

Target Area: Communication, Language, Speech Disorders

<p><b>Wambaugh, Linebaugh, Doyle, Martinez, Kalinyak-Flizsar &amp; Spencer (2001) <i>Aphasiology</i> 15(10-11): 933-950</b></p>	<p>SCED score - <i>to be confirmed</i></p>
<p>Method/Results</p>	<p>Rehabilitation Program</p>
<p><b>Design:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Study type:</b> SSD. Multiple baseline across behaviours, replicated across participants.</li> <li>➤ <b>Participant:</b> n=3 males with aphasia (M=55-71 years).</li> <li>➤ <b>Setting:</b> Not stated.</li> </ul> <p><b>Target behaviour measure/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Percentage of pictures named correctly.</li> </ul> <p><b>Primary outcome measure/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ No additional.</li> </ul> <p><b>Result:</b> All participants showed a positive response to both types of cueing hierarchies (i.e. semantic cueing and phonologic cueing) and one participant who had a predominantly phonological level deficits responded in a superior way to the semantic treatment.</p>	<p><b>Aim:</b> To compare two cueing treatments for naming deficits following aphasia.</p> <p><b>Materials:</b> Four sets of pictures of line drawings of objects consisting of 12 items each plus the cueing hierarchies.</p> <p><b>Treatment plan/procedure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Duration:</b> The program extended for 100 sessions for Participant 1, 86 sessions for participant 2 and 90 sessions for participant 3.</li> <li>➤ <b>Procedure:</b> Sessions were three times weekly.</li> <li>➤ <b>Content:</b> Both treatments used a response contingent cueing hierarchy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Semantic cueing treatment</i> is designed to strengthen semantic associations</li> <li>▪ <i>Phonological treatment</i> facilitates phonological processing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>