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| **Background to developing a statement on practice research** Professionals in the early 21st century are required to practise more effectively amid the increasing challenge of uncertainty and complexity. The widespread call for evidence ­based practice is a major response to this. Yet contemporary approaches to research often fail to produce adequate evidence or knowledge about practice for use in variable situations. How is professional practice to be researched better, to provide a basis for improved practice? This question affects us all, and is answered in both similar and different ways across a range of countries and professions. Mapping the range of answers to this question is an important step in developing research for better practice. In June 2008, a group of interested professionals came together (organised by SPRING – the Southampton Practice Research Initiative Network Group) in Salisbury, UK, to begin this mapping by formulating an international statement on practice research. The group comprised academics and practitioners from a range of countries (the Nordic countries, Italy, Canada, the USA, Israel, Singapore and the UK). This group formed the backbone of the group known as the “Salisbury Forum”. The group was comprised primarily of social workers, but tried to formulate a statement which might be applied more broadly in all professions where the research of practice is important. The statement is not intended to be definitive or conclusive, but simply aims to begin tracing the contours of practice research at this point in time as it continues to evolve. We have tried to word it in an inclusive manner, so that various perspectives and differences are recognised. We hope that the statement will provide a basis for continued discussion. We have written it so that various professionals, from different countries and contexts, will be able to use this statement to continue to craft their own thinking and positions on practice research; to increase the profile of practice research; and above all to undertake more and better practice research. **PRACTICE RESEARCH: THE SALISBURY STATEMENT** **Practice research: why is it important and why now?** The current global context demands effective practice from professionals. Economic and social changes mean more accountability is required yet the climate is of increasing unpredictability which compounds the difficulties in achieving accountability. There needs to be a shift in the way practice is researched so that it provides relevant knowledge for better practice in complex and uncertain situations. A major problem is a mainstream assumption that research leads practice. But research also needs to be practice ­minded in order to better study and develop knowledge which emerges directly from the complex practices themselves. Practice research, involving equal dialogue between the worlds of practice and research is important as a concept, since it seeks to develop our understanding of the best ways to research this complexity. It is important at this time in history given that concerns with new accountabilities now converge with doubts about the adequacy of scientific knowledge as a sole basis for improving practice.**What is it?** There is no definite consensus on the meaning of the term “practice research” and other related terms (e.g. “practitioner research”) are often used instead. Following is an example of a statement about practice research which captures some of the nuances involved: “………..Practice research involves curiosity about practice. It is about identifying good and promising ways in which to help people; and it is about challenging troubling practice through the critical examination of practice and the development of new ideas in the light of experience. It recognises that this is best done by practitioners in partnership with researchers, where the latter have as much, if not more, to learn from practitioners as practitioners have to learn from researchers. It is an inclusive approach to professional knowledge that is concerned with understanding the complexity of practice alongside the commitment to empower, and to realise social justice, through practice.” Practice research involves the generation of knowledge of direct relevance to professional practice and therefore will normally involve knowledge generated directly from practice itself in a grounded way. The following identifies some of the specific aspects involved. Clearly there has been thinking and practice regarding the linking of practice and research for some time, and this has taken particular paths of historical development in different settings (eg. the case study approach was seen as an early method for researching practice in some countries). Much of the contemporary meaning turns on the issue of how to bridge the gap between the world of research and the world of practice. Several specific issues are involved in determining how best to bridge this gap: * Whether and how practitioners are involved in practice research. This involves questions of whether practitioners are both users and creators of knowledge, and whether this means they MUST be involved in research to make it meaningful practice research.
* Whether all research which is useful to professionals is practice research or are there also other sorts of research which are necessary for effective practice
* How practice is understood and the different aspects incorporated (e.g. different types, methods, settings). How practitioners use and develop knowledge (and what types of knowledge) is a central question. What is the nature of complex practice experience, and how is this best represented through research? Practice research at some level needs to be able to represent the concerns of everyday practice.
* How the concept of research is understood – the particular approach to ways of knowing (epistemology) which underpins research, and how concepts like “rigour” and “trustworthiness” relate. In particular, the conception of research may need to allow for the creation of knowledge through day to day practice experience, “Inquiry”, or “research­minded practice” may be more appropriate terms.
* How the concept of knowledge is understood underpins both the above issues. In particular, what types of knowledge does practice research focus on, and whether it should involve exposing the tacit/implicit dimension of practice are key issues.
* How practice research relates to research in other disciplines (e.g. social science) or dominant professions (e.g. medicine) is a key question, including whether it simply draws from and modifies these, or whether there is a need to develop new and different paradigms/methods

