FEATURED ARTICLES

A Boy and a Zebrafish: An Integrated Developmental Framework for Autism

Daniel Franklin, Ph.D. and Rachel Galant, Pharm.D.

Daniel Franklin

Rachel Galant

Recent research from Yale University using zebrafish has renewed interest in the future of autism treatment. Zebrafish are increasingly valuable in neuroscience because their genome is well understood, they develop rapidly, and researchers can observe neural development and social behavior in real time (Stewart et al., 2014; Kalueff et al., 2014). Investigators have introduced autism-associated genetic variations into zebrafish to study how neural circuits related to social interaction, sensory processing, and behavioral flexibility develop and respond to medication candidates (Meshalkina et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2018). Work at Yale University and other leading institutions suggest that highly targeted compounds may one day improve social functioning, emotional regulation, and learning readiness by acting on specific neurobiological pathways (Hoffman et al., 2016; Tang et al., 2020). While animal findings do not translate directly to humans, they represent an important medical lens for understanding autism.

That medical lens, however, is only part of the picture. Autism intervention has historically been shaped by psychological models, especially behaviorism. In the early twentieth century, Ivan Pavlov demonstrated that behavior could be shaped through conditioned associations (Pavlov, 1927). John B. Watson argued that psychology should focus primarily on observable behavior rather than internal emotional life or subjective experience (Watson, 1913). Later, B. F. Skinner developed operant conditioning, emphasizing reinforcement, rewards, repetition, and consequences as tools for changing behavior (Skinner, 1953).

These ideas strongly influenced the development of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA), particularly through work at the University of California, Los Angeles and researchers such as O. Ivar Lovaas. In the 1960s and 1970s, Lovaas and colleagues applied intensive behavioral methods with autistic children, using discrete trial teaching, repetition, prompting, and reinforcement systems designed to increase language, attention, and adaptive behaviors (Lovaas, 1987). Their work helped establish ABA as a dominant autism intervention model and influenced programs across the United States.

ABA has helped some children acquire communication, adaptive behavior, and learning skills, particularly when implemented ethically, flexibly, and individually. However, criticism of ABA has grown substantially among autistic adults, disability scholars, developmental psychologists, and many clinicians. One major concern is that traditional ABA often prioritized making autistic children appear "indistinguishable from peers," a phrase used in early outcome studies, thereby emphasizing normalization rather than authentic well-being. The Autistic Self Advocacy Network has argued that many ABA programs historically taught children to suppress harmless autistic traits such as stimming, atypical eye contact, movement patterns, or communication styles, potentially encouraging masking rather than healthy adaptation (Bottema-Beutel et al., 2021).

A second criticism is that some ABA models overemphasize compliance training. Critics note that repeatedly rewarding obedience to adult demands may inadvertently weaken autonomy, body boundaries, and self-advocacy. Julia Bascom has argued that the goal of intervention should be helping autistic children become happy, healthy, self-determined autistic adults rather than simply more compliant children (Bascom, 2015).

A third criticism involves emotional harm and trauma. Ariella Sandoval-Norton and Gary Shkedy argued that some long-term ABA practices may contribute to anxiety, prompt dependency, reduced intrinsic motivation, and emotional distress when therapy is overly rigid or coercive (Sandoval-Norton & Shkedy, 2019). Other scholars have debated the strength of this evidence, but even defenders of ABA increasingly acknowledge the need for reform, consent-based practices, and more humane goals.

A fourth criticism concerns research quality and real-world outcomes. Some contemporary reviews have noted variability in study design, inconsistent outcome measures, conflicts of interest, and limited long-term follow-up in portions of the ABA literature. A widely discussed investigation in The Wall Street Journal reported that despite the rapid growth and multibillion-dollar expansion of the ABA industry, many families experience high staff turnover, inconsistent therapist training, fragmented care, and uncertain long-term benefits. The article also noted that some children spend very large numbers of hours in therapy without clear evidence that intensity alone predicts better outcomes, raising concerns about cost, burden, and quality control (The Wall Street Journal, 2026). These concerns have strengthened calls for more individualized, developmentally informed, and outcomes-based alternatives.

Both the medical model and the behavioral model offer useful insights, yet neither alone fully captures the complexity of autism. Modern developmental science increasingly suggests that autism is best understood through a biopsychosocial framework in which biology, relationships, environment, stress, learning

FEATURED ARTICLES

history, and support systems interact continuously. Genetic predispositions matter, but genes do not operate in isolation. Epigenetic research further demonstrates that environmental experiences can influence how genes are expressed without altering the underlying DNA sequence. Factors such as stress, caregiving relationships, sensory environments, and early developmental experiences can shape neural development through epigenetic mechanisms, providing an important bridge between biological vulnerability and environmental influence (Meaney & Szyf, 2005; Kundakovic & Champagne, 2015). Relationships, sensory experiences, trauma exposure, communication opportunities, and emotional safety all influence developmental outcomes (Meaney, 2010; Shonkoff et al., 2012). As Louis Cozolino emphasizes, learning is deeply shaped by relationships, emotional safety, and the social brain (Cozolino in Franklin, 2018).

