benefit from codifying experiences of teachers in
53 practice and ensuring that accumulated data can be analysed in partnership
54 with researchers (Kazdin, 2008), moving towards closer collaboration
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 between researchers and practitioners, one in which the role of judgement,
4 expertise and context ought to be studied directly. Nastasi et al. (2000)
5 argued for participatory action research approaches that involve stakeholders
6 in intervention efforts in order to focus on interventions that consumers find
7 acceptable and to move towards a broad conception of integrity and
8 effectiveness. Participatory approaches to developing interventions should
9 include competencies that are relevant to the targeted culture, valuing
10 naturalistic enquiry, real-life contexts, and understanding, as well as the
11 importance of describing phenomena from the population, thus facilitating
12 culturally specific theory and intervention (Nastasi et al. 2000).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **The case for rapprochement and change in emphasis**

28
29 In discussing the divide between research and practice, Kazdin (2008)
30 therefore argued for rapprochement and changes in emphasis, highlighting
31 that both research and practice should contribute to our knowledge base. This
32 is aligned with the conception of 'Evidence Based Treatment' (EBT) that was
33 put forward by the American Psychological Association in 2006 and defined
34 as 'the integration of the best available research and clinical expertise within
35 the context of patient characteristics, cultures, values and preferences' (APA,
36 2006, p 273). Kazdin (2008) highlighted that it is very unfortunate to take a
37 narrow view of knowledge transfer in which research is seen as contributing to
38 the knowledge base and practice as an application of research. This way of
39 seeing the contributions of each of the domains, does in fact heighten the
40 research-practice gap as it negates the contribution that clinical, or
41 educational practice can contribute to the scientific knowledge base. As well
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 as focusing on the expectation that educational practice should be the
4 application of research findings to practice, there is therefore clearly a need
5 for more rigorous examination of how educational practice can contribute to
6 the scientific knowledge base, promoting research designs that enable
7 teachers to both inform the research community and be informed by it.
8
9
10
11
12

13 14 15 16 **Conclusions**

17 This paper has argued that there is a key danger in privileging a certain kind
18 of research evidence over evidence from other sources. There is a need to
19 move towards research designs that enable stakeholders to participate in
20 identifying the outcomes to focus on and to contribute data from the
21 classroom, including participatory approaches that are situated in the contexts
22 in which people live and work (Biesta, 2013) and that take into account the
23 concerns and experiences of individuals with autism, their families and the
24 practitioners who work with them.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The autism field needs to move towards a double transformation of both
39 educational research and educational practice (Biesta et al., 2014), as factual
40 knowledge is never a sufficient determinant of good practice in education. The
41 problem with 'excessive quantification' and a focus solely on scientific
42 approaches is that it can push the field away from closer interactions with
43 policy and practice (Lagemann, 2000); it holds within it the danger of over-
44 simplifying the relationship of research to practice (Hammersley, 2005) and
45 negates the fact that multiple research designs are needed to address
46 different types of questions (APA, 2006; Mesibov & Shea, 2010). Research
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 questions need to be more firmly focused on what constitutes a good outcome
4 for a person with autism. Autistic people, their families and the practitioners
5 who work with them, need to be involved in identifying those questions,
6 including a re-framing of which outcomes measures are important to focus on.
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14 The argument is not that different forms of evidence are incompatible, but
15 rather that both need to be taken into account and combined to offer a more
16 balanced insight into best educational practices. Thus, calls for a need for
17 educational sciences to be rooted at the practical level (Thomas & Pring,
18 2014) do not negate the need for controlled experimental approaches but
19 recognise the need to broaden the concept of EBP beyond the knowledge
20 transfer model. What is argued for is a broader conceptualisation of EBP that
21 is informed by experimental evidence, as well as by the perspectives and
22 needs of individuals with autism, their families and the practitioners who work
23 with them (Kazdin, 2006).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Ultimately, to achieve this requires methodologies that ensure that teachers'
39 craft and tacit knowledge are both captured adequately and taken into
40 account *together with* the systematic knowledge generated by research
41 (Hammersley, 2005). To that end, scientific research and practice both have
42 in common that they need to be flexible, interpretative and reflective (Thomas,
43 2014).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **References**

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Allan, J. (2011). Complicating, Not Explicating: Taking Up Philosophy in
4 Learning Disability Research. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 34 (2), 153–161.
5 DOI:10.1177/073194871103 400206.
6

7 Arduin, S. (2015). A review of the values that underpin the structure of an
8 education system and its approach to disability and inclusion. *Oxford Review*
9 *of Education*, 41 (1), 105-121. DOI: 10.1080/03054985.2015.1006614.
10

11
12 APA presidential task force on Evidence Based Practice (2006). Evidence
13 Based Practice in Psychology. *American Psychologist*, 61 (4), 271-285.
14

15 BERA-RSA (2014). *Research and the teaching profession: building the*
16 *capacity for a self-improving education system*. Available from
17 <https://www.bera.ac.uk/project/research-and-teacher-education> [last accessed
18 17th May 2016].
19

20
21 Biesta, G. (2013). *The beautiful risk of education*. Boulder: Paradigm
22 Publishers.
23

24 Biesta, G., Allan, J. & Edwards, R. (2014) *Making a difference in theory. The*
25 *theory question in education and the education question in theory*. London:
26 Routledge.
27

28
29
30 Bruin, de. C.L. (2015). Conceptualizing effectiveness in disability research,
31 *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*,
32 DOI:10.1080/1743727X.2015.1033391.
33

34 Burns, M. K., & Ysseldyke, J. (2009). Reported Prevalence of Evidence-
35 Based Instructional Practices in Special Education. *The Journal of Special*
36 *Education*, 43 (1): 3–11. DOI:10.1177/0022466908315563.
37

38 Carter, M., Stephenson, J. & Strnadova', I. (2011). Reported Prevalence by
39 Australian Special Educators of Evidence-Based Instructional Practices.
40 *Australasian Journal of Special Education* 35 (1), 47–60.
41 DOI:10.1375/ajse.35.1.47.
42
43

44
45 Charman, T., Pellicano, L., Peacey, L., Peacey, N., Forward, K. & Dockrell, J.
46 (2011). *What is good practice in autism education?* London: Autism Education
47 Trust.
48

49
50 Corker, M., & Shakespeare, T. (2002). *Disability/postmodernity: Embodying*
51 *disability theory*. London: Continuum.
52

53 Damschroder, L.J., Aron, D.C., & Keith, R.E. (2009). Fostering
54 implementation of health services research findings into practice: a
55 consolidated framework for advancing implementation science.
56 *Implementation Science*, 4: 50. DOI::10.1186/1748-5908-4-50.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Department for Education (2014). *School funding: research priorities and*
4 *questions*, Crown copyright.

5
6 Dingfelder, H.E. & Mandell, D. S. (2011). Bridging the research-to-practice
7 gap in autism intervention: an application of Diffusion of Innovation theory.
8 *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 41 (5), 597-609.

