



## City Research Online

### City, University of London Institutional Repository

---

**Citation:** Kladouchou, V., Papathanasiou, I., Efstratiadou, E. A., Christaki, V. & Hilari, K. (2017). Treatment integrity of elaborated semantic feature analysis aphasia therapy delivered in individual and group settings. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 52(6), pp. 733-749. doi: 10.1111/1460-6984.12311

This is the supplemental version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

---

**Permanent repository link:** <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/16920/>

**Link to published version:** <https://doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12311>

**Copyright:** City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

**Reuse:** Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.



## Supplemental Material 1

*ESFA Integrity checklist* (individual therapy approach): This checklist outlines the therapy process against which treatment integrity was checked. It was used by the raters for observation and rating of the individual therapy videos.

### ESFA Integrity Checklist Individual therapy

---

*Duration of session:* .....

*Therapist's name:* .....

*Date of scoring:* .....

*Observer's name:* .....

During observation of each therapy session, please evaluate whether each component was implemented (at the time point of the session that it should occur) and rate it following the instructions below. If the component is fully implemented, rate as 1; if the component is partially implemented, rate as 0.5; and if is not implemented, rate as 0 in the respective box. In the case that the component is not applicable, please use the initials **NA** in the respective box.

In more detail, a component should be rated as 0, when the therapist does not implement a planned component that should have been implemented, or in the case of paraphasia type, when a therapist treats a paraphasia like another one, e.g. follow the cueing hierarchy of circumlocution instead of the semantic one. A component should be rated as 0.5, when the therapist applies a planned step, but s/he does not implement it exactly as described. For example, in terms of cueing hierarchy, the therapist follows the proper hierarchy based on the paraphasia produced, but s/he adds or skips a step of the hierarchy; or s/he follows all the cueing steps, but not in the proper order (as described in the checklist). In terms of group therapy another example of a 0.5 rating could be when although a component requires therapist to involve all participants in the process, s/he applies it for only one of them. A component should be rated as 1, when the therapist implements it, exactly as described in the checklist. Finally, a component should be marked as NA, when it cannot be applied. If for example a person with aphasia produces a semantic paraphasia, the components related to phonemic paraphasias or unrelated response should automatically be marked as NA.

No	Component	Target word					Comments (e.g. Deviations/ Rating explanation)
		T1	T2	T3	T4	T5...	

At the beginning of the session, when the therapist asks the client to name the pictures already analysed during the previous sessions:

1	Does the therapist offer a naming opportunity for the target word, when the card is shown?						
2	In the case that the client produces the target word with <u>phonological or phonemic paraphasias or circumlocution</u> :						
2a	Is phonemic cue offered by the therapist?						
2b	Is the phonemic cueing hierarchy followed, as specified in the manual? (mouthing→production of the word's first phoneme→production of the word's first syllable→production of the word's first and second syllables→production of the target word)						
2c	If therapist's cueing is not adequate						

	for a correct production, does the chart analysis take place again?						
2d	Does the therapist ask the client to repeat the word, after its retrieval?						
<b>3</b>	In the case that the client produces the target word with <u>semantic paraphasias</u> :						
3a	Does the therapist repeat the word as produced by the client and ask him/her if the word just produced is the target one?						
3b	Is semantic cue offered by the therapist, if the client does not change his/her production?						
3c	Is the semantic cueing hierarchy followed, as specified in the manual? (questions semantically related with the target word → hints (This is a .../ The ...) → sentence-completion cue)						
3d	If therapist's cueing is not adequate for a correct production, does the						

	chart analysis take place again?						
3e	Does the therapist ask the client to repeat the word, after its retrieval?						
<b>4</b>	In the case that the client gives <u>no/unrecognisable/unrelated response</u> :						
4a	Is cue offered by the therapist?						
4b	Is the cueing hierarchy followed, as specified in the manual? (gesture→hints (This is a .../ The ...) →sentence-completion cue→mouthing→production of the word's first phoneme→production of the word's first syllable→production of the word's first and second syllables→production of the target word)						
4c	If therapist's cueing is not adequate for a correct production, does the chart analysis take place again?						
4d	Does the therapist ask the client to repeat the word, after its retrieval?						

<b>5</b>	Does the therapist ask the client to produce a sentence with the target word?						
<b>5a</b>	If the client is not able to produce a sentence using the target word, does the therapist help him/her by indicating features to be used for the sentence production?						

When a new target word is presented:

		T1	
<b>6</b>	Does the therapist offer a naming opportunity for the target word, when the card is shown?		
<b>7</b>	Does the therapist present the ESFA chart to the client?		

8	Chart completion:		
8a	Does the therapist ask the client questions relevant to the chart categories?		
8b	Is the client encouraged to fill in the chart by writing the indicated features under the relative category?		
8c	Does the therapist help the client fill in the chart by using the alphabet s/he client has writing difficulties?		
8d	If the client does not take initiative or struggle to start completing the chart (choosing the category s/he wants), does the therapist begin from the categories of “action” or “use”?		
8e	Are all the chart categories completed? (excluding the case in which use and action take the same replies)?		



9	Does the therapist encourage the client to review the chart by producing phrases including the target word and one or two features of the chart categories, after its completion?		
10	Does the therapist encourage the client to produce a sentence using the target word and features of the categories of the chart?		
10a	If the client is not able to produce a sentence, does the therapist indicate and produce features that could be used and let the client complete the target word?		

At the end of the therapy session:

11	Does the therapist ask the client to name all the targets that have been worked on in previous therapies?		
----	---	--	--