

## Chapter 2

# Three Perspectives on Evidence-Based Practice



In addition to guiding practice decision-making, both evidence-based medicine (EBM) and EBP are being used at a policy level to reshape clinical practice. Cost containment, cost cutting, and, in many cases, profit making are shaping the policies that orient health-care practice. The implementation of EBP is often standardized rather than used to support decision-making by the individual client and clinician. As Romana (2006) states, “EBM has typically been implemented through clinical guidelines, protocols, or best practices, all which are used to standardize, not individualize, patient care” (p. 1). Beyond shaping policies, EBM and EBP are increasingly being used administratively to shape practice. Improving the quality of care while reducing costs is the recent mantra of managed care providers. Epidemiological research and EBM/EBP provide one valuable framework for evaluating service quality, though various minority populations are often not adequately represented. Further, at policy and administrative levels, the implementation of EBP may conflict with client preferences and with professional autonomy. The methods of EBP may even be applied to evaluation of individual professionals. To understand EBP requires attention to the overall context in which it is embedded.

From another perspective, EBM and EBP have begun to alter research priorities in ways that may restrict the variety of research approaches and methods used to understand and evaluate clinical practice. A key strength of EBM/EBP is its use of population-level research results based on experimental (or RCT) research designs. Yet overemphasis, or exclusive focus, on such research designs may undermine attention to other types of research and inquiry that are also important to practice knowledge building. In this way EBM/EBP may serve to promote some types of research knowledge while limiting others. For example, Lerner (2004, abstract) states that the emphasis on experimental research in EBP has excluded systemic family therapy “because it is language-based, client-directed and focused on relational process rather than step-by-step operational techniques.” Relevant to clinical social work practice, research on understanding persons in situations, on human diversity, on identifying environmental factors that impact treatment effectiveness,

and on the processes of clinical practice may be de-emphasized in favor of large-scale outcome research. Social work researchers and educators who for the past 30 years have advocated for “many ways of knowing” (Hartman, 1994) may find one method is favored, and funded, above all others. Issues of epistemology, ontology, values, and human diversity in research may lose traction, while specific methods gain favor.

In this chapter we will explore how EBP is used beyond practice, but in ways that influence how practice is funded and provided. The four components included in the contemporary definitions of EBM and EBP may not always be highlighted in policy level and research discussions. The roles of clinical expertise and of client values and preferences may become secondary or even marginal when EBP is viewed from these other perspectives. Our goal is to ensure the context in which EBP is located and shaped is part of how clinical social workers understand this social movement. In turn, clinical social workers may be better able to advocate for themselves and for their clients.

## **The Policy Level and Administrative Applications of EBP**

There is no question that high-quality research evidence, drawn from large samples and appropriately applied in practice, can save lives and improve services. In medicine, efforts to apply evidence-based standards for acute coronary patient care, for sepsis in the use of respiratory ventilators, and even for handwashing have all reduced illness and mortality. One study found that strictly following the guidelines for acute coronary care treatment might have reduced patient mortality by 22% after 1 year (Alexander et al., 1998). These guidelines addressed acute use of just three medications. Applying the results of large-scale, population-based, research can improve service outcomes in important ways. In 2002, large-scale epidemiological research established that the harms of estrogen replacement therapy for postmenopausal women were much more severe than first believed (Women’s Health Initiative, 2002). These harms were not apparent until a large-scale research project aggregated individual experiences. Routine treatment practices were quickly changed in ways that saved women’s lives and reduced overall harm. Even what appear to be small changes, such as routine handwashing, can prove to be very important to improving aggregate outcomes and reducing risks. The importance of such efforts may only become clear when very large groups of people are studied and compared. How EBP is applied at the policy level shapes much of the health and mental health delivery system.

Both the EBM and EBP movements must be understood in the larger context of macro-level models of health-care delivery. In the United Kingdom, in Canada, and in the United States, many initiatives drawing on the EBM and EBP models now shape public and private health-care funding and delivery. Each of these countries faces the very real challenge of containing health-care costs while providing services to a large and aging population. In each of these countries, policies were

developed to eliminate unnecessary health-care services and to improve overall outcomes. Note that these macro-level goals are fully consistent with the purposes of EBM set forth by Dr. Archie Cochrane. In the United States, a major part of this effort was the expansion of managed care in the 1980s and 1990s. Further, health-care providers were viewed as having financial incentives for providing more services than might really be needed. A tension between the interests of health-care organizations and profession providers became increasingly evident.