9
10 Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

11
12 Gallagher, D., Connor, D.J., & Ferri, B., A. (2011). Broadening our horizons:
13 towards a plurality of methodologies in learning disability research, *Learning*
14 *Disability Quarterly*, 34 (2), 107-121.

15
16 Greenwood, C. R., & Abbott, M. (2001). The research to practice gap in
17 special education. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 24 (A), 276-
18 289.

19
20 Guba, E. G. (1996). Commentary. In L. Heshusius & K. Ballard (Eds.). *From*
21 *positivism to interpretivism and beyond: Tales of transformation in educational*
22 *and social research*, 121-127. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

23
24 Guldberg, K. (2010). Preconditions for inclusion: conceptualising 'best autism
25 practice in early years education, *British Journal of Special Education*, 37 (4),
26 168-174.

27
28 Guldberg, K., Parsons, S., MacLeod, A., Jones, G., Prunty, A. & Balfe, T.
29 (2011). Implications for Practice from 'International review of the evidence on
30 best practice in educational provision for children on the autism spectrum',
31 *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 26 (1), 64-70.

32
33 Hammersley, M. (2005). Is the evidence-based practice movement doing
34 more good than harm? Reflections on Iain Chalmers' case for research-based
35 policy making and practice. *Evidence & Policy: a journal of research, debate*
36 *and practice*, 1 (1), 85-100.

37
38 Hattie, J. (2008) *Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta analyses*
39 *related to achievement*. NY: Routledge. ISBN 978-0-415-47618-8.

40
41 Horner, R. H., Carr, E. G., Halle, J., McGee, G., Odom, S., & Wolery, M.
42 (2005). The use of single-subject research to identify evidence-based practice
43 in special education. *Exceptional Children*, 71, 165–179.

44
45 *Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*, 1990.

46
47 Howlin, P. (2010) Evaluating psychological treatments for children with
48 autism-spectrum disorders. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment* (16): 133–40.

49
50 Hughes, B. (2000). Medicine and the aesthetic invalidation of disabled people.
51 *Disability & Society*, 15, 555–568.

1
2
3 Jordan, R.R. (2005). Managing autism and Asperger's syndrome in current
4 educational provision, *Paediatric Rehabilitation*, 8, 104-112.

5
6 Kasari, C. & Smith, T. (2013). Interventions in schools for children with autism
7 spectrum disorder: Methods and recommendations, *Autism*, 17 (3), 254–267.

8
9 Kazdin, A.,E. (2008). Evidence- Based Treatment and Practice, New
10 opportunities to bridge clinical research and practice, enhance the knowledge
11 base and improve patient care. *American Psychologist*, 63 (3), 146-159.

12
13
14 Kemmis, S., R. McTaggart, & Nixon, R. (2014). A New View of Research:
15 Research Within Practice Traditions, in *The Action Research Planner*, 67–83.
16 Singapore: Springer.

17
18 Klingner, J. K., & Boardman, A.G. (2011). Addressing the “Research Gap” in
19 Special Education Through Mixed Methods. *Learning Disability Quarterly* 34
20 (3): 208–218.DOI:10.1177/0731948711417559.

21
22
23 Lagemann, E. C. (2000). *An elusive science: The troubling history of*
24 *education research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

25
26 Lather, P. (2004). Scientific Research in Education: A Critical Perspective,
27 *British Educational Research Journal* 30 (6), 759–772. DOI:10.2307/1502240

28
29
30 Locke, J., Olsen, A., Wideman, R., Downey, M.M., Kretzman, M., Kasari, C.,
31 & Mandell, D.S. (2014). A Tangled Web: The Challenges of Implementing an
32 Evidence-Based Social Engagement Intervention for Children With Autism in
33 Urban Public School Settings, *Behavior Therapy*, 46 (1), 54-67.

34
35
36 Lundahl, L. (2013). Challenges of educational theory in the age of knowledge
37 capitalism, p 31-45 in Biesta, G., Allan, J. & Edwards, R. (2014) *Making a*
38 *difference in theory. The theory question in education and the education*
39 *question in theory*, London: Routledge.

40
41 Magiati, I., Tay, X. W. & Howlin, P. (2012). Early comprehensive behaviorally
42 based interventions for children with autism spectrum disorders: a summary of
43 findings from recent reviews and meta-analyses, *Cognitive Neuropsychiatry*,
44 2, (6), 543-570. DOI: 10.2217/NPY.12.59.

45
46 Mesibov, G. & Shea, V. (2010). The TEACCH programme in the era of
47 Evidence-Based Practice, *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*,
48 40: 570-579.

49
50 Mesibov, G. & Shea, V. (2011). Evidence-based practices and autism,
51 *Autism*, Vol 15 (1), 114-133.

52
53
54 Milton, D. (2014). So what exactly are autism interventions intervening
55 with? *Good Autism Practice*, Vol. 15 (2): 6-14.

56
57
58 Nastasi, B. K., Varjas,K., Schensul, S.L., Tudor Silva,K., Schensul,J.J., &
59

1
2
3 Ratnayake, P. (2000). The participatory intervention model: a framework for
4 conceptualizing and promoting intervention acceptability, *School Psychology*
5 *Quarterly*, 15 (2): 207-232.
6

7 National Autism Centre. (2009). *The National Standards Project-addressing*
8 *the need for evidence-based practice guidelines for autism spectrum*
9 *disorders*. National Autism Center, 41 Pacella Park Drive, Randolph,
10 Massachusetts.
11

12 *No Child Left Behind Act* (2001). United States of America.
13

14
15 Odom, S. L., E. Brantlinger, R. Gersten, R. H. Horner, B. Thompson, K. &
16 Harris, R. (2005). "Research in Special Education: Scientific Methods and
17 Evidence-based Practices." *Exceptional Children*, 71 (2): 137–148.
18

19
20 Pampaka, M., Williams, J. & Homer, M. (2016). Is the educational 'what
21 works' agenda working? Critical methodological developments,' *International*
22 *Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 39:3, 231-236, DOI:
23 10.1080/1743727X.2016.1170476.
24

25
26 Parsons, S., Guldberg, K., MacLeod, A., Jones, G., Prunty, A. & Balfe, T.
27 (2011). International review of the evidence on best practice in educational
28 provision for children on the autism spectrum, *European Journal of Special*
29 *Needs Education*, 26 (1), 47-63.
30

31
32 Parsons, S., Guldberg, K., Porayska-Pomsta, K. & Lee, R. (2015). Digital
33 Stories as a method for evidence-based practice and knowledge co-creation
34 in technology-enhanced learning for children with autism. *International Journal*
35 *of Research Methods in Education, Special Issue: E-research in educational*
36 *contexts*, Vol. 38 (3), 247-271.
37

38
39 Parsons, S. & Kasari, C. (2013). Editorial: Schools at the centre of educational
40 research in autism: Possibilities, practices and promises. *Autism*, 17 (3), 251–
41 253.
42

43 Pellicano, E., Dinsmore, A., & Charman, T. (2014). What should autism
44 research focus upon? Community views and priorities from the United
45 Kingdom. *Autism*, 1-15. DOI: 10.1177/1362361314529627.
46

