

Target Area: Communication, Language, Speech Disorders

<p>Wambaugh (2004). <i>Stimulus Generalization Effects of Sound Production Treatment for Apraxia of Speech</i>. <i>Journal of Medical Speech-Language Pathology</i> 12(2): 77-97</p>	<p>RoBiNT score - <i>to be confirmed</i></p>
<p>Method/Results</p>	<p>Rehabilitation Program</p>
<p>Design:</p> <p>Y Study type: SSD. Multiple baseline across behaviours, replicated across participants.</p> <p>Y Participants: n =2 with apraxia and aphasia</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participant 1: Male, aged 54 years 2. Participant 2: Female, aged 48 years. <p>Y Setting: Not stated.</p> <p>Target behaviour measure/s:</p> <p>Y Percent correct production of target sounds when reading words and phrases</p> <p>Y Percent correct production in sentence repetition and sentence completion.</p> <p>Primary outcome measure/s:</p> <p>Y No additional.</p> <p>Result: Treatment resulted in increased accuracy of production of treated sounds in trained words and untrained words. Response generalization to untrained exemplars of trained sounds was strong and mirrored acquisition effects. This showed that training a relatively few exemplars of a sound with sound production treatment may be sufficient for promoting generalized production of that sound in contexts similar to those used in training.</p>	<p>Aim: To evaluate stimulus generalization effects of sound production treatment.</p> <p>Materials: Treatment and probe stimuli were devised on an individual basis for each of the speakers. For speaker 1, 20 mono and bisyllabic words were chosen to represent both syllable-initial /v/ and syllable -initial /r/-blends. The 20 /v/ words were embedded as the second word of a semantically plausible phrase. The /r/-blends were not embedded in phrases and included a variety of blends. Ten items from each group were used in training and remaining items were never trained, but used to assess response generalization. For Speaker 2, 20 syllable final “sh”, syllable initial /z/ and syllable final “th” words were embedded in two and three word phrases. All of the words were monosyllabic, with the exception of two, two syllable /z/ words.</p> <p>Treatment plan/procedure</p> <p>Y Duration: Treatment for speaker 1 extended for 50 sessions and for speaker 2, 32 sessions.</p> <p>Y Procedure: Sessions were three times weekly.</p> <p>Y Content: Treatment was designed to facilitate correct production of the specific sounds target for intervention. Treatment combined modeling, repetition, minimal pair contrast, integral stimulation (i.e., watch me, listen to me, say it with me), articulatory placement cuing and feedback. The treatment was applied in a response-contingent hierarchy. That is, subsequent steps of the hierarchy were utilized only on an incorrect response.</p>