



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.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

Supplemental Material 2

ESFA Integrity checklist-G (group 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 group therapy videos.

ESFA Integrity Checklist-G Group 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 $\frac{1}{2}$; 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 <i>(e.g. Deviations/ Rating explanation)</i>
		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?						
1i	Does the therapist control the turn taking between clients? (The one who previously produced the sentence, now produces the word)						
2	In the case that the client produces the target word with <u>phonological or phonemic paraphasias or circumlocution</u> :						
2a	Does the therapist prompt the other client (not the target one) to give cue without saying the target word?						
2b	After cueing by the other client, does the therapist offer a naming opportunity to the target client again?						
2c	If the target client still cannot produce the target word, does the therapist ask the other one to name						

	the word?						
If the other client cannot name the word:							
2d	Is phonemic cue offered by the therapist?						
2e	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)						
2f	If therapist's cueing is not adequate for a correct production, does the chart analysis take place again?						
2g	Does the therapist ask the target client to repeat the word, after its retrieval?						
3	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	If the client does not change his/her production, does the therapist prompt the other client to give cue without saying the target word?						
3c	After cueing by the other client, does the therapist offer a naming opportunity to the target client again?						
3d	If the target client still cannot produce the target word, does the therapist ask the other one to name the word?						
If the other client cannot name the word:							
3e	Is semantic cue offered by the therapist, if the client does not change his/her production?						
3f	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)						
3g	If therapist's cueing is not adequate for a correct production, does the chart analysis take place again?						
3h	Does the therapist ask the target client to repeat the word, after its retrieval?						
4	In the case that the client gives <u>no/unrecognisable/unrelated response</u> :						
4a	Does the therapist prompt the other client to give cue without saying the target word?						
4b	After cueing by the other client, does the therapist offer a naming opportunity to the target client again?						
4c	If the target client still cannot produce the target word, does the therapist ask the other one to name the word?						

If the second client cannot name the word:

4d	Is cue offered by the therapist?						
4e	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)						
4f	If therapist's cueing is not adequate for a correct production, does the chart analysis take place again?						
4g	Does the therapist ask the target client to repeat the word, after its retrieval?						
5	Does the therapist ask the client (not the one who had to name the word) to produce a sentence with the target word?						

5a	Does the therapist prompt the other client to help him/her fill the sentence if needed?						
5b	If the target client is not able to produce a sentence after receiving help, does the therapist ask the other to produce a sentence?						
5c	If none of the clients is able to produce a sentence using the target word, does the therapist help them by indicating features to be used for the sentence production?						

When a new target word is presented:

6	Does the therapist offer a naming opportunity for the target word, when the card is shown?						
6i	Does the therapist control the turn-taking between clients? (The therapist asks the clients who wants to start and if they do not reply then the therapist prompts the one – not the one who produced the last						

	sentence- to start)						
7	Does the therapist present the ESFA chart to the client?						
8	Chart completion:						
8a	Does the therapist ask the clients questions relevant to the chart categories?						
8b	Is the target client encouraged to fill in the chart by writing the indicated features under the relative category?						
8c	Does the therapist prompt the other client to help the target client to fill in the chart by using the alphabet if the latter 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 receive the same reply)						
8f	If the target client is not able to give a feature, does the therapist prompt the other client to help?						
8g	Does the therapist control the turn-taking between clients?						
9	Does the therapist encourage the clients to review the chart by producing phrases including the target word and one or two features of the chart categories, after its completion?						
9i	Does the therapist control the turn taking between clients?						
10	Does the therapist encourage both clients to produce a sentence, using the target word?						

10a	Does the therapist prompt the other client to help, if necessary?	Client A						
		Client B						
10b	If the client is not able to produce a sentence, does the therapist indicate and produce features that could be used and let client to complete the target word?	Client A						
		Client B						

At the end of the therapy session:

11	Does the therapist ask the clients to name all the targets that have been worked on in previous therapies?						
11a	Does the therapist control the turn taking between clients? (either by having both clients name each word alternatively or by having each client name all the words in turn)						

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--