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# EXTENDED/DETAILED VERSION

**Pragmatic Language**

Pragmatic language can be defined as, “the ability to go beyond the literal words uttered and draw on our knowledge and experiences to construct meaning” (Norbury, 2014). Lavi (2016) further expands on this definition and describes pragmatics as, “language that binds together semantics, morphology, syntax, and overall language comprehension and oral expression to make effective communication occur.” It is the final element needed for appropriate and effective interaction to take place. (2016).

To assess XxXx’s communication skills in the realm of pragmatics, both standardized and non-standardized measures were used. Standardized measures used include the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and the Clinical Assessment of Pragmatics (CAPs). Additionally, the Contextualized Assessment of Pragmatics Skills Checklist and \_\_\_\_\_\_ were used to acquire a language sample and further examine theory of mind, communication style, reciprocity, and eye gaze via non-standardized means. Please see below for XxXx’s performance across standardized and non-standardized measures.

In preforming a comprehensive language assessment, Bloom & Lahey (1978) argue that form (syntax), content (semantics), and use (pragmatics) should be examined, both expressively and receptively. To assess pragmatics holistically as Bloom & Lahey suggest, the Clinical Assessment of Pragmatics (CAPs) was used.

***Clinical Assessment of Pragmatics (CAPs)***

The CAPs is a norm-referenced video-based pragmatic language battery of tests for children and young adults ages 7 through 18 years old. It is composed of six subtests that fall under two domains: pragmatic judgement and pragmatic performance.

The child’s Pragmatic Judgement and Pragmatic Performance are assessed via the use of six well-defined language constructs. The Pragmatic Judgement tasks include the following: 1) instrumental performance appraisal, 2) social context appraisal, and 3) paralinguistic decoding. The Pragmatic Performance tasks include: 1) instrumental performance, 2) affective expression, and 3) paralinguistic signals. Pragmatic Judgement is considered equivalent to receptive pragmatics. It is measured by the student’s ability to adequately understand and use appropriate language. This requires the student to form appropriate social language responses, such as saying the appropriate response at the right time in a given social context (Ryder et al., 2014; Simmons et al., 2014) This can mean identifying correct and incorrect responses in a social context. Additionally, this can entail verbally providing appropriate responses in a given situation. Pragmatic Performance, on the other hand, is defined as congruent to an individual’s expressive pragmatic skills. This can be measured through the responses given in social situations. Components analyzed in a child’s response include answers to questions/statements and responses to expressed emotions in video-based scenarios.

In order to investigate specific aspects of XxXx’s pragmatic language comprehension and usage, the full battery of the CAPs was administered with the following results:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subtest and Index Performance | Raw  Score | %ile  Rank | Scaled  Score |
| Instrumental Performance Appraisal (Awareness of Basic Social Routines) | 8 | 9 | 6 |
| Social Context Appraisal (Reading Context Cues) | 10 | 2 | 4 |
| Paralinguistic Decoding (Reading Nonverbal Cues) | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| Instrumental Performance (Using Social Routine Language) | 6 | 16 | 7 |
| Affective Expression (Expressing Emotions) | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Paralinguistic Signals (Using Nonverbal Cues) | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Total of Scaled Scores | | | 27 |
| CORE PRAGMATIC LANGUAGE COMPOSITE | | | **64** |
| Pragmatic Judgement Index | | | **77** |
| Pragmatic Performance Index | | | **74** |
| Paralinguistic Index | | | **74** |

Instrumental Performance Appraisal (Awareness of Basic Social Routines)

This subtest measures awareness of basic social routines and the ability to judge their appropriateness. This includes the ability to judge appropriateness of introductions, politeness, making requests, requesting help, answering phone calls, asking for permission, identifying rude tone of requests, identifying polite language, understanding when interruptions are appropriate, and understanding rules of conversational turn-taking. XxXx performed in the **below average** range on this subtest. XxXx demonstrated the ability to analyze social situations in videos and determine whether the individuals were demonstrating appropriate conversational turn-taking, polite introductions and requests, etc. or whether rudeness, impolite language, or poor conversational turn-taking was occurring. XxXx exhibited the ability to determine if anything went wrong by saying, “yes” or “no”. Additionally, he was able to identify and communicate what went wrong frequently. For example, XxXx was provided with the following scenario:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Examples of Video based Social Situations*** | ***Comments regarding Student’s Performance*** |
| **Narration: Jane is at a restaurant with her family. She finished her drink and is still very thirsty. The waitress finally comes by.** Waitress: *Would you like some more water?* Jane: *I’m very thirsty! Hurry!*  **Narration: It is Tom’s first day at summer school. All the new students are meeting in front of the classroom. A girl comes up to Tom.**Jane: *Hi, my name is Jane.* Tom: *Do you know what time lunch is? What are we having for lunch today?* | XxXx was asked: Did anything go wrong? XxXx responded, “yes,” which prompted the SLP to ask, “What went wrong?” XxXx responded: “Jane was rude.” XxXx’s response received a 2/2 for saying, “yes” followed by referring to the actress’ impoliteness.  XxXx was asked, “Did anything go wrong,” which XxXx responded, “yes.” This prompted the SLP to ask, “What went wrong.” XxXx responded: “Yes, Tom did not say the right thing.” This response is incorrect because XxXx does not refer to the actor’s off-topic response. In total, XxXx received 1/2 for identifying that something went wrong, but not providing a correct rationale. |

With a scaled score of 6 and percentile rank of 9, XxXx’s performance on this subtest was in the **below average** range.

