Effectiveness Framework of Functional Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>50:50</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Never/none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engagement
Participant’s understanding issue for discussion
Interviewer’s understanding of participant’s views
Participant - On track
Symmetry
Real time
Interviewer’s Satisfaction / Chill factor

A total score of 75% (21) or more represents effective communication.
Effectiveness Framework of Functional Communication

- **Engagement** – the social closeness that is established in the interaction and maintained through rapport and joint attention.

- **Participant's understanding** – based on verbal and non-verbal responses.

- **Interviewer's understanding of participant's views** – shown by non-verbal and verbal responses of interviewer.

- **Participant - On Track** – the relevance of the participant's verbal and non-verbal responses to the topic being discussed.

- **Symmetry** – the sense of equilibrium and balance that creates shared control in the interaction.

- **Real time** – the extent to which the interaction happens within a typical time frame.

- **Interviewer - Chill factor/Satisfaction** – the perspective of the interviewer about how easy it is to support and maintain the interaction.

For further information on the development of this measure please refer to the following publications
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Method of analysis

A consensus approach was used to analyse the video recordings in all three conditions and the following strategies were employed to improve inter-judge agreement as suggested in the literature.(1-3)

• Videos were watched in the same room under the same conditions;
• Each participant’s video was watched in one sitting;
• Clear definitions were developed for making judgements;
• The raters watched the video clips and scored the coding framework without knowledge of the others’ scores;
• They then discuss their individual scores for each topic and, where there is discrepancy, the raters are asked to justify and explain their judgements.
• The raters might then adjust their score but only if convinced by another person’s argument.
• A record is kept of inter-judge agreement following any adjustments.
• All instances of inter-rater agreement and disagreement are recorded and the percentage of agreement is determined


References for the indicators:


