In contrast, deficits specific to ASD lie in the domain of experience-sharing during emotion-based encounters, where sharing and integrating experiences with others become the primary goal (Hobson, 1993; Mundy, 1995; Sigman & Ruskin, 1999; Trevarthen, 2001). Examples of experience-sharing contexts and activities include reciprocal conversations; expressing curiosity about others’ thoughts and feelings; sharing memories; and, maintaining friendships. Experience-sharing competence is measured by the extent to which individuals are able to coordinate and integrate elements of their subjective experience with that of others (Carpenter, Nagell & Tomasello, 1998; Eckerman, Davis, & Didow, 1989; Hobson, 1993). Coordination occurs through matching, complementing, comparing, contrasting and/or integrating personal elements with those of others. Elements may range from simple emotional reactions to synchronized actions, shared goals, unique perspectives, important memories, future plans, and inner feelings (Fogel, 1993; Tomasello & Farrar, 1986).

While many characteristics of ASD seem to improve with time and/or instruction, experience-sharing deficits appear to be highly stable throughout the lifespan (Sigman & Ruskin, 1999; Tantam, 1991), as well as resistant to treatment (Hadwin, Baron-Cohen, Howlin, & Hill 1997; Hwang & Hughes 2000; Marriage, Gordon & Brand, 1995; Ozonoff & Miller, 1995).

Relationship Development Intervention

The following section briefly summarizes several of the critical features of Relationship Development Intervention (RDI), a comprehensive program specifically designed to remediate experience-sharing deficits. RDI is based on a cognitive and developmental systems approach that emphasizes teaching children to appraise and adapt their actions
Inability to establish a reliable emotional feedback system deprives parents of the ongoing information needed to effectively balance success and safety while introducing new challenges.

Developing an Emotional Feedback System

Experience-sharing competence develops in a gradual, systematic fashion in neurotypical children. Mastery of rudimentary abilities is the springboard for the introduction of new challenges (Rogoff, 1990; Sroufe, 1996). Parents carefully regulate this sequence, and the degree to which they “raise the bar” is based upon their infants’ responses. Hence, the parent-infant emotional feedback system is established in the first few months of life (Fogel, 1993; Sroufe, 1996; Tronick, 1989).

In contrast, children with ASD rarely provide the type of clear emotional feedback that caregivers require to finely tune their actions. Nor, do these children accurately interpret their parents’ emotional expressions (Capps, Kasari, Yirmiya, & Sigman 1993; Dawson, Hill, Spencer, Galpert, & Watson, 1990; McGee, Feldman & Chernin, 1991). Inability to establish a reliable emotional feedback system deprives parents of the ongoing information needed to effectively balance success and safety while introducing new challenges. It also deprives their children of valuable experience-sharing information.

RDI addresses this problem by teaching parents to employ simple activities and exercises designed to establish this feedback system by promoting emotional attunement between themselves and their children (Stern, 1977). Work on more complex experience-sharing does not progress until the child is regularly engaging in both unprompted facial gazing for emotion-sharing, and consistently responding to parental joint attention behaviors.

Apprenticeship in Co-Regulation

Parents of typically developing children act as senior co-participants in interactions with their children. They carefully increase demands for their children to take greater responsibility for coordinating and regulating the actions needed to maintain the coherence and mutual enjoyment of increasingly

Social relationships inherently involve the introduction of new challenges and information that does not fit the child’s existing ways of organizing knowledge.
sophisticated interpersonal encounters (Fogel, 1993; Rogoff, 1990; Sroufe, 1996). Individuals with ASD fail to master even the early foundations of co-regulation. Nor do they learn to make the frequent self-regulatory adjustments necessary to function as equal partners in dynamic social encounters (Bacon, Fein, Morris, Waterhouse, & Allen, 1998; Geller, 1998).

RDI parents learn to carefully pace their “demands” for co-regulation, so that their children develop a sense of self-efficacy and a desire to take their share of responsibility in reciprocal interactions. They do this by employing ongoing social referencing and behavior regulation techniques. These serve as ongoing “background” functions during social encounters. Success here can increase the child’s motivation to become a competent co-participant in these encounters.

