

Introduction

Careful description of participant characteristics – and control for these – is essential in aphasia research, having a direct impact on appropriateness of experimental design, analysis and interpretation of results, readers' interpretation of reports, generalization of conclusions, comparisons across studies, replicability, and meta-analyses (American Psychological Association, 2001; Cholewa, 2000; Dworkin, Abkarian, & Johns, 1988; Hammill, Bryant, Brown, & Marten 1989; Silverman, 1998; Skenes & McCauley, 1985). Participant description and control are especially critical in aphasiology because associated etiologies commonly lead to great variation in type and severity of language deficits across individuals and multiple concomitant problems that may confound behavioral results within individuals (Brookshire, 1983; Hallowell, 2004; Roberts, Code & McNeil, 2003; Obler, Goral, & Albert, 1995; Robey, 1999; Wertz, 1991).

Brookshire (1983), in his oft-cited article on participant description in aphasia research, examined a set of articles published in or submitted to four journals published over a 10-year period. He verified whether each included reference to each of 18 characteristics. Finding several areas of weakness, Brookshire advocated greater attention to participant description. Obler, Goral, and Albert (1995) analyzed participant selection criteria in articles published in *Brain and Language*, 15 from 1974 through 1976 and 15 from 1992 and 1993. The earlier set included larger participant samples. The later set included more inclusion and exclusion criteria and more descriptive detail.

Roberts, Code and McNeil, in their “audit of current practice” of participant description (2003) examined 100 articles from 2001 and 2002. Journal selection was based on a PsychInfo search. They used standards in the 2001 Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA) as a basis characteristics studied. Only seven of 43 characteristics were included in patient descriptions within 65% or more studies. Eleven variables were reported in 5% or fewer. They reported that most articles “fell far short of the recommended standards” and concluded that, “progress in the field is hindered when studies do not adequately describe the aphasic participants” (p. 912).

The current study builds upon the previous studies described above, which involved small samples of articles and manuscripts generated over brief periods of time. Significant limitations of prior studies are addressed through: inclusion of a wide array of journals over a substantial period of time; analysis of *all* qualifying articles rather than a small sample; tracking of a large array of descriptive variables; analysis of participant characteristics reported in light of actual tasks involved in each study; and restriction to only peer-reviewed published papers. Primary aims were to: evaluate the state of practice in participant description in aphasia research in light of assessment and experimental tasks required of participants; and examine changes in participant description practices over time.

Method

Data were collected from every qualifying article in each of 32 journals over an 18-year period (1990 through 2008). Inclusion criteria were that each article consist of a peer-reviewed empirical report relevant to aphasia or other acquired neurogenic language impairment subsequent to stroke, traumatic brain injury or neoplasm in adults, and include original empirical data. Articles were excluded if they did not address language functions. Case studies with no control or manipulation of specific independent variables were excluded. Selection of the characteristics to be examined was determined through an extensive literature review. Specific participant description characteristics tracked are listed in Table 2.

Assessment and experimental tasks within each study were evaluated in terms of whether they involved visual material, color vision, reading, listening, speaking, pointing, gesturing, writing, and drawing. Also noted was whether authors described or controlled for each characteristic, and whether they used such aspects to determine participant inclusion/exclusion. A highly conservative approach was used: 1) any mention at all of a characteristic, even if not carefully controlled, was considered to indicate that characteristic was addressed; and 2) mention of a characteristic was counted if it was included in any aspect of the study (inclusion/exclusion criteria, screening, experimental control, participant description, statistical analysis, or interpretation of results).

Data were collected by a team of five graduate students after training by the author (to be detailed in this presentation). Scorers were provided a glossary to ensure mutual understanding of terms, a list of decision criteria, and examples of coding scenarios. Reliability and reproducibility statistics were calculated for each characteristic.

Results

In total, 1611 articles published over the 18-year period qualified for inclusion. Most (87.7%) addressed aphasia secondary to stroke; 10.17% addressed language disorders associated with traumatic brain injury; 12.64% addressed language disorders associated with right brain injury.

Ninety-five percent confidence intervals were calculated for each characteristic across articles. Reliability was tested through repeated data extraction for a random sample of 200 articles by an independent scorer. Initial inter-scorer agreement ranged from 88 to 100%. Scorers achieved 100% agreement upon reviewing each discrepancy together and reconciling coding.