47 Poplin, M. (2011). Valuing a Plurality of Research Methodologies in the Field
48 of LD, *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 34 (2), Issue I of II, 150-152.
49

50 Pring, R. & Thomas, G. (Eds) (2004). *Evidence-based practice in Education*.
51 Open University Press: Berkshire.
52

53 Prizant, B. (2015). *Uniquely human: a different way of seeing autism*, The
54 Associated Press.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Reichow, B., Volkmar, F.R., & Chiccetti, D.V. (2008). Development of the
4 evaluative method for evaluating and determining evidence-based practices in
5 autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 38, 1311-1319.
6

7 Rynes, S. L., Bartunek, J.M. & Daft, R.L. (2001). Across the Great Divide:
8 Knowledge Creation and Transfer Between Practitioners and Academics. *The*
9 *Academy of Management Journal*, 44 (2): 340–355.
10

11 Sahlberg, P. (2010). Rethinking accountability in a knowledge society, *Journal*
12 *of Educational Change*, 11, 45-61. DOI 10.1007/s10833-008-9098-2
13

14 Smeyers, P. & Depaepe, M. eds. (2010). *Educational Research: Why 'What*
15 *Works' Doesn't Work*. Dordrecht: Springer.
16

17 Tatto, M., T. & Furlong, J. (2015). Research and teacher education: papers
18 from the BERA-RSA enquiry, *Oxford Review of Education*, 41: 2, 145-153,
19 DOI: 10.1080/03054985.2015.1017404.
20

21 Thomas, G., & R. Pring, eds. (2004). *Evidence-based Practice in Education*.
22 Berkshire: Open University Press.
23

24 Thomas, G. (2012a) A review of thinking and research about inclusive
25 education policy, with suggestions for a new kind of inclusive thinking. *British*
26 *Educational Research Journal*, 39, 3, 473-490. DOI:
27 10.1080/01411926.2011.652070.
28

29 Thomas, G. (2012b) Changing our landscape of inquiry for a new science of
30 education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 82, 1, 26-51.
31 <http://her.hepg.org/content/6t2r089l715x3377/>
32

33 Trent, S. C., Artiles, A. J., & Englert, C. S. (1998). From deficit thinking to
34 social constructivism: A review of theory, research, and practice in special
35 education. *Review of Research in Education*, 23, 277-307.
36

37 Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*.
38 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
39

40 Weisz, J., & Jensen, P. (1999). Efficacy and Effectiveness of Child and
41 Adolescent Psychotherapy and Pharmacotherapy." *Mental Health Services*
42 *Research*, 1 (3): 125–157. DOI:10.1023/A:1022321812352.
43

44 Winch, C., Oancea, A. & Orchard, J. (2015). The contribution of educational
45 research to teachers' professional learning: philosophical understandings', in
46 *Oxford Review of Education*, 41 (2), 202-216.
47

48 Wittemeyer, K., Charman, T., Cusack, J., Guldberg, K., Hastings, R., Howlin,
49 P., Macnab, N., Parsons, S., Pellicano, L. & Slonims, V. (2011) *Educational*
50
51

1
2
3 *provision and outcomes for people on the autism spectrum*, London: Autism
4 Education Trust.
5

6 Wong, C., Odom, S.L., Hume, K., Cox, A.W., Fetting, A., Kucharczyk, S., Brock,
7 M.E., Plavnik, J., B., Fleury, V., P. & Schultz, T.R. (2014) *Evidence based*
8 *practices for children, youth, and young adults with Autism Spectrum*
9 *Disorder*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, Frank Porter Graham
10 Child Development Institute, Autism Evidence-Based Practice Review Group.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Title: Evidence Based Practice in autism educational research: can we bridge the research and practice gap?

Minor revisions are outlined in the attached Table and changes are highlighted in the text using Track Changes.

Formatted: Justified

Reviewer Comment	Change
Page 1: The first sentence is not clear - the two 'strongly contested opinions' need to be reworded to ensure clarity from the start of the paper	This sentence has now been reworded.
The abbreviation for EBP is not always used - suggest consistency in writing	This has been addressed in the main text throughout.
Page 2: 'I argue that the gap between research and practice takes a particular form in the autism field, and there are lessons to be learnt from this field for educational research more broadly' - I am not convinced this is argued effectively in the main text of the paper, and would suggest further clarity on this point	I have adjusted this sentence to ensure it is more in line with what is effectively argued in the main text.
Page 8 line 38 missing word: 'if intervention research is to have both scientific validity in design and implementation as well AS social validity within the broader community...'	Corrected and the word 'as' has been added
Page 13 paragraph 2: it would be worth noting here that we don't have objective measures to enable successful identification and research on outcomes that support choice and autonomy - and that this is a limitation of current research methods	I have added this point to the relevant paragraph using Track Changes
Page 17: 'move from a narrowly defined epistemic science to one that articulates a social science that integrates context-dependency with practical deliberation' - to further highlight this point, it should be	I have added this important point using Track Changes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FOR

related to the fact that autism is, by definition, a spectrum of disorders and therefore this complexity cannot currently be narrowly defined	
Page 17 – you could go a step further and state how the qualitative and quantitative research can be combined in practical ways	This has been highlighted through the examples of participatory research

Introduction

~~Debates around Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) in education highlight is a hotly-contested subject at the moment, and has been for a while, with strong messages that teachers should be focusing on 'what works,' and that research favours certain teaching methods for maximising pupil learning outcomes (Hattie, 2008), and that further work is needed to address how to best apply research to practice (DfE, 2014), with researchers and government departments claiming that research favours certain teaching methods for maximising pupil learning outcomes (Hattie, 2008).~~ Thus the Department for Education (DfE) in the UK allocated £135 million to improve quantitative data in education as well as adopting a framework for conceptualising ~~EBP evidence-based teaching~~ focusing on the use and application of research evidence in schools (DfE, 2014). Meanwhile, the US institute of Education Sciences takes a clear stand that education researchers need to develop interventions that are effective in raising student achievement and to validate the effectiveness of those interventions using rigorous methods (Lundahl, 2013). The 'Individuals with Disabilities Education Act' (IDEA, 2008), ensures

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FOR

that services to children with disabilities require teachers to use EBPs by mandating the scientifically based research concept in education through the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) Act of 2001. This is now enshrined in law, with the NCLB addressing the need for standards and measurable goals with reliance on scientifically based research for interventions and teaching methods.

Within this context, autism educational research is dominated by experimental research designs that should inform decisions teachers make on the ground. When the US National Research Council (NRC) conducted a rigorous assessment of intervention research studies in the field of autism, for example, studies needed to employ particular methodologies in order to be considered an EBP and these included randomised, quasi-experimental or single-subject design studies. In a relatively recent National Professional Development Centre (NPDC) review of autism intervention research, 40% of studies used multiple baseline design, with 8% based on RCTs (Wong et al., 2014). Current research in autism is largely Single Subject Experimental Designs (SSED) with group designs becoming more common (Kasari & Smith, 2013) and there is a clear dominance of empirical and technical instrumental research that is modeled on the natural sciences (see Dingfelder & Mandell, 2011; Odom et al., 2005).