In 1984, a study by Wennberg revealed that the kinds of treatment provided by physicians around the United States varied widely in both diagnosis and in prescribed procedures. Other studies found similar variation in diagnosis and most prevalent treatments by geographic region. Epidemiological and actuarial studies would predict more or less consistent rates of diagnosis and comparable use of treatments across the country. Tanenbaum (1999, p. 758) states that these results were interpreted to mean “that physicians were uncertain about the value of alternative treatments and that their actions were consequently influenced by clinically extraneous factors such as tradition and convenience.” In other words, physicians did not explore, weigh and decide what treatment to use on the basis of the best evidence. Dr. Cochrane’s earlier concerns seemed very well founded and still very relevant.

Reed and Eisman (2006) state that this top-down perspective was adopted enthusiastically by the health-care industry. “Health care professionals were portrayed as major causes of waste, inefficiency, needless expense...” (p. 14). This argument, combined with claims that physicians would gain financially from providing more services, even if unnecessary, made health-care professionals a target for improved management and administrative control. In turn, health-care organizations in the United States and also in the United Kingdom and Canada began initiatives to transfer administrative authority from clinical providers to the health plan personnel. These initiatives were intended to standardize care practices and reduce variation in delivered services. They also served to limit access to services and to reduce overall demand, which achieved cost savings for funders. As Romana (2006) notes, standardization of care rather than individualization of care was how EBP was implemented administratively. In the United States, health-care corporations will gain in profits by reducing service access and costs. This corporate financial incentive, which produced large profits for for-profit health-care companies, is not widely viewed as problematic.

Not only funders but governmental agencies took up this argument. A series of efforts by the US National Institutes of Health in the 1990s began to promote the importance of teaching health-care professionals to use research-supported treatments (RSTs). Emphasizing “quality over numbers,” they also promoted the use of administrative strategies to ensure that such RSTs were used widely and consistently. Governmental support and funding promoted the expansion of administrative control of professional practice in health care. During these years, parallel efforts in the national health system of the United Kingdom and Canada also took place (Trinder, 2000b). EBP has quickly become a social movement (Pope, 2003).

Tanenbaum (2003) states that managed care framed the debate over EBP into a “public idea” contrasting good scientific research evidence against faulty clinical

judgment. To solve the problem of faulty practitioner judgment, research evidence was used administratively to direct health-care practice. A public idea (Reich, 1988) is a form of marketing common in political campaigns and product promotion. Complex social phenomena, like drunk driving or health care, are framed simply to highlight certain features of concern. In a public idea, a single, simple summary is presented that includes an image of both the causes of the problem and its optimal remedy. For drunk driving, the public image was one of repeat offenders causing horrible accidents, and the remedy was to put such offenders in jail. The limitation of the argument is that, overall, many more drunk driving accidents are caused by everyday people who drink too much—not repeat offenders (though they do pose a problem). Preventive education would likely reduce accidents more effectively than does jailing repeat offenders (Moore, 1988). Public ideas simplify complex social issues and may also distort them. Public ideas may give undue credibility to specific approaches to solving complex problems, rendering other useful solutions less prominent or less acceptable. They actively, and politically, shape public opinion.

Tanenbaum (2003) calls EBP a public idea of great rhetorical power. Indeed, who can argue with evidence? What scientific or rationale approach remains for those who would argue with “evidence.” As Brush (January 11, 2010) states, EBP can pit “competent researchers against clinicians.” Those who define good evidence have great power and influence. In this instance, those who define the best evidence also have both economic and political power over the services they fund. “We only reimburse for services that are evidence-based” (Lehman, 2010, p. 1) which provides a powerful rationale for payers to restrict or refuse services without full regard for the needs, values, and input of the individual client. The public idea of EBP emphasizes only part of a very complex situation.

When clinical practice is simply seen as a product in need of repair, its complexity and its many merits are minimized or ignored (Schwandt, 2005). While controlling health-care costs is an issue almost everyone would support, it can be undertaken in a manner that does not divide funder, client, and practitioner. As we shall see, this image also suggests a great deal more certainty about “what works” than may be found in treatment outcome research, especially for diverse populations.

It is also important to note that the policy-level focus on EBP emphasizes research results but does not address individual client needs and circumstances, nor does it address client values and preferences. It also omits attention to the pivotal role of clinical expertise and firsthand clinical assessment. The policy and administrative perspective on EBP appears to be based on a very different understanding of EBP than is the practice decision-making model of the McMaster Group (1981). Population-based research results are widely applied to critique the individualized actions of clinical practitioners. Administrative judgment may also replace the assessment of clinical social workers and other providers who have different training, qualification, and much greater access to the individual client.