Social Context Appraisal (Reading Context Cues)

This subtest measures awareness of social context cues and the ability to understand the intent of others and infer what others are thinking (perspective thinking). This also includes detecting non-verbal cues, understanding of indirectly implied requests and/or statements (e.g. idioms, expressions), making appropriate inferences (e.g. sarcasm) and making judgements about social context when situational cues change. XxXx presented with **poor** performance on this subtest. He demonstrated difficulty with perspective taking (theory of mind). Across several tasks, he was noted with difficulty in providing a rationale for what went wrong in a situation in which sarcasm or irony was used. For example, XxXx was provided the following scenario:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Examples of Video based Social Situations*** | ***Comments regarding Student’s Performance*** |
| **Narration: It is the first day of school. Tom and Cindy are standing next to each other.**Cindy: *Do you know that the teacher likes to be called Mr. Know-it-all? I heard he always gives students A’s who call him that. You should call him that*. Tom: *Really? Okay.* Tom sees his teacher walk by and says: *Mr. Know-it-all, when is our homework due?* Teacher*: What did you just call me?* | XxXx was asked: “Did anything go wrong?” XxXx responded, “no,” which prompted the SLP to ask, “Why do you think it went well?” XxXx responded, “The boy called his teacher by his first name.” This response received a score of 0 because XxXx was not able to detect the direct problem or describe the sarcasm used. |

XxXx obtained a scaled score of 4 and a percentile rank of 2 which is rated to be **poor.**

Paralinguistic Decoding (Reading Nonverbal Cues)

This subtest measures the ability to detect a speaker’s intent by recognizing meanings of various non-verbal cues, such as facial expressions, tone of voice, inflections in prosody, gestures, and overall body language.

XxXx exhibited **poor** paralinguistic decoding skills. Understanding facial expressions, tone of voice, inflections in prosody, gestures, and overall body language was noted to be difficult for XxXx across all tasks presented to him. XxXx provided rationales that were either incorrect or vague in nature. For example, he was presented with the following narrative:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Examples of Video based Social Situations*** | ***Comments regarding Student’s Performance*** |
| **Narration: Tom just got an F on his exam: Tom: Nervous—looking around- pumping fists.** Tom’s sister: *Hey! What’s wrong?* Tom: *Nothing!* Biting lip-rocking back and forth-pumping fists. Tom’s sister (sad and confused): *Okay.* | XxXx was sked if anything went wrong, which XxXx responded, “yes.” This prompted the SLP to ask, “What went wrong, and how do you know it?” XxXx did not describe the situation and said: “The girl was upset with Tom.” This response received a score of 1 out of 3 because XxXx was not able to detect the direct problem of the situation and was not able to identify rudeness/deceit. He did not refer to the actors’ facial expressions/tone of voice. |

With a scaled score of 6 and percentile rank of 9, XxXx’s performance on this subtest was rated to be **poor**.

Instrumental Performance (Using Social Routine Language)

This subtest measures language skills that are necessary to satisfy an individual’s basic needs to express communicative intent that is instrumental in nature. This includes the ability to use social routine language, such as expressing greetings, introductions, politeness, making requests, responding to gratitude, requesting help, requesting information (e.g. directions), and asking for permission. Using Social Routine Language is noted to be a strength of XxXx’s. He performed in the below average range on this subtest and was able to provide appropriate responses to specific social situations. For example, XxXx was presented with the following situation:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Examples of Video based Social Situations*** | ***Comments regarding Student’s Performance*** |
| ***“Molly and Ambar are at the park and run into Ambar’s cousin. Molly has never met Ambar’s cousin before.”***  ***“It’s the first meeting of the swim club. A girl comes up to Mark and says, “Hi, I’m Ellie.”*** | XxXx was asked, “What should Molly say, and how should she say it.” XxXx responded, “Hi! This is my cousin, and this is my friend, Molly.” XxXx received a score of 2 out of 2 for expressing an appropriate introduction with supporting statements.  XxXx was asked, “What should Mark say, and how should he say it?” XxXx responded, “Hi, I’m Mark.”  This response received a score of 1 out of 2 because despite expressing an introduction appropriately, no supportive statements were given. |

XxXx obtained a scaled score of 7 and a percentile rank of 16 which is in the **below average** range**.**

Affective Expression (Expressing Emotions)