The above hegemony of experimental designs has led to heated debate over the last few years about the way in which ~~EBP Evidence-Based Practice~~ is perceived, and the relationship between research and practice in autism

✓

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

educational research (de Bruin, 2015), with much discussion focusing on how to generate a positive relationship between educational research and teaching knowledge and practice (Tatto & Furlong, 2015; Pampaka et al., 2016) whilst recognising that there is a persistent gap between research and practice in autism education (Parsons & Kasari, 2013).

In this paper, I ~~focus on argue that~~ the ~~particular form the~~ gap between research and practice takes ~~a particular form~~ in the autism field, and ~~I identify the methodological re-adjustments that are needed~~ ~~there are lessons to be learnt from this field for educational research more broadly, recognising~~ given that broader discussions around 'what works' have been problematic in both practice and theory, as well as in methodology (Smeyers & Depaepe, 2010). I focus on the need to broaden the range of methodologies used so the field can draw on a wider knowledge base, as practice needs a much wider knowledge base than policy. By addressing the need for a plurality of methodologies, and for further dialogue about what kind of knowledge we value in the field of learning disabilities (Gallagher, Connor & Ferri, 2011), autism educational research exemplifies the methodological reorientation that is needed in educational research more generally.

I discuss the fact that whilst the 'what works' debate is designed to find rigorous ways of using evidence to improve practice, the dominance of experimental designs in autism education contribute to a schism between research and practice in this field (Parsons & Kaskari, 2013; Parsons et al. 2015). This substantial gap between research and practice in autism educational research is problematic (Damschroder et al., 2011; Parsons &

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FOR

Kasari, 2013) because long-term outcomes for individuals with autism remain poor (Magiati, Tay & Howlin, 2012), leading to a need for practical solutions for education and life skills (Pellicano, Dinsmore & Charman, 2014).

My paper therefore discusses the preconditions for developing better frameworks and tools for understanding variation across different contextual factors (Klingner & Boardman, 2011), and it underscores the need for a more balanced range of studies and research designs. It highlights that the field needs to become better at recognising that evidence applicable to education will occur in diverse forms and therefore needs to be gathered through diverse means. This includes objective measures obtained from controlled trials, *and* subjective perspectives that are grounded in professional understanding, experiences and interpretations of teachers, in conjunction with approaches that focus on methodologies and methods that respect and value both researchers and practitioners (BERA-RSA, 2014).

The aims are therefore to i) highlight how the dominance of experimental designs leads to a schism between research and practice in this field; ii) discuss how to develop better frameworks and tools for understanding variation across different contextual factors and iii) put the case for recognising that evidence applicable to education needs to take different forms and therefore needs to be gathered through different means. In taking the reader through this argument, I start by highlighting the range of interventions that are present in the autism field and examine current attempts to address the gap between research and practice, before putting the case for

✓

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

a paradigm shift in autism education.

A broad range of interventions with different theoretical underpinnings

A quick online search for 'autism interventions' gives over 38 million links so there are clearly many strategies, approaches, therapies and interventions for improving the lives of autistic people. 'Research Autism', a website dedicated to researching the wide range of 'treatments' and 'interventions' in autism, currently lists over a thousand of those in the field of autism along with indications of the evidence base (Milton, 2014). These have a number of different underlying theoretical perspectives. In autism, as in broader disability studies, there are three main theoretical approaches (Arduin, 2015): the medical model through which autism is viewed through the lens of a pathological or flawed existence (Hughes, 2000); the social model, which posits that concepts of disability are culturally relative and the consequence of particular cultural conditions (Corker & Shakespeare, 2002) and the interactionist, human rights or transactional model which focuses on human rights, and disability as being part of diversity, with difficulties arising from an interaction between the individual and the environment (Prizant, 2015).

Within these theoretical traditions, much of the emphasis on experimental designs and quantitative studies around EBP in autism education tend to emanate from a deficit based medical model, in which disability is defined as 'a physical or mental impairment' (DfE, 2014), with a high proportion of intervention studies focusing on intensive behavioural interventions (Howlin,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FOR

2010) that are based on a normative focus on 'correcting deficits' (Milton, 2014).

The above theoretical perspectives have a bearing not only on views about how pupils learn, but also on how to conduct research, as they lead to different foci in terms of the developmental areas they focus on, which in turn affect how progress is measured (Howlin, 2010). Researchers with varying theoretical perspectives will see the world differently and will therefore differ in the questions they ask, what they examine in research as well as the methodologies they consider valid for measuring pupil progress (Poplin, 2011). Hence, behaviourists will tend to define the behavior that is considered desirable, then count the behavior, and reinforce it; cognitive theorists shift this to strategic academic behaviours they believe underpin academic performance whilst constructivist focus the lens on the process of facilitating an individuals construction of meaning (Poplin, 2011).

Methodological critiques of current intervention research

Although a number of studies have provided some reliable knowledge about which interventions 'work' and have helped practitioners make decisions in selecting suitable interventions, reviews have highlighted that there is not enough evidence to promote a specific form of intervention given the lack of robust evidence coupled with the wide range of interventions in the field of autism (Parsons et al. 2011; Odom et al., 2005; Howlin, 2010). Furthermore, as well as intervention research involving many different strategies, there is often a limited range of outcomes measured (Pasons et al., 2011). Effects of

7

✓

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

interventions often impact on a narrow range of skills so a programme to improve non-verbal communication will narrowly focus on that without examining its effect on broader cognitive functioning, for example (Howlin, 2010).

Furthermore, whilst current intervention research clearly represents a desire to apply a rigorous and systematic approach to produce knowledge that can in turn enable generalisation (de Bruin, 2015), the underlying assumption that these designs infer causality and should be able to support professionals to make decisions about 'what works' are problematic as there are clear methodological challenges. Although many reviews and meta-reviews have been undertaken in the field, the groups define different literature, use different definitions of EBP, lump or split interventions at different levels of specificity and come to different conclusions (see Mesibov & Shea, 2010 and Parsons et al., 2011). Furthermore, sample sizes tend to be limited, most examine relatively short-term gains and there are problems sorting out intervention effects compared to other variables (Horner et al., 2005). In addition, most pupils receive more than one intervention at any one point in time, making it difficult to separate out a particular element or type of approach (Parsons et al., 2011).

The perceived weaknesses of current intervention research have therefore led to calls for more methodologically rigorous research (Parsons et al., 2011; Charman et al., 2011) with attempts to counter the narrow focus on specific research designs as the only legitimate way of conducting research in the field

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

and with proposals for assessing the quality of a variety of research designs (see Horner, et al., 2005 and Reichow et al. 2008).

The problem with applying experimental designs to school settings

The field is currently dominated by efficacy studies that report the success or failure of interventions in 'ideal' conditions that are carefully controlled. As a result, arguments have been put forward for countering the narrow focus on specific research designs as the only legitimate way of conducting research in the field (see Horner, et al., 2005 and Reichow et al. 2008). This stems from the recognition that it can be quite a challenge to gather efficacy for particular methods as there are so many variables that can be difficult to pin down and measure. Efficacy studies also tend to lack the flexibility that would allow one to capture and to understand what happens naturally or to predict all of the many and varied consequences of a particular course of action due to the context specific nature of education, as much of what happens depends upon chance and dynamic combinations of different starting points, teacher skills and understanding, the school context, and learning objectives (Biesta, et al., 2014).