Mace (1999) states that the United Kingdom’s National Health Services views EBP as a cornerstone of the effort to include quality assurance in the responsibilities of providers. While few would argue with quality services and professional accountability, funders, clients, and professionals may differ on what constitutes the best

available services for a specific client in a specific situation. They may differ on what is the key problem, on what treatments and related services are appropriate to address it, and on what constitute suitable measures of treatment outcome. Administrative attention to the aggregate needs, and to cost cutting, may not always fit with ethical and appropriate client-specific decision-making. There are important differences of perspective between people focused on large-scale, aggregate outcomes and others focused on specific outcomes for a single client. Yet, at the same time, service costs and quality must be reviewed to control costs for all. There can be, at times, an understandable tension between the practices and goals of administrators and practitioners.

As we can see, EBP is actually a complex social movement. This means that the way EBP is understood, and the elements of EBP that are emphasized, will vary with the particular purposes of the author or speaker. It is important that clinical social workers bear mind that EBP can have a different “look” depending on the focus of the speaker. Yet in practice, the key influence is the clinical expertise of the social worker who must integrate the client’s clinical circumstances, particular values, and views with the best current research knowledge in making practice decisions.

### ***Using Evidence in Evaluations of the Performance of Professionals***

In addition to administrators potentially using EBP to influence and direct how services are delivered to clients, “evidence-based” arguments are being used politically and economically to evaluate, and hire or fire, individual professionals. For example, during the summer of 2010, the *Los Angeles Times* published a series of articles regarding the performance of public school teachers in Los Angeles (*Los Angeles Times*, n.d.). The series included the online, public, posting of the evaluations of approximately 6000 teachers. The names of the teachers were also posted. These evaluations were paid for by the public school system, and some people argued that they were open information. However the teachers and their union officials stated they believed the evaluations were personal information to be used privately within the school system. Reputations were affected in a very public forum, with little opportunity for response by individual teachers.

Another aspect of the debate centered on a “value-added analysis,” a research model that ranked teachers’ impact on student achievement. The results of this statistical analysis were then used to decide whether or not teachers should be fired or re-hired. In effect, teachers would retain or lose their jobs based on their evaluations, which were linked to the measured achievement of their students. Some people argued that teacher quality was crucial to student achievement. It is, of course, difficult to argue that some teachers are more effective than are others. Still, opponents of the model argued that many other factors including student nutrition, degree of parental support, and prior “social promotion” of students who had previ-

ously not demonstrated grade appropriate achievement all distorted the evaluations. They argued that to put all the responsibility for student performance on the teacher was neither valid nor fair. Here outcome measures (the student's annual achievement) were interpreted and used as key measures of the teacher's competence, dedication, and effort. Notably, researchers spoke for both points of view (Dillon, September 1, 2010).

Similar efforts to grade teacher performance using student test scores are underway in New York State (Otterman, 2011). Teachers, using their political power, tried to expand the base from which judgments about their effectiveness were made. Noting that because student performance was influenced by parental support, including adequate nutrition and sleep, they argued parents should also be evaluated. Florida State Representative Kelli Stargel filed a bill that would require elementary school teachers to evaluate parents based on "the quality" of their involvement in their children's schools (Postal & Balona, 2011). In parts of Alaska and in Pennsylvania, parents are fined if their children are frequently truant (Associated Press, 2010; Levy, 2011). There is considerable developmental research supporting the view that parental support is an important factor in child development and school performance. However, solutions to resolve these concerns often prove complex and multifaceted. More administrative oversight of professionals may not prove sufficient or effective in improving service outcomes. Nonetheless, the public idea of EBP may suggest such actions.

In mental health care, managed care companies sometimes profile individual clinical practitioners (Panzarino & Kellar, 1994). The number of clients, types of disorders, number of sessions, and often the client's satisfaction are each tracked and recorded. This information may be used to drop clinicians from company "panels" and are, in effect, ratings of clinician performance or cost-effectiveness. It is not hard to imagine that the administrative use of EBP could both shape the nature of treatments clinicians can use and perhaps become a part of how a clinician's performance is evaluated.

States and some insurance providers are already establishing lists of what they consider to be empirically supported treatments or best practices. For example, the Minneapolis Veterans' Administration (VA) health-care web site (2018) usefully lists empirically supported treatments for several disorders. (Note carefully—this is a list of what this VA defines as empirically supported treatments based on "controlled" research—though they label the list as "evidence-based treatments." Understanding terminology is important!) Practicing clinical social workers also report that their states and private insurance payers frequently suggest "evidence-based treatments" for specific disorders. Clinicians also state that, in some cases, payers may refuse to authorize certain treatments for specific disorders due to what the payers claim is the lack of a sufficient evidence base for the proposed treatment.