Description of etiology was mentioned in 64.69% of articles, time post-onset in 87.20%, and site of lesion in 66.16%. All (100%) included participants' age; 85% mentioned gender and 58.01% handedness. Race or ethnicity was mentioned in 6.68% and native speaker, bilingual and/or multilingual status in 34.85%. Few mentioned any aspect of socioeconomic status (2.62%), living environment (11.93%) or social support (5.57%). Geographic region was mentioned in 11.55%. Recruitment source was given for 22.08%.

Overall communication impairment severity was mentioned in 41.17%, while 49.76% included severity by modality. Conversational ability was described in 8.82%. Motor speech was assessed only for studies that included speech tasks. Presence or absence of dysarthria was noted in 10.81%. Fewer addressed specific aspects such as intelligibility (4.12%), naturalness of speech (2.95%), or physiological measures (.54%). In those studies that involved speaking, the presence or absence of apraxia of speech was mentioned in 16.36%. Of those in which pointing was required, presence or absence of limb apraxia was noted in .07%. Motor control of the body was mentioned in terms of paralysis or paresis in 26.41%.; 7.63% included mention of alertness or attention, while 15.44% included mention of memory, 16.48% cognition, and 14.71% intelligence/IQ.

Of those studies including auditory tasks (94.75%), 4.98% included any mention of hearing. Pure-tone results or criteria were reported in 14%; full pure-tone evaluations were reported in 1.26%. Three percent included any mention of speech discrimination. Other aspects of hearing were reported in less than .4% of articles.

Among the 94.6% of articles involving presentation of visual materials, 4.7% included any mention of visual functioning. Of the 48.9 % articles involving visual material in color, 5% included color vision.

History of psychological or psychiatric problems was reported in 14.31%. History of learning disability and previous communication disorders was reported less frequently (4.13% and 5.57, respectively). Educational history was reported in 56.81%. Any aspect at all of participants' personality and mood was reported in 3.3%.

Conclusions

It is critical that investigators carefully screen for, describe and control for characteristics that may influence performance within a given study. Most of the participant characteristics studied – characteristics that have been deemed by numerous authors to be vital to the validity and reliability of aphasia research - were reported infrequently in articles published over the 18-year period. Variability in the frequency (across all articles) of authors addressing each characteristic is low.

Formative feedback concerning appropriate participant control and description is critical in the peer review process for publication and funding. It is important that education in research in neurogenic communication disorders include enhanced foci on participant description. Guidance in the development of strategic screening protocols and continuing education opportunities regarding specific means of participant screening are sorely needed.

References

- American Psychological Association (2001). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.) Washington, DC: APA
- Charman, T., Taylor, E., Drew, A., Cockerill, H., Brown, J., & Baird, G. (2005). Outcome at 7 years of children diagnosed with autism at age 2: predictive validity of assessments conducted at 2 and 3 years of age and pattern of symptom change over time. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *46*(5), 500-513.
- Christensen, A.L. (1997). Communication in relation to self-esteem. *Aphasiology*, *11*(7), 727-734.
- Cholewa, J. (2000). The Neurolinguistic Evaluation System (NES): A computer-based tool for single-case therapy research. *Aphasiology*, *14*, 291-310.
- Coll, P.P. (1989). Depression associated with a stroke. *The Journal of Family Practice*, *28*(2), 153-155.
- Dworkin, J.P, Abkarian, G.G., Johns, D.F. (1988). Apraxia of speech-The effectiveness of a treatment regimen. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, *53*, 280-294.
- Fisk, G.D., Owsley, C., Mennemeier, M. (2002). Vision, attention, and self-reported driving behaviors in community-dwelling stroke survivors. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, *83*, 469-477.
- Fortney, J.C., Booth, B.M., Smith, G.R. (1996). Variation among VA hospitals in length of stay for treatment of depression. *Psychiatric Services*, *47*(6), 608-613.
- Gao, B., Jiang, S., Wang, X., Chen, J. (2000). The role of pre-injury IQ in the determination of intellectual impairment from traumatic head injury. *Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience*, *12*(3), 385-388.
- Greasley, P., Sherrard, C., & Waterman, M. (2000). Emotion in language and speech: methodological issues in naturalistic approaches. *Language and Speech*, *43*(4), 355-375.
- Grodzinsky, Y., Piñango, M.M., Zurif, E., & Drai, D. (1999). The critical role of group studies in neuropsychology: Comprehension regularities in Broca's Aphasia. *Brain and Language*, *67*, 134-147.
- Haggard, P., Cockburn, J., Cock, J., Fordham, C., Wade, D. (2000). Interference between gait and cognitive tasks in the rehabilitating neurological population. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, *69*, 479-486.