Participating in Dynamic Systems

Social relationships inherently involve the introduction of new challenges and information that does not fit the child’s existing ways of organizing knowledge. Thus, reciprocal social encounters inevitably create some degree of disruption of the child’s current cognitive state. Typically developing infants and toddlers benefit from these periods of “productive uncertainty,” using them to develop more sophisticated ways of organizing their experiences. Additionally, they spend countless hours developing proficiency in rapidly adapting to change by engaging with parents in the elaboration of simple games, such as peek-a-boo and pat-a-cake.

Children with ASD have neither the desire nor the ability to participate in any types of encounters that are characterized by ongoing change and novelty. They seek either to avoid such encounters, or to transform them into static interactions, by attempting to control or codify all participants’ actions so that they become predictable and repetitive.

RDI parents learn to guide the child by co-participating in simple, regulated activities. Parents continually add challenge in small manageable amounts, to afford the child the opportunity to assimilate the added complexity and/or incongruity. For example, sweeping the floor might begin with simple parallel actions of both partners using brooms and matching actions to sweep. Later, parents might introduce “complementary” roles by having one partner act as the “sweeper” while the other performs the “dustpan” role in a coordinated fashion.

Developing Declarative Communication

Participants in dynamic encounters communicate through declarative means. Declarative communication involves the intent to share and invite others to share some aspect of one’s experience. It is distinguished from imperative forms of communication which are instrumental in nature (i.e., directed toward the satisfaction of one’s own needs) (Bates, Camioni & Volterra, 1975; Carpenter, Nagell & Tomasello, 1998). For example, a request “demands” a particular response, and thus constitutes a form of imperative communication. Children with autism—even those who are verbally proficient—appear to make almost exclusive use of imperative communication (Landa, 2000; Stone, Ousley, Yoder, Hogan, & Hepburn, 1997).

RDI parents are taught to emphasize and maintain a primarily declarative communication style. They learn to slow down communication to allow the child time to process information and to consider his or her reply. They limit and modify communication elements that add unnecessary complexity, or that might distract the child from an experience-sharing focus. As such, parents are taught to avoid over-talking, frequent questioning and prompting.
Constructing Optimal Learning Environments

Typical children are able to master the foundations of experience-sharing during the infancy and toddler years, through their participation in simple shared activities, paced to their developmental needs, with limited competing attentional demands (Sroufe, 1996; Tronick, 1989). Deprived of the natural “advantages” of infancy and toddlerhood (i.e., participation in shared activities), children with autism are highly vulnerable to the attraction of objects and activities that “compete for attention” with social partners (Joseph & Tager-Flusberg, 1997).

RDI parents learn to simplify physical environments, slow down the pace of daily activities, and provide opportunities throughout the day for their children to hone their newly developed experience-sharing skills. With the help of a certified RDI consultant, parents learn to monitor their child’s progress, and to gradually and systematically increase environmental “noise,” so as to approximate real-world demands. All of this is carefully “titrated” to accommodate their child’s increasing competence.

Encouraging Results from Preliminary Research

In a preliminary attempt to study RDI’s effectiveness, we selected the following two measures: 1) improvement on the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule (ADOS) (Lord, Rutter, DiLavore, & Risi, 2002), and 2) increased independent functioning in educational settings. Over a sixteen month period, we compared 31 children with ASD between the ages of two and nine—seventeen children whose families had participated in RDI, and fourteen children of similar diagnoses, ages, cognitive, and language functioning who participated in other treatments. The non-RDI group averaged over 25 hours per week of therapist contact, while the RDI group averaged a little over 5 hours per week. A complete description of research methods and results can be found in a related publication (Gutstein, in press).

After sixteen months, 70% of the RDI children had improved in at least one diagnostic category on the ADOS. In contrast, not a single child in the non-RDI group had improved in any diagnostic category.

RDI and non-RDI children did not initially differ in educational placement. At initial evaluation only one child in each group functioned independently in a regular education classroom. By the second evaluation, however, thirteen RDI children were attending regular education settings without significant support. In contrast not a single child in the non-RDI group had moved from a special to a regular education setting during the sixteen month interval.

While we believe that it is likely that the dramatic progress made by children participating in the RDI group will hold up as they mature, a great deal of further research is needed to substantiate this. Studies should employ larger samples, different age groups, longer-term follow up, and more extensive measurements of progress. We are, however, certainly encouraged by our preliminary findings.
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