It is important to note that neither lists of empirically supported treatments nor best practices are necessarily based on kinds of evidence and methods used in EBP. How clinician effectiveness is conceptualized and measured will matter greatly to clinical social workers, much as it does to Los Angeles public school teachers. The administrative uses of EBP are an important driving force in its rapid adoption

and promotion. The term “EBP” can also be used administratively and economically in ways that are still developing but that do not always fit with the formal definition of EBP as a process. Using the label does not constitute accurate or correct use of EBP. All four parts of the EBP process—clinical situation, client’s values and preferences, the best research knowledge, and clinical expertise—actually define EBP, not simply a list of treatments.

Of course, it *is* appropriate to use evidence in the evaluation of professional performance. No one would seriously argue that performance should not be tied to evidence. The issue is what kinds of evidence are most informative and how we understand them in context. To evaluate the quality of a teacher solely by the performance of his or her students may overrate the impact of a teacher. It surely diminishes the impact of social contexts including adequacy of space, materials, and equipment not to mention the child’s family supports and social circumstances. Similarly, clinical social workers often work with clients with multiple disorders and stressors that may directly impact the client’s ability to engage in treatment and demonstrate “success.” The appropriate use of research evidence requires fair and comprehensive models that fit with our best ideas about how complex systems work. Values, critical thinking, and theories all have a place in the optimal selection and use of research evidence (Gambrill, 2001).

It is very important to consider how, and by whom, the term EBP is being used. Administrators, funders, researchers, and mental health clinicians may have different goals and information needs. Clinical practitioners may look for situation-specific treatment planning help, while researchers dispute what constitutes the “best” methods to generate evidence, and payers seek to limit costs while maintaining service quality. Each of these endeavors has real merit. Each endeavor is also multifaceted and complex. Yet the view of EBP each perspective generates is somewhat distinct. Let us next consider the research perspective on EBM and EBP.

## **EBP, Many Ways of Knowing, and Qualitative Research**

Tanenbaum (2003) argues that EBP is a public idea that purposefully shapes public perception. Many authors call EBM and EBP a social movement (Trinder, 2000b). We argue that a third perspective on EBP suggests it may also be an effort to shape, and perhaps to restrict, how science and research evidence are understood and valued. EBP may be the next research paradigm. Paradigms shape how research is designed, funded, and taught. The impact of changes in research paradigms extends well beyond the university. Nespor (2006, p. 123) states that paradigms are results of “tensions and conflicts that stretch outside the university to state bureaucracies, pressure groups, big corporations, community groups.” Paradigm debates may start within the academy, but their impact is much more widespread. As noted in the first section of this chapter, the impact of EBP may have profound economic and political consequences for mental health practice. To frame this perspective on EBP, we begin with some recent history on the debates regarding what Hartman (1994) calls

“many ways of knowing” that took place in social work and allied fields in the 1980s and 1990s. Note that this is the same period of time in which EBM and EBP first became prominent.

Until the mid-twentieth century, there were few challenges to the centrality of the scientific method and knowledge as guides for the professions, including social work. In the early 1900s, a philosophy called logical positivism was promoted as a way to build mathematically based laws or models that accurately represented the world. In the hard sciences, such scientific laws had proved useful for over 200 years. However, the underlying justifications for the “truth value” of scientific theories began to be challenged. In 1962 Thomas Kuhn published *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, a book that argued science was, in part, socially determined and did not progress solely through test and analysis. Kuhn argued that Western scientific knowledge had developed through a series of revolutions or “paradigm shifts” in which the framework through which scientists viewed the world changed in incompatible fashion. One widely cited example is the paradigm shift from a Ptolemaic or Earth centered view of the solar system to a Copernican or Sun centered view of the solar system. Scholars following Kuhn argued that human influences and power structures shape scientific knowledge. Different points of view about *how* we know and the *value* of science became more apparent during the 1970s and 1980s. The view that science is a social construction and is shaped by economic, political, and cultural forces became more prominent in both the social and hard sciences.

In the late 1980s and 1990s, the “science wars” contrasted science with other ways of knowing (see Flyvbjerg, 2001; Nelkin, 1996; Ravetz, 1979). The differences were both about epistemology, or ways of knowing, and about research methods. Postmodernist scholars pointed to social knowledge as a social construction that is situated in a particular time and place and shaped by the economics, politics, and social norms of the times (Foucault, 1964; Lyotard, 1984; Rorty, 1979). They doubted “objective” methods could produce social “truths” (Quine, 1953). Feminist and cultural scholars noted how the interests and voices of women were often omitted or minimized in scientific scholarship (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Harding, 1986). Indigenous scholars noted how the very different ways of knowing of aboriginal peoples were devalued and omitted in scientific scholarship (Kovach, 2009, 2018; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Critical scholars noted how political interests shaped research funding and the application of research results (Foucault, 1964; Habermas, 1990). Some scholars advocated that research should include social action (Fals-Borda & Rahman, 1991). For some, the kinds of work that constituted “research” expanded considerably.

