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Henri-Frédéric Amiel was the name and pathography was his game. Not much is heard about the issue of pathogenesis, or the writing out of illness, but it is clear from Amiel’s opus magnum that writing “out” illness was a complex, melancholy business – part poison, part antidote and part therapy – that makes writing “about” it seem very straightforward.

Scarcely acknowledged in his lifetime, international fame and clame came posthumously to this Swiss philosopher and diarist who lived from 1821 to 1881, when his Journal intime was published and translated into English. He was outwardly successful as professor of aesthetics, and then as professor of moral philosophy in Geneva, but because his were political appointments he struggled with isolation from the city’s rich cultural life. Left with his own ideas in pursuing his genius was revealed, the oft-quoted Amiel’s reflections on the urge to intervene and the need to analyse our motives for, and methods of, doing so resonate in helpful ways with contemporary thought on evidence-based clinical practice.

Truth and values

The processes and responsibilities of clinicians who adopt evidence-based practice are commonly represented diagrammatically as points on an equilateral triangle (ASHA, 2004) in the Euclidian plane geometry tradition. Echoing Amiel, two points of the triangle represent our constant quest for truth: theoretically, empirically and in practice, and the other point, our regard for our clients’ values.

Best evidence

Unlucky Amiel lived in an age of scepticism. By contrast, we exist in a professional milieu that welcomes accountability, best evidence and exemplary care. In embracing the “three Es” of quality assurance – effectiveness, efficiency and effects (Olswang, 1998) – we understand that “it works for me”, or “I don’t know why it works but it does” approaches to justifying why we implement particular interventions simply won’t wash! Why? Because “professionals should be wary about trusting their own clinical experience as the sole basis for determining the validity of a treatment claim” (Finn, Bothe & Bramlett, 2005, p. 182).

The onus for adopting EBP rests with individual clinicians. It cannot be imposed by professional associations, employers, legislators or policy-makers. It is up to us to constantly gather and objectively view clinical data, reflect, and ask hard questions about our interventions. Are they theoretically sound? Are they supported by evidence? Are they effective and valid? Do they work? Are they efficient? Do they work as well as, or better than other therapies? Can their efficiency be improved? And their effects: what changes do our therapies evoke?

Bernstein Ratner (2006) explains why she believes that EBP is a valuable construct, but cautions that along with those reflections and hard questions come potentially difficult issues. These require us establish robust communication at all points, from laboratory and clinic– that is, between the funding bodies and researchers who develop the evidence, the academics who spread the word, the administrators who regulate change, the employers charged with maintaining conducive workplaces, the practitioners who implement the evidence, and the client, who, in egalitarian practice, may have the last say.

“EBP is a valuable construct in ensuring quality of care. However, bridging between research evidence and clinical practice may require us to confront potentially difficult issues and establish thoughtful dialogue about best practices in fostering EBP itself (Bernstein Ratner, 2006, p. 257).”

Plane figures

A triangle has three sides and three angles, but it is a plane, and a plane has no depth. The points on a plane have no parts, no width, no length and no breadth. But each point has an indivisible location. Do we accept that EBP is all about truth and values and that it is located at the junctures between clinical SLPs’ engagement with scientific theory and research, their clinical expertise and their respectful engagement with their clients and their worlds? Or is it deeper and more complex than that, and is adopting EBP all about clinicians and their responsibilities?

Bridges

Bridges have three necessary parts: substructure, superstructure and deck. The substructure is the foundation of a bridge comprising the piers and abutments that carry the superimposed load of the superstructure to the underlying
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Links


Webwords 31 is at http://speech-language-therapy.com/webwords31.htm with live links to featured and additional resources.

Electronic copies of ACQ

Speech Pathology Australia members are able to access past and present issues of ACQ via the Speech Pathology Australia website.

www.speechpathologyaustralia.org.au

Hard copies are available to everyone (members and non members) at a cost by emailing pubs@speechpathologyaustralia.org.au.