






Effectiveness Framework of Functional Communication

Indicators	4  Always	3  Often	2  50:50	1  Occasionally	0  Never/none
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

1. Murphy, J., (2000). Enabling People with Aphasia to Discuss Quality of Life. *British Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation*, 7, (11) 454-457.
2. Murphy, J. and Cameron, L., (2008) The Effectiveness of Talking Mats for People with Intellectual Disability. *British Journal of Learning Disability*, 36, 232-241.
3. Murphy, J., et al, (2010). The Effectiveness of the Talking Mats Framework with People with Dementia. *Dementia : International Journal of Social Research and Practice*, 9 (4) 454-472.

Effectiveness Framework of Functional Communication

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

1. Carter, M. & Iacono, T. 2002, "Professional judgments of the intentionality of communicative acts", *Augmentative & Alternative Communication*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 177-191.
2. Roulstone, S. 2001, "Consensus and variation between speech and language therapists in the assessment and selection of preschool children for intervention: A body of knowledge or idiosyncratic decisions?", *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 329-346.
3. Ashton, R. H. 2000, "A Review and analysis of research on the test-retest reliability of professional judgment", *Journal of Behavioural Decision Making*, vol. 13, pp. 277-194.

References for the indicators:

1. Locke, J. L. (1998) "Where did all the gossip go? Casual conversation in the Information Age", *American Speech Language Hearing Association*, 40, 3, 26-31.
2. Light, J. (1988) "Interaction involving individuals using augmentative and alternative communication systems: state of the art and future directions", *AAC*, 4, 2, 66-82
3. Lund, S. K. & Light, J. (2006) "Long-term outcomes for individuals who use augmentative and alternative communication: Part 1 - what is a 'good' outcome?", *AAC*, 22, 4, 284-299.
4. Ho et al (2005) "The Effect of Remnant and Pictographic Books on the Communicative Interaction of Individuals with Global Aphasia", *AAC*, 21,3, 218-232