Arguments affirming the value of small sample, intensive research were also made during this time. Some scholars argued that clinically relevant and important research often used methods quite unlike those most valued in EBP. Rustin (2001) points out that a lot of valuable clinical and developmental research is small scale and intensive in format, rather than large scale and extensive. He points out how Ainsworth’s (1964, 1978) Strange Situation Test helped generate a typology of attachment styles that later proved to hold up in many different countries and cultures. Intensive study of a few mothers and children led the way to an innovative

approach to understanding attachment and the consequences of its disruption. Rustin further notes how Stern's (1985) in-depth studies of babies and mothers pointed out that babies possess many more perceptual and meaning-making capacities than had previously been identified. Rustin argues for methodological pluralism and shows how clinical insights at the micro level can benefit many forms of research. EBP's focus on large-scale experimental research has value, he states, but is not the only approach to productive clinical research.

Along similar lines, Tonelli (1998, 2001), a physician working with respiratory disease, argues that clinical experience and physiologic rationale are two types of medical knowledge that differ in kind from population-based epidemiological evidence. Tonelli believes their devaluation in EBP reflects a conceptual error. This is because clinical expertise, physiologic rationale, and epidemiological research are distinct kinds of knowledge that do not belong on the same graded hierarchy. Many kinds of evidence may have relevance to clinical decision-making. Buetow and Kenealy (2000) and Buetow and Mintoft (2011) argue that EBM too severely limits the use of nonscientific knowledge, including patient intuition, that may complement and enhance EBP decision-making.

There are many kinds of research and knowledge that might extend, complement, or enhance EBM and EBP. Many of the more formal and well-developed forms of knowledge development are collectively known as qualitative research. We next explore how qualitative researchers argued for the merits of their approaches and methods in "science wars."

## *Qualitative Research and EBP*

During the 1990s many social workers advocated for greater attention to qualitative research (Drisko, 1997; Gilgun, Daly, & Handel, 1992; Popay & Williams, 1994; Riessman, 1994; Rodwell, 1998; Shaw, 1999; Sherman & Reid, 1994). Qualitative research is frequently portrayed as a simple dichotomy contrasted with quantitative, statistical research in social work textbooks. More accurately, qualitative research consists of a wide-ranging family of related research approaches and methods. Qualitative research has many different purposes and draws upon a range of different epistemological or philosophical premises (Drisko, 1997, 2013). It emphasizes discovery, context, witnessing, understanding meaning, and understanding process and can include social action and even can aspire to liberation. Qualitative research is widely used to develop, refine, and even to test theory. Advocates for expanding attention to "many ways of knowing" (Hartman, 1990) promoted the use of non-quantitative research approaches. In social work and allied fields, the number of publications using these methods increased during the 1990s and early 2000s.

Whether, and if so, how, EBM and EBP will include "many ways of knowing" is uncertain. Indeed, EBP hierarchies of evidence continue to locate the results of case studies and qualitative research on the lowest levels of evidence. As attention is directed to quantitative outcome studies, other research purposes and methods are

actively or implicitly devalued. In this way, EBM and EBP may represent a social movement to restrict certain kinds of research and to privilege other forms. Popay and Williams (1998) call this the “Gingerbread Man Threat,” that qualitative researchers will be gobbled up by their better funded and more powerful quantitative colleagues. In effect, the EBP research hierarchy resolves the science wars by omitting many kinds of research, mainly due to its dependence on population-based, quantitative, experimental studies. In this way, EBP may be viewed as an implicit action in a long-term academic and economic disagreement.

The choice to devalue qualitative research has both a clear rationale and some serious consequences. The purpose of the research hierarchy is to promote research results with strong internal validity or the ability to make cause and effect claims. This is one way to document the quality of research results. On the other hand, it allows very little room for change and innovation as diverse populations, social needs, conceptual systems, and diagnoses change over time. The EBM/EBP research hierarchy does not address what innovations to explore when treatment prove ineffective, or how new treatment models would be created.

