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Background and Significance
- The most common cause of aphasia is stroke; about 25-40% of stroke survivors acquire aphasia (National Aphasia Association, 2018).
- Aphasia is an impairment of language including reading, writing, speaking, and listening (Stroke Center, 2018).
- Aphasia is associated with significant life-altering psychosocial consequences including poor vocational outcomes, changes in relationships, and social isolation (Worrall et al., 2011).
- The prevalence of depression after stroke is approximately 31% in persons with aphasia (Worrall et al., 2016).
- Traditional aphasia therapy models lack the therapeutic intensity and holistic intervention approach that Intensive Comprehensive Aphasia Programs (ICAP) provide (Rose, Worrall, and Cherney, 2013).

Intensive Comprehensive Aphasia Programs (ICAPS)
- ICAPS integrate individual and group therapy, current technologies, and both patient and family caregiver wellness and education (Babbitt, Worrall, and Cherney, 2015).
- Holistic treatment targets impairment, activity and participation domains of the WHO-IFC model relative to language and functional communication (Babbitt et al., 2015).
- Minimum of 3 hours of therapy a day for 2 weeks (Rose et al., 2013).
- Must include individual and group treatment (Rose et al., 2013).
- Include a cohort of participants that start and stop at the same time (Rose et al., 2013).

University of Montana ICAP
- Pre- and post-treatment assessment of language and psychosocial well-being.
- Treatment Intensity varies across sessions (see table).
- Treatment Delivery: individualized, evidence-based treatment, conversation groups, weekly large group, weekly community outings.

Purpose
To examine language impairment and psychosocial outcomes of persons with aphasia following participation in an ICAP.

Research Question
Are there significant positive changes in pre/post scores on measures of language impairment and psychosocial well-being following participation in the UM ICAP?

Approach
Participants: 37 persons with aphasia (PWA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Time post-onset</th>
<th>Years of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 female</td>
<td>19-80 years old</td>
<td>2-280 months post-onset of stroke</td>
<td>Highschool graduate - Doctoral Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICAP Session | Hours Per Day | Days Per Week | # of Weeks | # Hours of Treatment | Treatment Intensity Ratio |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2017A</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2017B</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICAP Language Outcome Measures
1. Western Aphasia Battery-Revised, part 1 (WAB-R; Kertesz, 2006).

ICAP Psychosocial Outcome Measures
1. Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS; Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986).
2. Assessment of Living with Aphasia, second edition (ALA; Kagan et al., 2010).

Results and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Pre-ICAP</th>
<th>SD Pre-ICAP</th>
<th>Mean Post-ICAP</th>
<th>SD Post-ICAP</th>
<th>Paired Sample t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>t=1.01; p=.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>t=3.04; p=.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAB-R</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47.52</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>52.58</td>
<td>26.94</td>
<td>t=4.388; p=.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>20.07</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>21.13</td>
<td>t=3.225; p=.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language Impairment Outcomes
- Significant improvement of language (WAB-R)
- Significant improvement of word retrieval (BNT)

Psychosocial Well-Being Outcomes
- Significant reduction of depression
- No significant change in overall aphasia-related quality of life

Implications
- Retrospective analysis of outcome measures across UM ICAP sessions suggests that the therapeutic intensity and holistic intervention approach offered by the UM ICAPs are beneficial to improving quality of life and communicative rehabilitation for stroke survivors with aphasia.
- The ALA may not be sensitive enough to detect changes in aphasia-related quality of life given the short period of time between assessments; consider re-administering ALA one month and six months post ICAP to look at long term impact of ICAP on quality of life.
- Future service delivery models should consider the ICAP’s multifaceted approach as well as ways to better support PWA autonomy and sense of respect and dignity throughout therapy.