

Forschungs “ad-hockery”

Die Forschungen und Veröffentlichungen zum Thema Autismus schießen aus dem Boden wie Pilze.

Doch trotz vielfältiger Bemühungen auf den unterschiedlichsten Gebieten fehlt es bis heute an einer einheitlichen, konsistenten Theorie.

Egal ob Oxytocin, MDMA, Spiegelneuronen ... (früher war es die “Kühlschrank-Mutter” ...)

Bei den Forschungen handelt es sich in aller Regel um punktuelle Sichtweisen, die vielleicht eins der Symptome erklären können, aber nicht das Syndrom als Ganzes. Und manchmal auch vollkommen falsch und irreführend.

Aus:

Waterhouse, Lynn (2008): Autism Overflows: Increasing Prevalence and Proliferating Theories. In: *Neuropsychol Rev* 18 (4), S. 273–286. DOI: 10.1007/s11065-008-9074-x

“The variability of autism has posed a great challenge for researchers and theorists. Lakatos (1970) argued that a progressive research program effectively explains variant data, generates new hypotheses, and confirms and expands the hard core of fundamental assumptions. However, the hard core assumptions of the field of autism are in conflict, pitting the assumption of autism as a scientific research entity against the assumption of immense variation within that entity. It is therefore more difficult for research and theory in autism to be additive and progressive, and often one theory simply replaces another, a problem Meehl (1990) called “ad hockery.” Despite the overwhelming flood of causal theories for autism, the field has not made progress in creating a synthesized, standard predictive causal theory of autism, and it may well be time to abandon the effort to find a unifying causal deficit model for autism (Happé et al. 2006).”