Greenhalgh (2010, p.163) points out that qualitative research “is not just complementary to, but in many cases a prerequisite for... quantitative research...” That is, the concepts, diagnosis and treatment model tested for effectiveness in EBM and EBP research are routinely developed and refined using qualitative research designs and methods. Without openness to qualitative research, there is no way for new ideas, new disorders, and new treatments to be developed. To some authors, it is shortsighted to relegate qualitative research to the lowest levels of evidence, especially because the results of such research may significantly shape the substance of later quantitative studies.

Popay and Williams (1998) argue that qualitative research may be seen as “enhancing” EBM and EBP or as “different” from them. Black (1994) points out four ways in which qualitative research can enhance EBM and EBP. He states it (1) can help researchers understand how and why interventions work, (2) can help identify new variables and hypotheses for future study, (3) can help clarify unexpected results from quantitative studies, and (4) can help improve the accuracy and relevance of quantitative research. Yet Popay and Williams (1998) see even greater potential in qualitative research’s differences from quantitative research. They note it (1) can help identify “taken for granted” aspects of health care and of potential risks, (2) can help professionals understand the experience and meaning of being a patient and of receiving a diagnosis, (3) can provide different sources of information and perspective from clients and important others (including subjective assessments of outcome), and (4) can explore the impact of agency practices and complex policies on clients. In this way qualitative research helps identify what EBP may miss, omit, or render invisible. Qualitative research can complement EBM and EBP as well as enhancing them.

Trinder (2000a) notes that the Cochrane Collaboration had begun a Qualitative Interest Group. She argues that it is vital that qualitative and other “non-RCT” research be accepted and valued on their own terms, rather than fitted awkwardly and inappropriately into an existing framework (p. 231). However, a decade later the

role of qualitative research in EBM and EBP is still unclear (Nelson, 2008). Greenhalgh (2010) points to standards for quality in qualitative research but does not address how qualitative research fits with the larger EBM model. The Cochrane Qualitative Interest Group offers conference workshops on specific methodological topics, but the larger question of how qualitative research is valued and included in EBM and EBP remains unanswered.

In social work, Rubin and Bellamy (2012) state that qualitative research may be the appropriate source for answers about client's experience with illness or social challenges. This may prove to be one important use for qualitative research. Gilgun (2005) further points out that better conceptualization of patient values and patient preferences would help clarify key aspects of the EBM and EBP process. She adds that professional expertise and the personal experiences of the professional also deserve conceptual elaboration and further study. Petr (2008) offers a variation on EBP that emphasizes the voices and views of clients as the basis for determining effectiveness. His multidimensional approach to EBP expands the narrow focus on symptoms to include other areas of interest to clinical social workers and clients. Qualitative researchers, and many clinical investigators using qualitative research methods, make valuable contributions to the practice knowledge base.

The EBM/EBP hierarchy of evidence and research designs has many merits. It is one valuable way to enhance practice decision-making and, in the aggregate, to make the best use of limited health-care resources. Still, critical thinking is required to ensure that the assumptions embedded in the EBM/EBP model are fully understood and recognized. As a social movement, EBM and EBP advocate for the use of specific techniques and specific kinds of evidence. These merits have strong supporters as well as some cogent critiques. Clinical social workers must consider both the strengths and the limitations of EBM and EBP research methods as they impact on practice.

## Summary

In this chapter we have explored how EBP is not solely a practice decision-making process. We argue that EBP can be viewed from three different perspectives which point out different aspects of the social movement that is EBM and EBP. The practice decision-making process is the core of EBP. From this first perspective, EBP adds to the responsibilities of clinical social workers. Yet from policy and administrative perspective, EBP is a way to increase accountability and reduced costs while improving service outcomes. At its worst, it may also restrict professional autonomy and replace it with administrative oversight. The large-scale quantitative methods prioritized in EBP may also be applied to the evaluation of individual professional performance. From a research perspective, EBP seeks to generate population-level outcome studies that can identify effective treatments and reveal possible risks. Yet EBP may also reduce attention to important epistemological, value, and contextual issues that shape research, especially on diverse populations. Qualitative research

and other non-quantitative ways of knowing are devalued in the EBP evidence hierarchy and in related research funding. These methods may produce knowledge that can be useful to direct clinical practice and to administration and policy efforts. Critical thinking about the EBP model and its application is appropriate.

### *A Starting Point for the Clinical Social Work Practitioner*

A very useful starting point for clinical social work practitioners is to learn about EBP and to be able to use it to inform treatment planning decisions. Still, practitioners must always use this information in combination with professional expertise and critical thinking to meet the needs and interests of clients. Terminology is often used in ways that are confusing and may not fit with the correct definition of EBP as a process.

In the next chapter, we will explore the several “steps” of the EBP practice decision-making model. This model organizes the practice application of research results to direct clinical social work practice.