Although efficacy studies contribute important new knowledge to the autism field, we therefore need to stay mindful of the fact that even when there is evidence for specific interventions in the highly controlled contexts in which they were studied (Kasari & Smith, 2013), these might not be applicable to educational contexts where individual teachers make judgements based on available evidence. If intervention research is to have both scientific validity in

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

design and implementation as well as social validity within the broader community, the field needs to find better ways of ensuring interventions are evaluated in the area in which children are based, such as mainstream primary schools (NAC, 2009). This has led to calls for conducting more effectiveness studies, which focus on the sustainability of the intervention and the importance of it to those participating in it in everyday conditions (Weisz & Jensen, 1999; Kasari & Smith, 2013).

The question is then whether this will go far enough in changing the fact that University based autism intervention research is not evident in the child's school in most schools in the UK and US, or if it is, it is changed so much that it is different from the original intervention (Kasari & Smith, 2013). Practitioners rarely alter their practice by drawing on the evidence base from research (Lather, 2004) despite schools being under increasing pressure to implement EBPs in order to meet the diverse needs of pupils with autism, with many continuing to use practices that are unsupported by such research (Burns & Ysseldyke 2009; Carter et al., 2011). Teachers have reported that they view researchers as being out of touch with the realities of today's classroom contexts (Greenwood & Abbott, 2001), whilst being less concerned about EBPs and more interested in how the given solutions might fit with the needs of individual children (Guldberg et al., 2011).

Researchers have therefore begun exploring the barriers to implementing studies in schools (Locke et al., 2014). These barriers have been seen as relating to 'incompletely developed interventions, limited evidence of their

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 utility in promoting long term and meaningful change and poor fit with school
20 environments' (Kasari and Smith, 2013, p1). More specifically, barriers have
21 been linked with lack of training of teachers (Dingfelder & Mandell, 2012), the
22 competing priorities of staff, policies surrounding break times, lack of school
23 support, and difficulty finding resources and time for implementing
24 interventions in the school day (Locke et al., 2014). Whilst a focus on barriers
25 to implementation is important, I go on to argue that a more fundamental
26 paradigm shift is needed than current debates indicate.

27 **The knowledge transfer model orthodoxy**

28 The debates around efficacy, effectiveness and implementation problems in
29 schools highlight that there is an assumption that effective
30 ~~practices/treatments~~ have been produced, but that the issue is that teachers
31 are not implementing these ~~EBP/evidence-based treatments~~. This narrative
32 sees the problem as a 'translational one' in which research dissemination is
33 perceived as a linear, top-down transmission model from which practitioners
34 should draw knowledge. Research should then flow from the journal to
35 classroom practice without any real and sustained engagement with teachers
36 or pupils (Greenwood & Abbott, 2001). This model posits the researcher as
37 the "expert" and the teacher as simply the vehicle for delivering the
38 intervention (Trent, Artiles, & Englert, 1998).

39 This 'knowledge transfer' model in autism education research can be
40 illustrated by the National Autism Centre's (2009) systematic review of both
41 SSED and group designs, identifying eleven 'treatments' for which they claim
42

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 there is evidence of effective practice, and moving from this to producing a
20 manual for EBP in schools and recommending a specific set of best practices
21 such as visual schedules and self management techniques (NAC, 2009).
22 Meanwhile, the National Professional Development Centre identified a larger
23 set of practices and made steps to operationalise these by producing step-by-
24 step reviews (Wong et al., 2014), focusing on the necessity of translating
25 scientific results into intervention practices or practitioner friendly summaries
26 so that users can be informed by those (Reichow, 2008), whilst also providing
27 'professional development and support for implementing the practices with
28 fidelity' (Wong et al., 2014, p. 34).

29 **The need to take onboard different ways of knowing**

30 The above solutions do not take account of the fact that a teacher's choice of
31 educational programmes tends to derive from a combination of educational,
32 behavioural and developmental research and theory (Howlin, 2010) resulting
33 in them employing an eclectic mix of strategies (Guldberg, 2010). Whilst the
34 science behind research-based instruction and intervention studies requires
35 fidelity of implementation, teachers tend to view good teaching as involving
36 innovation and an eclectic sampling from a variety of instructional or teaching
37 models (Greenwood & Abbott, 2001).

38 Unfortunately the prevailing research culture of knowledge transfer in
39 evidence-based research diminishes the potential contributions of teachers
40 and pupils by prioritising particular ways of knowing. It ignores important
41 aspects of professional knowledge (Rynes, Bartunek & Daft, 2001) and the
42

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FOR

situated nature of the experiences and expectations of teachers and children in schools (Parsons et al., 2013), as well as the complex nature of schools where it is often difficult to implement more rigid, experimental research designs requiring strict adherence to planned protocols (Kasari & Smith, 2013).

As far back as 1996, Guba noted that stakeholders should inform an integral part of knowledge and that they would feel no obligation to abide by knowledge if they do not have ownership of it (Guba, 1996). Yet the prevailing culture of knowledge transfer puts agency in the hands of policy or the intervention whilst there is actually a need to allow variation and mediation between teachers, thus giving more agency of the whole process to the schools, pupils and their families (Gallagher et al., 2011). The issue of agency is a crucial one in that it highlights the need to introduce methodologies that position not only teachers, but also individuals with autism and their families at the center of inquiry and knowledge. This can enable research to be both practical in terms of day-to-day practice and modifiable to meet diverse pupil needs.

In order to identify the goals that are important for the autism community, for families and for practitioners, meaning therefore needs to be found in lived experiences, and research needs to invest in working *with* those stakeholders rather than *on* them (Freire, 1972), with a concomitant reorientation towards human subjectivity (Allan, 2011). It is difficult to see how a practice can be effective at generating improvement if we do not also gain an understanding

✓

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

of the way that the world is viewed and experienced by the individuals whose outcomes we are aiming to improve. This is particularly pertinent as autistic adults feel that 'research fails to speak to the reality of their lives in the here-and-now' (Pellicano et al., 2014, p. 5). Individuals with autism have simply not been involved in setting the agenda of working out what is important to focus on (Pellicano et al. 2014) and this has led to a large mismatch between what individuals with autism say they need in terms of what constitutes positive outcomes, and what research tends to focus on.

Wittemeyer et al., (2011) found that a good adult outcome needs to be considered within the context of individual needs and aspirations; enabling a person to make choices and giving them access to the right support when needed was seen as crucial. Milton (2014), an autistic sociologist, has echoed this through advocating that care must be taken to ensure that structures are put in place to encourage the learner's autonomy and reduce their stress. Evidence Based Practice therefore needs to take into account what it should work for and who should have a say in determining the latter (Biesta, 2013).