**Why is it done?** Broadly and simply, practice research aims to directly improve practice, by generating relevant professional knowledge. However there is a multitude of complicating perspectives on exactly what is involved in this: * Who is it for? There are many different interest groups involved (practitioners, service users, academics, researchers, policy makers, managers, the general public) who may represent contradictory interests. Which ones take primacy, and whether practice research must always benefit (and involve) the service users directly are major issues on which perspectives will differ.
* The drivers of practice research. This is linked with the above question. Questions of whether it must be driven by concerns which derive directly from practice, or whether it is possible that less direct concerns may also be relevant provide different perspectives
* The value base of practice research. Should there be a value base tied directly with the value base of the relevant profession (i.e. In the case of social work should it aim at change towards greater justice (social and personal)?
* In developing the relationship between practice and research the following principles/practices are important:

o Collaboration o participation o ethical reflexivity and critical reflection o contextuality and o the dynamic, fluid or relational nature of research * Practice research may also contribute to the development of the profession through generating its distinctive knowledge and expertise.

**How is it done?** What methods are relevant to practice research? Whilst it is acknowledged that the actual problems and questions which arise from practice should drive its research, it is also appropriate to ask whether particular methodologies or methods are preferable. Both existing and new methods may be relevant in continuing to develop the ways in which the complexities of practice are researched. An inclusive approach (recognising multiple perspectives) is important in articulating paradigms therefore purely quantitative or purely qualitative approaches are seldom applicable. Practice research may often require creating new methods or innovatively using existing methods in ways which are congruent with the principles of collaboration, complexity, dialogue, relationality and contextuality. For example, methods such as participatory action research, or involving reflection and reflexivity, may lend themselves more readily to the purposes of practice research. If there is to be dynamic dialogue between practice and research, the methods for devising research problems and questions directly from practice, and the relative roles of practitioners and researchers require further attention. How does each of the different parties in the research process (practitioner, academic, service user, policy maker, manager) make a differing (or similar) contribution based on their specific position and expertise? **What next?** What is now needed to further develop practice research? * Structures, processes and conditions to support practice research – a range of different structures and conditions may be needed depending on the interest group and resources available. Different countries have tried different initiatives (e.g. In Finland the Centres of Excellence; in other Nordic countries the HUSK partnerships between government, academia and service users). Within organisations, spaces (physical and intellectual and protected time) need to be made available for exchange of practice research ideas. Social capital needs to be built to enable practice research, and to encourage educationalists to train practitioners to be more research ­minded, and researchers to be more practice ­minded.
* Research funding bodies need to recognise the emergence of new models for researching practice.
* New paradigms/epistemologies? Perhaps new ways of talking about practice research need to be developed in order to recognise the emergent nature of a practice research approach
* Call for action. The time has come for further systematic and collaborative action. Educationalists, practitioners, researchers, managers and employers all have an intrinsic part to play in developing practice research, so collaborative efforts in a number of spheres are vital.

