



## NSW Speech Pathology Evidence Based Practice Interest Group

### Critically Appraised Paper (CAP)

**CLINICAL BOTTOM LINE:** Group communication without prior individual therapy may improve overall communication on linguistic measures only.

**Clinical Question [patient/problem, intervention, (comparison), outcome]:** Does supported conversation in groups maintain or improve communication skills following a CVA.

**Search Terms:**

**Search Systems:**

**Citation:** Bollinger, R., Musson, N. and Holland, A. (1993). A study of group communication intervention with chronically aphasic persons. *Aphasiology Vol 27, No. 3: 301-313.*

**Design:** Cross over design with heterogeneity. Experimental group was also the control.

**Participants:** 10 Aphasics (left Hemisphere stroke, head injury or surgery). Minimum 8 months post onset. 9 males and 1 female.

**Experimental Group:** Had not received individual speech and language treatment. Aphasic subjects assigned to a low and high level group depending on their level of communication assessed on the CADL. Treatment was 20 weeks treatment, 10 weeks no treatment. 20 weeks treatment (reversed treatment). Treatment included 10 weeks contemporary group treatment and 10 weeks structured television-viewing group. Treatment was for 1 hour 3 times a week. Retested using CADL, PICA & ACTS 6 times, pre-therapy, after 20 week period, after 10 week period.

**Control Group:** No control group

**Results:** Overall communication gains made after 20 weeks of group therapy – tested using the PICA and CADL and scores significant. Treatment gains retained through treatment withdrawals. No difference on the testing of the ACTS. In second treatment phases only differences made on PICA scores.

**Comments on Design:** No control and a small number of participants. Good comparison to previous data (Attens et al 1982). Potential for bias and non-compliance. Sufficient information provided on the different treatments however treatment the same for low and high level group?. Excessive testing of participants - ?learning effect. 2 different group leaders - ?different skill level. Excessive therapy time. Results tainted by heterogeneous population.

**Level of Evidence (NH&MRC):** Level 1V

**Appraised By:** Adult Speech, Language and Dysphagia  
EBP Group

May 2002

**Date:** August 2003