## References

- Ainsworth, M. D. (1964). Patterns of attachment behavior shown by the infant in interaction with his mother. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development*, 10, 51–58.
- Ainsworth, M. D. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Alexander, K., Peterson, E., Granger, C., Casas, A. C., Van der Werf, F., Armstrong, P., et al. (1998). Potential impact of evidence-based medicine in acute coronary syndromes: Insights from GUSTO-IIb. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 32, 2023–2030.
- Associated Press (2010, December 13). *Some Alaskan parents fined if kids skip school*. Retrieved from [www.foxnews.com/us/2010/12/13/alaska-parents-fined-kids-skip-school/#ixzz1NTeOsepm](http://www.foxnews.com/us/2010/12/13/alaska-parents-fined-kids-skip-school/#ixzz1NTeOsepm)
- Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing*. New York: Basic Books.
- Black, N. (1994). Why we need qualitative research. *Journal of Epidemiological Community Health*, 48, 425–426.
- Brush, J. (2010, January 11). Letters: Looking at ways to treat depression. *The New York Times Online*. Retrieved Jan. 12, 2010 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/12/opinion/12warner.html>
- Buetow, S., & Kenealy, T. (2000). Evidence-based medicine: The need for a new definition. *Journal of Evaluation of Clinical Practice*, 6(2), 85–92.
- Buetow, S., & Mintoft, B. (2011). When should patient intuition be taken seriously? *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 26(4), 433–436.
- Dillon, S. (2010, August 31). Formula to grade teachers' skill gains acceptance, and critics. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/01/education/01teacher.html?ref=magazine&pagewanted=all> (print version September, 1, 2010, p. A1).
- Drisko, J. (1997). Strengthening qualitative studies and reports: Standards to enhance academic integrity. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 33, 187–197.

- Drisko, J. (2013). Standards for qualitative studies and reports. In R. Fortune et al. (Eds.), *Qualitative research in social work* (2nd ed., pp. 1–34). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Drisko, J., Corbin, J., & Begay, P. (2019). Multiple ways of knowing: Teaching research under EPAS 2015. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15313204.2019.1590887>.
- Fals-Borda, O., & Rahman, M. (Eds.). (1991). *Action and knowledge: Breaking the monopoly with participatory action research*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1964). *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason*. New York: Random House.
- Gambrill, E. (2001). Social work: An authority-based profession. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 11, 166–175.
- Gilgun, J. (2005). The four cornerstones of evidence-based practice. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 15(1), 52–61.
- Gilgun, J., Daly, K., & Handel, G. (1992). *Qualitative methods in family research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Greenhalgh, T. (2010). *How to read a paper: The basics of evidence-based medicine*. Hoboken, NJ: BMJ Books; Blackwell-Riley.
- Habermas, J. (1990). *The philosophical discourse of modernity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Harding, S. (1986). *The science question in feminism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hartman, A. (1990). Many ways of knowing. *Social Work*, 35(1), 3–4.
- Hartman, A. (1994). Many ways of knowing. In W. Reid & E. Sherman (Eds.), *Qualitative research in social work* (pp. 459–463). Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Kovach, M. (2018). Doing indigenous methodologies: A letter to a research class. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed., pp. 214–234). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: University Chicago Press.
- Larner, G. (2004). Family therapy and the politics of evidence. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 26, 17–39.
- Lehman, A. (2010). Adopting evidence-based practices: Our hesitation waltz. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 36(1), 1–2.
- Levy, M. (2011, January 20). Lebanon school district sued over excessive truancy fines. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from [www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/01/20/pennsylvania-truancy-fines\\_n\\_811833.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/01/20/pennsylvania-truancy-fines_n_811833.html)
- Los Angeles Times. (n.d.). *Grading the teachers: Value-added analysis*. (A series of articles published over the summer of 2010). Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com/news/local/teachers-investigation/>
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mace, C. (1999). Psychotherapy and the modernization of the UK health service. *European Journal of Psychotherapy and Health*, 2(2), 217–227.
- McMaster Group - The Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, McMaster University Health Sciences Center. (1981). How to read clinical journals, [part] I: Why to read them and how to start reading them critically. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 124(5), 555–558.
- Minneapolis VA Health Care System. (2018). *Mental health: Evidence-based treatments*. Retrieved August 24, 2018 from <https://www.minneapolis.va.gov/services/MentalHealth/MHebt.asp>
- Moore, M. (1988). What sort of ideas become public ideas? In R. Reich (Ed.), *The power of public ideas* (pp. 55–84). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing.
- Nelkin, D. (1996). The science wars: Responses to a marriage failed. *Social Text*, (46/47, 14), 93–100.