Given that findings from studies indicate that autistic individuals place importance on outcomes that support choice and autonomy (Wittemeyer et al., 2011; Pellicano et al., 2014; Milton, 2014), it is troubling that outcomes such as these, which can seem loose and fuzzy, are seldom focused on in autism research, with the consequence that interventions are limited to those whose goals can be measured. We know very little about how changes in standardised measures reflect changes in everyday life though and variables

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

that lend themselves to measurement and statistical analysis may not be important for some of the long-term goals and outcomes of people with autism such as life satisfaction, community participation and personal relationships

(Wittemeyer et al., 2011). [A further a limitation of current research methods is that we do not have objective measures that enable successful identification and research on outcomes that support choice and autonomy.](#)

Many studies involving Early Intensive Behavioural Intervention, for example, have used IQ as a principal outcome measure, yet even statistically significant increases in IQ do not necessarily lead to improvement in other, more practical day to day skills (Howlin, 2010). Neither does statistical significance in controlled trials necessarily mean that pupils have improved in ways that are reflected in their everyday functioning (Mesibov and Shea, 2011). The dangers of this approach are summed up by Poplin, who argues that 'when the human sciences use only quantitative data, we end up with a narrow, piecemeal view of reality' (Poplin, 2011, p150). She goes on to argue that both inductive and deductive research is vital to understanding educational contexts (Poplin, 2011) and it is this question I turn to next.

The argument for both inductive and deductive research

Although much of the current autism research into interventions has come up with information that is of general value, it has often been of little help in deciding on a particular case (Jordan, 2005) as the classroom is very different from an experimental or therapeutic setting. In classrooms that educate pupils with autism, interventions need to be individualised according to pupil

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

characteristics, include real life outcome measures and be generalisable to complex real-life conditions and multiple cultures and settings (Mesibov and Shea, 2010). This means focusing the lens on the individual child, young person or adult, rather than the 'model' or 'intervention' (Guldberg, 2010). The teacher working with a child with autism needs to understand the child and how autism impacts on the child and the family, before deciding which strategies or interventions might work and how she might implement those in the particular context in which she works (Jordan, 2005).

Implementation often relies on a number of factors, including choice of educational approach, attending to the responses of the child or children whilst approaches are being implemented, gauging how children are responding to them, observing, reflecting and then possibly changing how an approach is used depending on how the child responds (Guldberg et al., 2011). This relies on knowledge and understanding of autism, values, tacit judgements, experience, local knowledge, and skills (Parsons et al., 2015). Furthermore, the ways teachers and pupils behave are strongly influenced by one another and participants interpret and make sense of their world in different ways (Biesta, 2013), with learning being situated and context dependent (Wenger, 1998).

This highlights that professional practice needs to move beyond the notion of simply relying on 'what works', to ensuring that research can make a positive contribution to each aspect of teachers' professional knowledge. This professional knowledge embodies practical wisdom and critical reflection as

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 well as technical knowledge (Winch et al., 2015). Thus it is not enough to
20 purely focus on addressing how schools and teachers can become better
21 informed by data and robust evidence so they can access and interpret
22 different kinds of evidence and adapt it to their own settings and contexts
23 (Tatto & Furlong, 2015). Nor should discussion about the gap between
24 research and practice be too narrowly focused on the need for teachers to
25 develop research related skills and knowledge or to become better equipped
26 to engage with and become consumers of research.

27
28 Rather, there needs to be acknowledgement of the fact that the knowledge of
29 educators is rooted in immersion and reflection, resulting in cumulative
30 knowledge arising from an accumulation of understandings rather than an
31 accumulation of facts (Thomas, 2012b). This knowledge is practical and tacit,
32 based upon ~~using~~ personal experience and learning from the experience of
33 others. Teachers deal with more than the simple application of strategies or
34 techniques to bring about predetermined ends (Biesta et al., 2014), and their
35 work is not necessarily open to objective assessment, neither is it technical
36 (Biesta et al., 2014). Our focus therefore needs to shift more towards ensuring
37 that the field gets a better understanding about what good teaching is and
38 how it leads to learning (Sahlberg, 2010), and therefore to notions of 'good
39 autism practice' in education. This means recognizing the importance of
40 focusing on what Sahlberg and Hasak describe as 'small data'- 'the diversity
41 and beauty that exists in every classroom, and the causation they reveal in
42 the present'. Thus a teacher will need to be able to draw upon both the
43 evidence base for research, such as the fact that many pupils with autism

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

need visual augmentative strategies, whilst also being able to reflect on how those strategies are being implemented and responded to in the interactions and relationships that are developing in the classroom.

The proposed core principles flowing from this then need to become that EBPs should have a cogent rationale for educational strategies. As Mesibov and Shea (2010) argue, this latter focus is productive because it encourages the use of diverse sources of information for developing and evaluating educational approaches and encourages a focus on how to respond to the varying needs of different pupils and what is feasible. This does not negate the importance of drawing upon research evidence to shape and enhance practice. Rather, it is about, as Pring and Thomas (2004) argue, questioning the nature of evidence and the potency assigned to particular types of evidence.

What we therefore need more of in the field of autism intervention research, is a 'move from a narrowly defined epistemic science to one that articulates a social science that integrates context-dependency with practical deliberation' (Lather, 2004). This is essential given that autism represents a complex spectrum of different abilities and difficulties that cannot be narrowly defined. It highlights the need for methodologies that means staying close to the complexities and contradictions of existence, with the goal of also fostering understanding, reflection and action as well as translation of research into practice. This has in turn led to several scholars articulating the need to value qualitative methodologies on a par with the quantitative experimental designs

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

that currently dominate the field (Poplin, 2011) calling for the use of a broader range of methods that allow us to look at phenomena in ways that reveal many facets of human experience (Kazdin, 2008). This can include in-depth evaluation, subjective views and how individuals react to their situations and contexts whilst looking for genuine change in functioning, meaning, experience and perception. It can include a whole range of methodologies that enable this kind of study, from case studies to action research, phenomenology or narrative research (Gallagher et al., 2011).

Furthermore, the field would benefit from codifying experiences of teachers in practice and ensuring that accumulated data can be analysed in partnership with researchers (Kazdin, 2008), moving towards closer collaboration between researchers and practitioners, one in which the role of judgement, expertise and context ought to be studied directly. Nastasi et al. (2000) argued for participatory action research approaches that involve stakeholders in intervention efforts in order to focus on interventions that consumers find acceptable and to move towards a broad conception of integrity and effectiveness. Participatory approaches to developing interventions should include competencies that are relevant to the targeted culture, valuing naturalistic enquiry, real-life contexts, and understanding, as well as the importance of describing phenomena from the population, thus facilitating culturally specific theory and intervention (Nastasi et al. 2000).