Having the resources and structures is not enough. What should animate these is a culture which supports the engagement of practitioners and researchers; where their different skills can be valued and exchanged; and where equal value is given to the challenge of making knowledge more generalisable and to the recognition and valuing of specific and local knowledge. A vital part of developing the concept of practice research is the need to keep doing it, and from these practices, to continue to develop our understanding. **APPENDIX** The following were part of the Salisbury Forum Group that provided the foundation of this Statement: Gurid Aga Askeland, Norway Mike Austin, USA Tony Evans, UK Sylvia Fargion, Italy Mike Fisher, UK Jan Fook, UK Ilse Julkunen, Finland Aulikki Kananoja, Finland Synnöve Karvinen­Niinikoski, Finland Rhoda MacRae, UK Edgar Marthinsen, Norway Matts Mosesson, Sweden Joan Orme, UK Helen Pain, UK Jackie Powell, UK Gillian Ruch, UK Mirja Satka, Finland Riki Savaya, Israel Ian Shaw, UK Tim Sim, Hong Kong Lars Uggerhøj, Denmark Helen Welsh, UK Bessa Whitmore, Canada Laura Yliruka, Finland  | **實務研究宣言的研擬背景**自邁入二十一世紀起，進行實務工作時，專業人員被期待更為有效地面對日益嚴峻的不確定性和複雜性等挑戰。對實務工作應具實證基礎(evidence ­based practice)的廣泛呼籲聲，即是對這個現象的重要迴響 。然而實務狀況不盡相同，當代的研究方法通常不足以為實務工作產生適用的證據或知識。如何對專業的實務工作有更好的研究，亦即提供一個基礎可促進更好的實務工作？這個問題影響著我們所有人，解決之道可參考許多國家和許多不同專業者，以相似或迥異的方式所著手的。 對這個問題擷取出一個適當的解答範圍，是發展更好的實務研究之首要。2008年6月，一群對此感興趣的專業人士聚集在英國的索利斯堡(Salisbury)（由南安普敦實務研究倡議網絡群組 “Southampton Practice Research Initiative Network Group （SPRING)”所舉辦），透過由擬定一個實務研究的國際宣言來開始這項工作。這個群組包含了來自多國（北歐國家，義大利，加拿大，美國，以色列，新加坡和英國）的學者和實務工作者。這個群體後來擴展成所謂的「索利斯堡論壇」。這個主要由社會工作者組成的群組，試圖制定一個宣言，可以更廣泛地應用在所有那些對他們而言，實務研究是非常重要的的專業​​中。本宣言並不是絕對的或結論性的，而僅僅旨在這個時間點試圖開始描繪實務研究的輪廓，因為它的不斷發展。我們試圖用包容的語言，納入多元的角度和不同的看法。我們希望本宣言可以成為持續討論的基礎。我們完成這的宣言，以便使來自不同國家和背景的各類專業人才，能夠使用此宣言以繼續以他們自己的思想和位置來精進實務研究；擴大實務研究的面向；以及提供更多更好的實務研究。**實務研究：索利斯堡宣言****實務研究：為什麼它很重要，為何現在提出呢？** 專業人士在實務工作上的效能是目前全球性的需求。經濟和社會的變化意味著更多對「責信」(accountability)的要求，而越來越多的不可預測性也造成了責信上的困難。對實務工作的研究需要改變，以便提供一種在複雜和不確定的情況下，更好做法的相關知識。一個重大的問題是以研究領導實務的主流假設。其實，研究也需要具有實踐意識，以便從複雜的實務本身，直接產生更佳的研究成果和發展知識。實務研究的重要概念，是促進實務和研究領域之間平等對話，目的在認識研究這種複雜性的最佳途徑。目前是重要的歷史時刻，因為對新責信制的關注，大家現在對科學知識是否足以作為改善實務工作的唯一依據產生了質疑。 **什麼是實務研究？**目前對於「實務研究」的定義沒有明確的共識，往往也會被其他相關名詞（如實務工作者研究(practitioner research)）所取代。接下來關於實務研究宣言，試圖捕捉相關細節：「......實務研究發自對實務工作的好奇心。為了確認好的且有盼望的助人方法；它透過對實務工作的嚴格檢驗和從過去的經驗反射出新的理念，挑戰不良的實務工作。我們認為實務研究最好由實務工作者與研究人員合作進行，後者應盡可能地向實務工作者學習，實務工作者也可以向研究者學習。實務研究是透過包容性方法探索專業知識，以實務工作，理解其複雜性，搭配促權的承諾，以實現社會正義。」實務研究包括專業實務相關的知識產生，因此通常會涉及從實務本身直接產生的扎根知識。接下來我們列舉出一些相關的具體面向。 顯然，聯結實務與研究的想法與實踐已經發展了一段時間，而在不同環境的歷史發展下採用特定方法（例如，在一些國家，個案研究方法被看作是早期研究實務工作的方法）。大致而言，實務研究的當代意義則轉變為如何橋接研究領域和實務領域之間的差距問題。 如何最好地彌合這種差距，牽涉到下列幾個具體的問題： * 實務工作者是否有以及如何參與實務研究。這個問題與實務工作者是否是知識的使用者和創造者有關，並且這是否意味著他們「必須」參與研究，才能使實務研究有意義。
* 是否所有的對專業者有用的研究就是實務研究？還是其他各式各樣對提升實務工作效率的研究也是？
* 實務工作是如何被理解的？不同觀點是如何被結合的（例如，不同的類型，方法，情境）？實務工作者如何使用和開發知識（以及何種知識）是一個核心問題。複雜的實務經驗的本質是什麼？如何透過研究完美的呈現出來？在一定程度上，實務研究需要反映出日常實務中所關心的議題。
* 研究的概念是如何被理解的－支撐研究以獲得知識的特定方法（認識論），以及「嚴謹」和「誠信」的概念如何與此有關？特別是，本研究的概念可能需要允許透過日常實務經驗來產生知識，「調查」，或「具有研究思維的實務工作」可能更適當的稱呼。
* 理解前述兩個問題的基礎，是何謂知識的概念？特別是，什麼類型的知識是實務研究重點，以及是實務工作中默認/隱含的面向，是否應該揭露是關鍵議題。
* 實務研究與其他學科（如社會科學）或佔主導地位的專業（如醫學）的研究，是一個關鍵問題，包括實務研究是否只是模仿或修改自它們？或者是否有必要開發新的和不同的典範/方法。