- Hammill, D.D., Bryant, B.R., Brown, L., Marten, A. (1989). How replicable is current LD research-A follow-up to the CLD research committees' recommendations. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 12, 174-179.
- Herrmann, M. (1997). Studying psychosocial problems in aphasia: Some conceptual and methodological considerations. *Aphasiology*, 11, 717-725.
- Hogan, A.M., Kirkham, F.J., Isaacs, E.B. (2000). Intelligence after stroke in childhood: Review of the literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Child Neurology*, 15(5), 325-332.
- Le Dorze, G. & Bedard, C. (1998). Effects of age and education on the lexico-semantic content of connected speech in adults. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 31, 53-71.
- Lubinski, R., Moscato, B.S., Willer, B.S. (1997). Prevalence of speaking and hearing disabilities among adults with traumatic brain injury from a national household survey. *Brain Injury*, 11(2), 103-114.
- Mahendra, N., Bayles, K.A., & Harris, F.P. (2005). Effect of presentation modality on immediate and delayed recall in individuals with Alzheimer's disease. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 14, 144-155.
- McCauley, R.J; Demetras, M.J. (1990). The identification of language impairment in the selection of specifically language-impaired subjects. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 55, 468-475.
- McNeil, M.R.; Pratt, S.R. (2001). Defining aphasia: Some theoretical and clinical implications of operating from a formal definition. *Aphasiology*, 15, 901-911.
- Michaelson, S., Rose, J.T., May, A.E. (1967). Controlling for experimenter effect in the psychometric assessment of brain damage. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 40(4), 371-374.
- Miller, E.N., Selnes, O.A., Satz, P. (1994). Methods of controlling for demographic differences in neuropsychological studies of HIV infection. *AIDS*, 8(2), 280-281.
- Murray, L.L. (1999). Review: Attention and aphasia: Theory, research, and clinical implications. *Aphasiology*, 13(2), 91-111.
- Murray, L.L., & Ramage, A.E. (2000). Assessing the executive function ability of adults with neurogenic communication disorders. *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 21(1), 153-168.

- Myers, P.S. & Brookshire, R.H. (1996). Effect of visual and inferential variables on scene descriptions by right-hemisphere-damaged, and non-brain-damaged adults. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 39, 870-880.
- Nicholas, L E, MacLennan, D. L., & Brookshire, R.H. (1986). Validity of multiple-sentence reading comprehension tests for aphasic adults. *The Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 51, 82-87.
- Obler, L.K., Goral, M., Albert, M.L. (1995). Variability in aphasia research: Aphasia subject selection in group studies. *Brain and Language*, 48, 341-350.
- Oliveri, M., Rossini, P.M., Cicinelli, P., Traversa, R., Pasqualetti, P., Filippi, M.M., Caltagirone, C. (2000). Neurophysiological evaluation of tactile space perception deficits through transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Brain Research Protocols*, 5, 25-29.
- Osborne F, Hickin J, Best W, Howard D. (1998). Treating word-finding difficulties--beyond picture naming. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 33, 208-213.
- Parker, Randall M. (1990). Power, control, and validity in research. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 23, 613-620.
- Parker, Randall M. (1993). Threats to the validity of research. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 36, 130-138.
- Pineda, D.A., Rosselli, M., Ardila, A., Mejia, S.E., Romero, M.G., Perez, C. (2000). The Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination-Spanish Version: The influence of demographic variables. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 6, 802-814.
- Purdy, M. (2002). Executive function ability in persons with aphasia. *Aphasiology*, 16(4/5/6), 549-557.
- Ramsberger, G., & Rende, B. (2002). Measuring transactional success in the conversation of people with aphasia. *Aphasiology*, 16(3), 337-353.
- Randolph, Lansing, Ivnik, Collum, & Hermann, 1999.
- Reitan, R.M. & Wolfson, D. (1997). The influence of age and education on neuropsychological performances of persons with mild head injuries. *Applied Neuropsychology*, 4(1), 16-33.
- Roberts, P.M. (1998a). Clinical research needs and issues in bilingual aphasia. *Aphasiology*, 12, 119-130.