The case for rapprochement and change in emphasis

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

In discussing the divide between research and practice, Kazdin (2008) therefore argued for rapprochement and changes in emphasis, highlighting that both research and practice should contribute to our knowledge base. This is aligned with the conception of 'Evidence Based Treatment' (EBT) that was put forward by the American Psychological Association in 2006 and defined as 'the integration of the best available research and clinical expertise within the context of patient characteristics, cultures, values and preferences' (APA, 2006, p 273). Kazdin (2008) highlighted that it is very unfortunate to take a narrow view of knowledge transfer in which research is seen as contributing to the knowledge base and practice as an application of research. This way of seeing the contributions of each of the domains, does in fact heighten the research-practice gap as it negates the contribution that clinical, or educational practice can contribute to the scientific knowledge base. As well as focusing on the expectation that educational practice should be the application of research findings to practice, there is therefore clearly a need for more rigorous examination of how educational practice can contribute to the scientific knowledge base, promoting research designs that enable teachers to both inform the research community and be informed by it.

Conclusions

This paper has argued that there is a key danger in privileging a certain kind of research evidence over evidence from other sources. There is a need to move towards research designs that enable stakeholders to participate in identifying the outcomes to focus on and to contribute data from the classroom, including participatory approaches that are situated in the contexts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FOR

in which people live and work (Biesta, 2013) and that take into account the concerns and experiences of individuals with autism, their families and the practitioners who work with them.

The autism field needs to move towards a double transformation of both educational research and educational practice (Biesta et al., 2014), as factual knowledge is never a sufficient determinant of good practice in education. The problem with 'excessive quantification' and a focus solely on scientific approaches is that it can push the field away from closer interactions with policy and practice (Lagemann, 2000); it holds within it the danger of oversimplifying the relationship of research to practice (Hammersley, 2005) and negates the fact that multiple research designs are needed to address different types of questions (APA, 2006; Mesibov & Shea, 2010). Research questions need to be more firmly focused on what constitutes a good outcome for a person with autism. Autistic people, their families and the practitioners who work with them, need to be involved in identifying those questions, including a re-framing of which outcomes measures are important to focus on.

The argument is not that different forms of evidence are incompatible, but rather that both need to be taken into account and combined to offer a more balanced insight into best educational practices. Thus, calls for a need for educational sciences to be rooted at the practical level (Thomas & Pring, 2014) do not negate the need for controlled experimental approaches but recognise the need to broaden the concept of EBP beyond the knowledge transfer model. What is argued for is a broader conceptualisation of EBP that

✓

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 is informed by experimental evidence, as well as by the perspectives and
20 needs of individuals with autism, their families and the practitioners who work
21 with them (Kazdin, 2006).

22
23 Ultimately, to achieve this requires methodologies that ensure that teachers'
24 craft and tacit knowledge are both captured adequately and taken into
25 account *together with* the systematic knowledge generated by research
26 (Hammersley, 2005). To that end, scientific research and practice both have
27 in common that they need to be flexible, interpretative and reflective (Thomas,
28 2014).

29 **References**

30
31 Allan, J. (2011). Complicating, Not Explicating: Taking Up Philosophy in
32 Learning Disability Research. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 34 (2), 153–161.
33 DOI:10.1177/073194871103400206.

34 Arduin, S. (2015). A review of the values that underpin the structure of an
35 education system and its approach to disability and inclusion. *Oxford Review
36 of Education*, 41 (1), 105-121. DOI: 10.1080/03054985.2015.1006614.

37 APA presidential task force on Evidence Based Practice (2006). Evidence
38 Based Practice in Psychology. *American Psychologist*, 61 (4), 271-285.

39 BERA-RSA (2014). *Research and the teaching profession: building the
40 capacity for a self-improving education system*. Available from
41 <https://www.bera.ac.uk/project/research-and-teacher-education> [last accessed
42 17th May 2016].

43 Biesta, G. (2013). *The beautiful risk of education*. Boulder: Paradigm
44 Publishers.

45 Biesta, G., Allan, J. & Edwards, R. (2014) *Making a difference in theory. The
46 theory question in education and the education question in theory*. London:
47 Routledge.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Bruin, de, C.L. (2015). Conceptualizing effectiveness in disability research, *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, DOI:10.1080/1743727X.2015.1033391.

Burns, M. K., & Ysseldyke, J. (2009). Reported Prevalence of Evidence-Based Instructional Practices in Special Education. *The Journal of Special Education*, 43 (1): 3–11. DOI:10.1177/0022466908315563.

Carter, M., Stephenson, J. & Strnadova, I. (2011). Reported Prevalence by Australian Special Educators of Evidence-Based Instructional Practices. *Australasian Journal of Special Education* 35 (1), 47–60. DOI:10.1375/ajse.35.1.47.

Charman, T., Pellicano, L., Peacey, L., Peacey, N., Forward, K. & Dockrell, J. (2011). *What is good practice in autism education?* London: Autism Education Trust.

Corker, M., & Shakespeare, T. (2002). *Disability/postmodernity: Embodying disability theory*. London: Continuum.

Damschroder, L.J., Aron, D.C., & Keith, R.E. (2009). Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. *Implementation Science*, 4: 50. DOI:10.1186/1748-5908-4-50.

Department for Education (2014). *School funding: research priorities and questions*. Crown copyright.

Dingfelder, H.E. & Mandell, D. S. (2011). Bridging the research-to-practice gap in autism intervention: an application of Diffusion of Innovation theory. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 41 (5), 597-609.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Hammondsworth: Penguin.

Gallagher, D., Connor, D.J., & Ferri, B., A. (2011). Broadening our horizons: towards a plurality of methodologies in learning disability research, *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 34 (2), 107-121.

Greenwood, C. R., & Abbott, M. (2001). The research to practice gap in special education. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 24 (A), 276-289.

Guba, E. G. (1996). Commentary. In L. Heshusius & K. Ballard (Eds.), *From positivism to interpretivism and beyond: Tales of transformation in educational and social research*, 121-127. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Guldberg, K. (2010). Preconditions for inclusion: conceptualising 'best autism practice in early years education, *British Journal of Special Education*, 37 (4), 168-174.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Guldberg, K., Parsons, S., MacLeod, A., Jones, G., Prunty, A. & Balfe, T. (2011). Implications for Practice from 'International review of the evidence on best practice in educational provision for children on the autism spectrum', *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 26 (1), 64-70.
- Hammersley, M. (2005). Is the evidence-based practice movement doing more good than harm? Reflections on Iain Chalmers' case for research-based policy making and practice. *Evidence & Policy: a journal of research, debate and practice*, 1 (1), 85-100.
- Hattie, J. (2008) *Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta analyses related to achievement*. NY: Routledge. ISBN 978-0-415-47618-8.
- Horner, R. H., Carr, E. G., Halle, J., McGee, G., Odom, S., & Wolery, M. (2005). The use of single-subject research to identify evidence-based practice in special education. *Exceptional Children*, 71, 165–179.
- Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*, 1990.
- Howlin, P. (2010) Evaluating psychological treatments for children with autism-spectrum disorders. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment* (16): 133–40.
- Hughes, B. (2000). Medicine and the aesthetic invalidation of disabled people. *Disability & Society*, 15, 555–568.
- Jordan, R.R. (2005). Managing autism and Asperger's syndrome in current educational provision, *Paediatric Rehabilitation*, 8, 104-112.
- Kasari, C. & Smith, T. (2013). Interventions in schools for children with autism spectrum disorder: Methods and recommendations, *Autism*, 17 (3), 254–267.
- Kazdin, A.E. (2008). Evidence- Based Treatment and Practice. New opportunities to bridge clinical research and practice, enhance the knowledge base and improve patient care. *American Psychologist*, 63 (3), 146-159.
- Kemmis, S., R. McTaggart, & Nixon, R. (2014). A New View of Research: Research Within Practice Traditions, in *The Action Research Planner*, 67–83. Singapore: Springer.
- Klingner, J. K., & Boardman, A.G. (2011). Addressing the "Research Gap" in Special Education Through Mixed Methods. *Learning Disability Quarterly* 34 (3): 208–218. DOI:10.1177/0731948711417559.
- Lagemann, E. C. (2000). *An elusive science: The troubling history of education research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lather, P. (2004). Scientific Research in Education: A Critical Perspective. *British Educational Research Journal* 30 (6), 759–772. DOI:10.2307/1502240