- Nelson, A. (2008). Addressing the threat of evidence-based practice to qualitative inquiry through increasing attention to quality: A discussion paper. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 45(2), 316–322.
- Nespor, J. (2006). Methodological inquiry: The uses and spaces of paradigm proliferation. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19, 115–128.
- Otterman, S. (2011, May 25). Tests for pupils, but the grades go to teachers. *The New York Times Online*. Retrieved from [www.nytimes.com/2011/05/24/education/24tests.html?\\_r=1&ref=education](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/24/education/24tests.html?_r=1&ref=education)
- Panzarino, P., & Kellar, J. (1994). Integrating outcomes, quality and utilization data for profiling behavioral health providers. *Behavioral Healthcare Tomorrow*, 3(6), 27–30.
- Popay, J., & Williams, G. (1994). *Researching the people's health: Social research and health care*. London: Routledge.
- Popay, J., & Williams, G. (1998). Qualitative research and evidence-based healthcare. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 91.(Supp 35, 32–37.
- Pope, C. (2003). Resisting evidence: The study of evidence-based medicine as a contemporary social movement. *Health*, 7(3), 267–282.
- Postal, L., & Balona, D-. M. (2011, January 18). It's time to grade parents, new bill proposes. *The Orlando [FL] Sentinel*. [http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2011-01-18/news/os-teachers-grade-parents-20110118\\_1\\_parental-involvement-parent-appeals-grade-parents](http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2011-01-18/news/os-teachers-grade-parents-20110118_1_parental-involvement-parent-appeals-grade-parents)
- Quine, W. V. O. (1953). Two dogmas of empiricism. In W. V. O. Quine (Ed.), *From a logical point of view* (pp. 20–46). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ravetz, J. (1979). *Scientific knowledge and its social problems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reed, G., & Eisman, E. (2006). Uses and misused of evidence: Managed care, treatment guidelines, and outcomes measurement in professional practice. In C. Goodheart, A. Kazdin, & R. Sternberg (Eds.), *Evidence-based psychotherapy: Where practice and research meet* (pp. 13–35). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Reich, R. (1988). *The power of public ideas*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing.
- Riessman, C. (Ed.). (1994). *Qualitative studies in social work research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rodwell [O'Connor], M. (1998). *Social work constructivist research*. New York: Garland.
- Romana, H.-W. (2006). Is evidence-based medicine patient-centered and is patient-centered care evidence-based? *Health Services Research*, 41(1), 1–8.
- Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rubin, A., & Bellamy, J. (2012). *Practitioner's guide to using research for evidence-based practice* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rustin, M. (2001). Research, evidence and psychotherapy. In C. Mace, S. Moorey, & B. Roberts (Eds.), *Evidence in the psychological therapies: A critical guide for practitioners* (pp. 27–45). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Schwandt, T. (2005). The centrality of practice to evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26, 95–105.
- Shaw, I. (1999). *Qualitative evaluation*. London: Sage.
- Sherman, E., & Reid, W. (Eds.). (1994). *Qualitative research in social work*. New York: Columbia.
- Stern, D. (1985). *The interpersonal world of the infant*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tanenbaum, S. (1999). Evidence and expertise: The challenge of the outcomes movement to medical professionalism. *Academic Medicine*, 74, 757–763.
- Tanenbaum, S. (2003). Evidence-based practice in mental health: Practical weakness meets political strengths. *Journal of Evidence in Clinical Practice*, 9, 287–301.
- Tonelli, M. (1998). The philosophical limits of evidence-based medicine. *Academic Medicine*, 73(12), 1234–1240.
- Tonelli, M. (2001). The limits of evidence-based medicine. *Respiratory Care*, 46(2), 1435–1440.
- Trinder, L. (2000a). A critical appraisal of evidence-based practice. In L. Trinder & S. Reynolds (Eds.), *Evidence-based practice: A critical appraisal* (pp. 212–241). Ames, IA: Blackwell Science.

- Trinder, L. (2000b). Introduction: The context of evidence-based practice. In L. Trinder & S. Reynolds (Eds.), *Evidence-based practice: A critical appraisal* (pp. 1–16). Ames, IA: Blackwell Science.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin, NZ: University of Otago Press.
- Wennberg, J. (1984). Dealing with medical practice variations: A proposal for action. *Health Affairs*, 3, 6–12.
- Women's Health Initiative. (2002). Risk and benefits of estrogen plus progestin in healthy postmenopausal women: Principal results from the Women's Health Initiative randomized controlled trial. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 288(3), 321–333.