- Roberts, P.M. (1998b). Reply-Bilingual aphasia: some answers and more questions. *Aphasiology*, 12, 141-146.
- Roberts, P.M., Code, C., & McNeil, M.R. (2003). Describing participants in aphasia research: Part 1: Audit of current practice. *Aphasiology*, 17, 911- 932.
- Robey, R.R., Schultz, M.C., Crawford, A.B., & Sinner, C.A. (1999). Review: Single-subject clinical outcome research: Design, data effect sizes, and analyses. *Aphasiology*, 13(6), 445-473.
- Roselli, M., Ardila, A., Florez, A., & Castro, C. (1990). Normative data on the Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination in a Spanish-speaking population. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 12(2), 313-322.
- Rosenberg, C.R., Pasternack, B.S., Shore, R.E., Koenig, K.L., & Toniolo, P.G. (1994). Premenopausal estradiol levels and the risk of breast cancer: A new method of controlling for day of the menstrual cycle. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 140(6), 518-525.
- Ross, K.B., & Wertz, R.T. (2001). Possible demographic influences on differentiating normal from aphasic performance. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 1-2, 115.
- Ross, K.B., & Wertz, R.T. (2003). Discriminative validity of selected measures for differentiating normal from aphasic performance. *Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 12, 312-319.
- Rust, J.O., Barnard, D., & Oster, G.D. (1979). WAIS verbal performance differences among elderly when controlling for fatigue. *Psychological Reports*, 44, 489-490.
- Sandberg, O., Franklin, K.A., Bucht, G., & Gustafson, Y. (2001), Sleep apnea, delirium, depressed mood, cognition, and ADL ability after stroke. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 49(4), 391-397.
- Sander, A., Nakase-Richardson, R., Consantinidou, F., Wertheimer, J, & Paul, D.R. (2007) Memory assessment on an interdisciplinary rehabilitation team: A theoretically based framework. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 16, 316-330.
- Schiavetti, N. (2002). *Evaluating research in communicative disorders*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Schmitt, J.F. & Meline, T. J. (1990). Subject descriptions, control groups, and research designs in published studies of language-impaired children. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 23, 365-382.

- Seguin, J.R., Boulerice, B., Harden, P.W., Tremblay, R.E., & Pihl, R.O. (1999). Executive functions and physical aggression after controlling for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, general memory, and IQ. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 40(8), 1197-1208.
- Sherrill-Pattison, S., Donders, J., & Thompson, E. (2000). Influence of demographic variables on neuropsychological test performance after traumatic brain injury. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 14(4), 496-503.
- Silverman, F.H. (1998) *Research design and evaluation in speech-language pathology and audiology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ska, B. & Joannette, Y. (1996). Discourse in older adults: Influence of text, task, and participant characteristics. *Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology*, 20(2), 101-107.
- Skenes, L.L. & McCauley, R.J. (1985). Psychometric review of nine aphasia tests. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 18, 461-474.
- Song, J.Y., Merskey, H., Noh, S., & Sullivan, S. (1993). The effect of controlling for anxiety and depression upon the threshold for pressure pain in three comparison groups. *Journal of Musculoskeletal Pain*, 1(1), 73-87.
- Swinney, D. & Zurif, E. (1995). Syntactic processing in aphasia. *Brain and Language*, 50, 225-239.
- Taylor and Francis Group (2007). Instructions for Authors – Aphasiology. Available online: <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/authors/paphauth.asp>
- Tesak, J. (1992). Factors influencing surface manifestations of agrammatism. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 7(1/2), 91-101.
- Tompkins, C.A., Jackson, S.T., & Schulz, R. (1990). On prognostic research in adult neurologic disorders. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 33, 398-401.
- Wallschlaeger, M. & Hendricks, B. (1997). Gender differences in phonetic processing. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, Social*, 16(2), 155-166.
- Wertz, R.T. (1991). Aphasiology 1990- A view from the colonies. *Aphasiology*, 5, 311-322.
- Wickstrom, S., Goldstein, H., & Johnson, L. (1985). On the subject of subjects-suggestions for describing subjects in language intervention studies. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*. 50(3) 282-286.