**為什麼要從事實務研究？**廣泛並簡單地說，實務研究的目的是透過產生相關的專業知識，以直接改善實務工作。然而，這個議題包含了許多相關的複雜觀點：* 實務研究為的是誰呢？許多不同的利益集團都參與其中（實務工作者，服務使用者，學界，研究者，政策決定者，管理者，一般民眾），這些人可能在利益上相互矛盾。誰有優先地位？實務研究是否總是必須對服務使用者有利，或者讓他們直接參與？不同的觀點對上述重大議題會有不同的答案。
* 實務研究的驅力。這也與上述問題有關。驅力是否必須直接從實務中的困惑所產生？或間接的困惑是否也可能是一種驅力？這可能也會帶來不同的觀點。
* 實務研究的價值基礎。是不是該有一種與該專業直接相關的價值基礎（即：以社會工作來說，是否該以追求更大的（社會及個人）正義為目標）？
* 為發展實務與研究之間的關係，以下的原則/實踐是很重要的：
* 合作
* 參與
* 倫理性反思和批判性反思
* 脈絡性(contextuality) 與
* 研究的動態性、流動性(fluid)或相關性(relational)性質
* 實務研究也將透過產生其獨特的知識和專長增進專業發展。

**如何做到的呢？**那些方法與實務研究相關？當我們同意用實務工作中所引起的實際問題和疑惑來推動實務研究，我們也該問是否有些特定的方法或方法論是比較適合的？在繼續發展研究實務中複雜性的方法的過程中，現有的和新的方法都可能是相關的。一個具有包容性的方法（注意到不同觀點）對發展典範是重要的，因此純粹的量化或質化方法就比較不適用。實務研究往往可能需要創建新的方法或創新性地採用現有的方法，這與合作、複雜性、對話、關係性和脈絡化的原則是一致的。舉例來說，像參與式行動研究的方法，或使用反思(reflection)和反身性(reflexivity)，可能更方便用於實務研究的目的。如果要促進實務和研究之間的動態對話，我們需要進一步關注直接從實務中制定研究議題和問題，以及實務工作者和研究人員的相關角色。如何使研究過程中各方（實務工作者、學界、服務使用者、政策制訂者、管理者）根據其具體位置和專長提出作不同的（或類似）貢獻？**下一步是什麼？**要進一步發展實務研究，現在需要些什麼？* 支持實務研究的結構、方法和條件－根據不同的利益團體和可用資源，會需要一系列不同結構和條件。不同的國家做了不同的嘗試（例如，在芬蘭的卓越中心(Centres of Excellence)；在其他北歐國家的醫療與社會服務辦公室(HUSK)（政府，學界和服務使用者之間的夥伴關係））。在組織中，必須提供空間（體力和心力，並保留時間）來交流實務研究的想法。需要建立促進實務研究的社會資本，並鼓勵教育界培訓實務工作者更俱備研究思維，也使研究者更俱備實務思維。
* 研究資助機構必須認識到研究實務新模式的出現。
* 新典範式/認識論？也許需要發展描述實務研究的新語言，以面對新出現的實務研究方法。
* 呼籲採取行動。已經到了進一步的系統性合作行動的時間。教育界，實務工作者，研究者，管理人員和雇主在發展實務研究都有扮演一份重要角色，因此在多元領域的合作努力是至關重要的。

只有資源和結構是不夠的。應該要鼓舞一種支持實務工作者和研究者互動的文化，使其尊重和交換彼此不同的專長;並給認同產生更普遍知識的挑戰，以及承認和重視特定的和在地的知識。發展實務研究概念的一個重要部分是需要繼續做下去，並從這實踐中，繼續發展我們對此概念的認識。**附錄**研擬此宣言的索利斯堡論壇的成員名單如下：Gurid Aga Askeland，挪威Mike Austin, 美國Tony Evans, 英國Sylvia Fargion, 義大利Mike Fisher, 英國Jan Fook, 英國Ilse Julkunen, 芬蘭Aulikki Kananoja, 芬蘭Synnöve Karvinen-Niinikoski, 芬蘭Rhoda MacRae, 英國Edgar Marthinsen, 挪威Matts Mosesson, 瑞典Joan Orme, 英國Helen Pain, 英國Jackie Powell, 英國Gillian Ruch, 英國Mirja Satka, 芬蘭Riki Savaya, 以色列Ian Shaw, 英國沈文偉, 香港Lars Uggerhøj, 丹麥Helen Welsh, 英國Bessa Whitmore, 加拿大Laura Yliruka, 芬蘭譯者：王實之，台灣 translator: Samuel Shih-Chih Wang |