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Locke, J., Olsen, A., Wideman, R., Downey, M.M., Kretzman, M., Kasari, C., & Mandell, D.S. (2014). A Tangled Web: The Challenges of Implementing an Evidence-Based Social Engagement Intervention for Children With Autism in Urban Public School Settings, *Behavior Therapy*, 46 (1), 54-67.

Lundahl, L. (2013). Challenges of educational theory in the age of knowledge capitalism, p 31-45 in Biesta, G., Allan, J. & Edwards, R. (2014) *Making a difference in theory. The theory question in education and the education question in theory*. London: Routledge.

Magiati, I., Tay, X. W. & Howlin, P. (2012). Early comprehensive behaviorally based interventions for children with autism spectrum disorders: a summary of findings from recent reviews and meta-analyses, *Cognitive Neuropsychiatry*, 2, (6), 543-570. DOI: 10.2217/NPY.12.59.

Mesibov, G. & Shea, V. (2010). The TEACCH programme in the era of Evidence-Based Practice, *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 40: 570-579.

Mesibov, G. & Shea, V. (2011). Evidence-based practices and autism, *Autism*, Vol 15 (1), 114-133.

Milton, D. (2014). So what exactly are autism interventions intervening with? *Good Autism Practice*, Vol. 15 (2): 6-14.

Nastasi, B. K., Varjas, K., Schensul, S.L., Tudor Silva, K., Schensul, J.J., & Ratnayake, P. (2000). The participatory intervention model: a framework for conceptualizing and promoting intervention acceptability, *School Psychology Quarterly*, 15 (2): 207-232.

National Autism Centre. (2009). *The National Standards Project-addressing the need for evidence-based practice guidelines for autism spectrum disorders*. National Autism Center, 41 Pacella Park Drive, Randolph, Massachusetts.

No Child Left Behind Act (2001). United States of America.

Odom, S. L., E. Brantlinger, R. Gersten, R. H. Horner, B. Thompson, K. & Harris, R. (2005). "Research in Special Education: Scientific Methods and Evidence-based Practices." *Exceptional Children*, 71 (2): 137-148.

Pampaka, M., Williams, J. & Homer, M. (2016). Is the educational 'what works' agenda working? Critical methodological developments, *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 39:3, 231-236, DOI: 10.1080/1743727X.2016.1170476.

Parsons, S., Guldberg, K., MacLeod, A., Jones, G., Prunty, A. & Balfe, T. (2011). International review of the evidence on best practice in educational

provision for children on the autism spectrum, *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 26 (1), 47-63.

Parsons, S., Guldberg, K., Porayska-Pomsta, K. & Lee, R. (2015). Digital Stories as a method for evidence-based practice and knowledge co-creation in technology-enhanced learning for children with autism. *International Journal of Research Methods in Education, Special Issue: E-research in educational contexts*, Vol. 38 (3), 247-271.

Parsons, S. & Kasari, C. (2013). Editorial: Schools at the centre of educational research in autism: Possibilities, practices and promises. *Autism*, 17 (3), 251-253.

Pellicano, E., Dinsmore, A., & Charman, T. (2014). What should autism research focus upon? Community views and priorities from the United Kingdom. *Autism*, 1-15. DOI: 10.1177/1362361314529627.

Poplin, M. (2011). Valuing a Plurality of Research Methodologies in the Field of LD. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 34 (2), Issue I of II, 150-152.

Pring, R. & Thomas, G. (Eds) (2004). *Evidence-based practice in Education*. Open University Press: Berkshire.

Prizant, B. (2015). *Uniquely human: a different way of seeing autism*, The Associated Press.

Reichow, B., Volkmar, F.R., & Chicoetti, D.V. (2008). Development of the evaluative method for evaluating and determining evidence-based practices in autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 38, 1311-1319.

Rynes, S. L., Bartunek, J.M. & Daft, R.L. (2001). Across the Great Divide: Knowledge Creation and Transfer Between Practitioners and Academics. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44 (2): 340-355.

Sahlberg, P. (2010). Rethinking accountability in a knowledge society. *Journal of Educational Change*, 11, 45-61. DOI 10.1007/s10833-008-9098-2


Smeyers, P. & Depaepe, M. eds. (2010). *Educational Research: Why 'What Works' Doesn't Work*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Tatto, M., T. & Furlong, J. (2015). Research and teacher education: papers from the BERA-RSA enquiry. *Oxford Review of Education*, 41: 2, 145-153, DOI: 10.1080/03054985.2015.1017404.

Thomas, G., & R. Pring, eds. (2004). *Evidence-based Practice in Education*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Thomas, G. (2012a) A review of thinking and research about inclusive education policy, with suggestions for a new kind of inclusive thinking. *British*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Educational Research Journal, 39, 3, 473-490. DOI: 10.1080/014111926.2011.652070.

Thomas, G. (2012b) Changing our landscape of inquiry for a new science of education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 82, 1, 26-51. <http://her.hepg.org/content/612r0891715x3377/>

Trent, S. C., Artiles, A. J., & Englert, C. S. (1998). From deficit thinking to social constructivism: A review of theory, research, and practice in special education. *Review of Research in Education*, 23, 277-307.

Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weisz, J., & Jensen, P. (1999). Efficacy and Effectiveness of Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy and Pharmacotherapy." *Mental Health Services Research*, 1 (3): 125-157. DOI:10.1023/A:1022321812352.

Winch, C., Oancea, A. & Orchard, J. (2015). The contribution of educational research to teachers' professional learning: philosophical understandings', in *Oxford Review of Education*, 41 (2), 202-216.

Wittemeyer, K., Charman, T., Cusack, J., Guldberg, K., Hastings, R., Howlin, P., Macnab, N., Parsons, S., Pellicano, L. & Slonims, V. (2011) *Educational provision and outcomes for people on the autism spectrum*, London: Autism Education Trust.

Wong, C., Odom, S.L., Hume, K., Cox, A.W., Fettig, A., Kucharczyk, S., Brock, M.E., Plavnik, J.B., Fleury, V., P. & Schultz, T.R.(2014) *Evidence based practices for children, youth, and young adults with Autism Spectrum Disorder*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute, Autism Evidence-Based Practice Review Group.