This broader understanding became vividly clear about a year ago when a six-year-old boy with autism arrived at our clinic. He had acute PTSD resulting from highly negative school experiences. He presented with severe dysregulation, profound barriers to learning, limited communication, rigid and distressed behavior patterns, and major challenges in social and emotional functioning. It was among the most acute and complex presentations we have encountered in our four decades in special education.

Importantly, we are distinguishing between autism as a legitimate neurodevelopmental condition with biological foundations and the tendency to reduce autism solely to genetics while ignoring environmental effects. In this child's case, trauma, repeated stress, relational disruption, and poor educational fit appeared to be dramatically intensifying his symptoms. When those environmental burdens were addressed, substantial developmental progress became possible.

Upon his arrival, we implemented an attachment-based and interpersonal neurobiology framework influenced by Daniel J. Siegel. This model emphasizes that the developing brain is shaped through relationships characterized by safety, attunement, co-regulation, predictability, and emotional connection (Siegel, 2012). Rather than focusing only on external behavior, the goal is to help regulate the nervous system internally through supportive human relationships. When a child feels safe, the brain becomes more available for language, flexibility, and learning.

We also integrated the DIR/Floortime model developed by Stanley Greenspan and Serena Wieder. DIR stands for Developmental, Individual-differences, and Relationship-based. This approach uses playful, emotionally meaningful engagement to build shared attention, communication, emotional regulation, symbolic thinking, and flexible problem solving (Greenspan & Wieder, 1998). It respects each child's sensory profile, developmental stage, and interests as pathways to growth. We utilized DIR/Floortime as a central component of the therapeutic schooling program we provided.

In addition, the work of Barry Prizant informed our treatment planning. His SCERTS model—Social Communication, Emotional Regulation, and Transactional Support—views challenging behaviors as adaptive responses to stress, dysregulation, sensory overload, and communication breakdown rather than symptoms to suppress (Prizant et al., 2006). This perspective encourages adults to ask not simply how to stop a behavior, but what the child may be communicating and what support is needed.

The child also received a careful pharmaceutical evaluation that resulted in a recommendation for a low-dose medication intervention. While it is difficult to isolate the exact contribution of this support, we believe it was an important adjunctive component of stabilization and progress. Our therapeutic school environment itself was essential: highly individualized instruction, one-to-one support, sensory regulation opportunities, predictable routines, movement breaks, warm adult relationships, and academic work carefully matched to readiness level. As stress decreased, the child's strengths became more apparent.

Today, many of his most acute symptoms have significantly diminished. He demonstrates stronger communication, improved emotional regulation, greater flexibility, increased trust in adults, better frustration tolerance, and substantially increased readiness for learning. He is more socially engaged, more joyful, and more available for development.

This case illustrates an important shift in the field. Autism should not be understood only through a narrow medical lens or through behaviorist models alone. It is more accurately understood through an integrated developmental framework in which neurology, relationships, trauma history, environment, education, and support all interact. The next generation of care may emerge not from choosing one model over another, but from thoughtfully combining biological science with humane, relational, trauma-informed, and developmentally sophisticated practice. The zebrafish may help us better understand the biology of autism, but children ultimately develop within relationships, communities, and lived experiences that no laboratory model can fully capture. ▲

Daniel Franklin, Ph.D., *has over forty-years' experience in special education as a teacher, school administrator, and educational consultant. He is the author of Helping Your Child with Language Based Learning Disabilities (2018), and the founder, owner, and clinical director of Franklin Educational Services which specializes in addressing the needs of children and young adults with autism.*

Rachel Galant, Pharm.D., M.A. in IECD*, is a DIR Floortime-certified relationship-based play therapist and the founder of *Developmental Bridges.* She holds a Doctor of Pharmacy and a Master's in Infant and Child Development with an emphasis on mental health and developmental delays. Rachel works with children on the autism spectrum, as well as those with other developmental delays and mental health challenges. She contributed to the MTA and Preschool ADHD studies and led the Prop 10 clinic at UCI. Rachel specializes in developmental therapy through a whole-child lens and interdisciplinary collaboration.*

References are available on the LACPA Website www.lacpa.org.