Wolery, M., & Ezell, H.K. (1993) Subject descriptions and single-subject research.
Journal of Learning Disabilities, 26, 642.

Yiu, EML. (1992) Linguistic assessment of Chinese-speaking aphasics- development of a
Cantonese aphasia battery. *Journal of Neurolinguistics, 7*, 379-424.

Table 1. Journals included in the study

- *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*
- *Annals of Neurology*
- *Aphasiology*
- *Archives of Neurology*
- *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*
- *Brain and Cognition*
- *Brain and Language*
- *British Journal of Disorders of Communication*
- *Clinical Aphasiology*
- *Cognitive Neuropsychology*
- *Cortex*
- *Disability and Rehabilitation*
- *European Journal of Rehabilitation Research*
- *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*
- *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*
- *Journal of Communication Disorders*
- *Journal of Head Trauma and Rehabilitation*
- *Journal of International Neuropsychological Society*
- *Journal of Medical Speech Language Pathology*
- *Journal of Neurolinguistics*
- *Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development*
- *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research and Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*
- *Language and Cognitive Processes*
- *Neurology*
- *Neuropsychologia*
- *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*
- *Neuroradiology*
- *Neuroreport*
- *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*
- *Perceptual and Motor Skills*
- *Psychological Review*
- *Psychophysiology*

Table 2. Participant description/control characteristics tracked

- Severity of overall communication impairment
- Severity by modality
 - Auditory Comprehension
 - Oral expression
 - Reading
 - Writing
 - Gesturing
 - Conversational ability
- Motor functioning
 - Dysarthria
 - Apraxia of speech
 - Limb apraxia
 - Paralysis/Paresis
 - Alertness or attention
- Psychological/Psychiatric status
- Memory
- Intelligence/IQ/mental status
- Premorbid intelligence/IQ/ communication disorder
- Premorbid learning disability
- Educational History
- Vision
 - History of illness affecting vision
 - History of visual problems
 - Wearing of glasses or contact lenses
 - Visual discomfort
 - Observation of symmetry, lesions, eye swelling, & drainage
 - Central visual acuity: near
 - Central visual acuity: far
 - Visual field cuts/deficit
 - Visual attention deficits
 - Central visual fields
 - Peripheral visual fields
 - Consensual constriction
 - Near constriction of pupils
 - Pupil size
 - Strabismus testing
 - Pupillary constriction
 - Oculomotor apraxia
 - Nystagmus
 - Latent nystagmus
 - Color vision
- Hearing
 - History of hearing problems
 - Use of hearing aids
 - Pure tone screening

Table 2, continued

- Pure tone full evaluation
- Speech discrimination testing
- Auditory brainstem response testing
- Auditory processing
- Evoked response testing (e.g., MMN, N400, P300, P600)
- Central auditory testing
- Tympanometry
- Age
- Health/medical status
 - Medications
 - Seizures
 - Smoking
 - Drinking
 - Obesity
 - Diabetes
 - Hypertension
 - “Signs of aging”
- Gender
- Handedness
- Ethnic and/or racial group
- Native speaker, bilingual and/or multilingual status
- For articles on aphasia, description of type of aphasia
 - Posterior/Anterior
 - Cortical/Subcortical
 - Fluent/Nonfluent
 - Classical
- For articles on aphasia, definition of aphasia
- Etiology/cause
 - Site of lesion
 - Means of determining site of lesion/imaging information
 - Number of strokes and/or lesions and/or Number of brain injury incidents
- Time post-onset
- Previous treatment for speech and language
 - Duration and frequency
 - Time of treatment
 - Previous treatment goals
 - Previous treatment methods
- Personality and mood factors
- Socioeconomic status
- Occupation
- Living environment
- Social support
- Geographic region
- Source of recruitment
- Number of participants
- Payment of participants