Portuguese Adaptation and Validation of the Communicative Activities Checklist

by Alexandra Magalhães | Luís Jesus | Pedro Sá Couto | Madeline Cruice | Maria Assunção Matos | University of Aveiro | University of Aveiro | University of Aveiro | City, University of London | University of Aveiro

Abstract ID: 117
Event: SoA 2023 Nice
Topic: Clinical and experimental work on aphasia and related disorders

Introduction and aims

The Communicative Activities Checklist – COMACT (Cruice, 2001; Worrall & Hickson, 2003) measures the type and frequency of communicative activities people with aphasia (PWA) do and how this condition limits their realisation. These are related to Talking, Listening, Reading and Writing activities. COMACT is one of the assessment tools Portuguese speech and language therapists would like to use in their clinical practice (Leal, 2009). This study aimed to translate the COMACT to European Portuguese (EP); analyse its validity and reliability with a sample of Portuguese PWA and neurologically healthy people (NHP).

Methods

This methodological, observational, descriptive-correlational study included different phases: Translation and backtranslation; development of a user's manual; evaluation of the different versions by a committee of specialists (N=6); cognitive debriefing (individually) and discussion group about the final version of COMACT-EP with five PWA (content validation); use of COMACT- EP with a sample of Portuguese PWA and NHP. Participants were recruited at the Portuguese Institute of Aphasia (IPA), in Matosinhos, according to the following inclusion criteria: Both sexes; over 18 years of age; EP as first language; literate; living at home; having at least 3 months post onset; no hearing problems that interfered in the communication process; aphasia diagnosis according to the Lisbon Aphasia Assessment Battery – BAAL (Caldas, 1979; Damásio, 1973; Ferro, 1986); reliable yes/no response (no less than 7 on the BAAL yes/no questions - total score of 8 points); no presumed cognitive disorder according to the Language Mini Mental State Examination – LMMMSE (Pashek, 2008) EP version (Matos and Jesus, 2011) and according to the information in the clinical history of the person; no presumed depression according to the Center For Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale – CES-D (Radloff, 1979) EP version (Gonçalves and Fagulha, 2004); be able to understand simple sentences according to the sub-test of the Language and Aphasia Assessment Tests in Portuguese – PALPA-P (Castro et al., 2007). Content analysis was also contemplated (qualitative analysis of the data obtained in the cognitive debriefing and calculation of the Content Validity Index – CVI); concurrent validity between COMACT-EP and the Communication Disability Profile's (CDP) activity subscale was analysed using Spearman's correlation; internal consistency was analysed with Cronbach's

α; test-retest stability (7 days interval) was analysed with the Wilcoxon test; the two groups were compared with t-tests (continuous variables) and chi-square tests (categorical variables).

Results

Fifteen PWA (7 men; 8 women; mean age: 58.46±14.43) and 30 NHP (13 men; 17 women; mean age: 58.60±15.24) were involved. Several suggestions were made by PWA, including the substitution and/or deletion of words and creation of new items. Two items of the Talking category and 3 items from the Writing category were altered. The CVI obtained was excellent (Alexandre & Coluci, 2011). Significant differences between groups were found in 7 items of the Talking, Listening and Reading categories. In the Writing category, no items were found to have significant differences between both groups. Considering Concurrent Validity, only a few items presented strong positive correlations. Test-retest results revealed stability, with exception of one item (“Read maps and directions”). Internal Consistency for the Talking, Listening and Writing categories were generally low for both groups. The Reading category presented the highest Cronbach’s α value for both groups, indicating that the responses were consistent.

Discussion

Considering the translation process, the discussion group that followed the individual cognitive debriefing, was most effective in providing feedback that resulted in changes in COMACT-EP. Further adaptation of certain items is needed, to make them clearer in what they mean and aim to evaluate. It is also necessary to review and update items that do not reflect our current society, as some were viewed as irrelevant or non-important, bearing in mind that the original COMACT was created in 2001. The professional status is what differs most between groups, as the majority of PWA are retired, but most NHP are currently working. This reflects how language and communication limitations can impact work opportunities, as companies are ill-equipped to embrace PWA or adapt their job posts after a brain injury (Morris et al, 2011).Concerning the differences between groups, in relation to COMACT-EP and its activities, PWA didn’t participate as much in activities such: “Talking in a small group of people”/ “Talk to shopkeepers/trades people”. Concerning the differences between groups, in relation to COMACT-EP and its activities, PWA didn’t participate as much in activities such: “Talking in a small group of people”/ “Talk to shopkeepers/trades people”. These activities might present many communicational barriers for PWA and communication partners might not have the appropriate tools to facilitate their expression. Differences were also found in the Listening category: “Listen to the radio” and “Listen to a conversation”. When examining these activities, it is important to bear in mind oral comprehension difficulties presented by PWA. People talking rapidly and giving too much information at once, aggravate comprehension limitations, being understandable that PWA avoid these situations. Concerning the Reading category, differences were found in just one

of the items: “Do crosswords”, as these results might be related to reading/writing difficulties associated with aphasia. Regarding Concurrent Validity, the Listening category presents a stronger positive correlation, possibly due to some similarity of the items and what they assess. The item “Read forms and bills/invoices” correlated negatively with two CDP-EP items: “Read and understood a complete article on a newspaper”; “Read and understood a letter from a friend”. Further testing is necessary to extrapolate more reliable conclusions from these results. However, it is important to consider that, typically, PWA have less difficulty comprehending simpler texts. Test-retest results revealed only one item with a low stability: “Read maps and directions”. In the retest, the frequency with which people did this activity changed, as more individuals chose the lower frequencies. It is possible that this item was not fully understood.

Conclusions

The results obtained indicate the importance of developing future studies to obtain better results in terms of reliability. It is necessary to continue the revision/rewording of some items and to include a larger sample of PWA with greater ethnic, geographic and cultural representation, as well as with different types of aphasia and severity.

References

Alexandre, N. and Coluci, M. (2011). Validade de conteúdo nos processos de construção e adaptação de instrumentos de medidas. Ciência & Saúde Coletiva v. 16, n. 7, pp. 3061-3068.

Cruice, M. (2001) Communication and quality of life in older people with aphasia and healthy older people. Unpublished Doctoral thesis completed within Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology, University of Queensland, Australia.

Leal, A. (2009). Avaliação da afasia pelos terapeutas da fala em Portugal. M.Sc. Thesis, University of Aveiro, Portugal.

Matos, A., Serra, A. and Jesus, L. (2016). Content validation of the Communication Disability Profile (CDP) - Portuguese Version. BMC Health Services Research 16 (Suppl 3), p. 70.

Morris, J., Franklin, S. and Menger, F. (2011). Returning to work with aphasia: A case study. Aphasiology, 25(8), 890–907. DOI:10.1080/02687038.2010.549568

Swinburn, K., & Byng, S. (2006). The Communication Disability Profile. London: Connect – the communication disability network.

Worrall, L. and Hickson, L. (2003). Communication disability in aging: From prevention to intervention. Clifton Park, NY: Delmar Learning.


UNIVERSITÉ CÔTE D'AZUR
cnrs
SoA Conference
18-21 September 2023, Nice (Fr)
Science of Aphasia
UNIVERSITÉ CÔTE D'AZUR
cnrs
Science of Aphasia

Abstracts