This subtest measures the ability to appropriately express higher order pragmatic language that is emotive in nature, such as regret, sorrow, peer support, praise, empathy, gratitude, encouragement, etc. XxXx exhibited difficulty in expressing regret, support, empathy, etc. These higher order pragmatic language tasks were evaluated across several tasks, and XxXx exhibited significant difficulties in providing appropriate emotive responses. For example, XxXx was provided with the following scenario:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Examples of Video based Social Situations*** | ***Comments regarding Student’s Performance*** |
| ***“It is Sara’s driving test today. She is really nervous.”***  ***“Maria’s new puppy is lost. She printed out missing flyers. She is sad.”*** | XxXx was asked, “Show me, what would you tell your friend and how?” While XxXx provided an appropriate response, which was, “that’s okay. It’s okay to be nervous,” however no affect was present and prosody was noted to be flat.  XxXx was asked, “Show me, what would you tell your friend and how?” XxXx responded, “Get a new puppy.” XxXx’s response lacked empathy and affect, and was characterized by monotone prosody. |

XxXx obtained a scaled score of 3 and a percentile rank of 1 which is in the **deficient** range**.**

Paralinguistic Signals (Using Nonverbal Cues)

This subtest measures the ability to use various non-verbal cues, such as facial expressions, tone of voice, inflections in prosody, gestures, and overall body language to express various communicative intents. XxXx was noted to struggle with this task. Overall, his responses were characterized by diminished gestures, raised inflections at the end of statements, and flat affect. For example, XxXx was presented with the following scenario:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Examples of Video based Social Situations*** | ***Comments regarding Student’s Performance*** |
| ***“You and your friends are running late for a biology test. You are very nervous about this test. Your friends are all behind you walking slowly and chatting with each other.”***  ***“Jane’s laptop broke down, and she needs to finish her class paper today. She is very upset.”*** | XxXx was asked, “Show me, what would you tell your friends and how?” XxXx responded, “Walk faster” with a flat affect and monotone tone of voice. This response received a score of zero.  XxXx was asked, “Show me, what would you tell your friends and how?” XxXx responded, “*You need to charge it*” exhibiting a flat affect, limited inflections in prosody and limited eye brow movement. |

Overall, XxXx is currently performing at below the 1st percentile for using non-verbal cues and presents with **severe deficits** in this area.

Pragmatic Judgement Index denotes the examinee’s ability to correctly detect, comprehend, and interpret contextualized social cues (i.e. interpret others’ intent and infer what others are thinking (perspective taking). This also includes the comprehension of indirectly implied requests and/or statements and drawing appropriate inferences and judgements about social context when situational cues vary, such as conversational adaptation. Additionally, the Pragmatic Judgement Index measures awareness of basic social routines and the ability to judge their appropriateness. Examinees who do well on the Pragmatic Judgement Index are aware of the dynamic nature of social situations and adapt easily to an interlocutor’s change in topics, transitions, and use of ambiguous language. Examinees who score poorly in this area exhibit rigidity in their understanding of the fluidity of social situations and display difficulty when uncertainty/variability is likely, making engagement in successful reciprocal communication at school challenging.  **With a composite score of 77 and percentile rank of 6, XxXx’s overall performance in this domain was rated to be poor.**

The Pragmatic Performance Index highlights the examinee’s ability to adequately express natural instrumental communication intent (social routine language, such as expressing farewells, introductions, politeness, making requests, and responding to gratitude), as well as emotions or higher order language, such as regret, sorrow, peer support, compliments, humor, empathy, and, encouragement.  Examinees who do well on the Pragmatic Performance Index exhibit an ability to adequately express cognitive empathy verbally. Examinees who score poorly in this area struggle with using socially acceptable greetings and expressing elaborate sentiments, reducing their ability to follow expected social routines in school and communicate their feelings throughout the day. **With a composite score of 74 and percentile rank of 4, XxXx’s overall performance in this domain was rated to be poor.**

Paralinguistic Index represents the examinees’ use of non-verbal communication, such as prosody, gestures, and facial expressions. Examinees who do well on the Paralinguistic Index domain demonstrate an excellent ability to decode facial expressions (such as boredom, anger, rudeness, etc.), detect when the listener is not understanding, read inflections in prosody (such as questions, sadness, sorrow, empathy, etc.) and interpret tone of voice (such as sarcasm, deceit, anger, etc.). Expressively, examinees who do well in this area demonstrate appropriate and genuine use of facial expressions (e.g., raised eyebrows when surprised, pleased; frowned eyebrows when expressing empathy, frustration, sorrow, anger), use of inflections in prosody to express a variety of types of communication intent, such as empathy, excitement, pleasure, and sorrow. Examinees who score poorly exhibit reduced use of facial expressions (e.g. flat affect, and little or no movement of the eyebrows when surprised or expressing empathy, frustration, sorrow, or anger), inappropriate use of inflection in prosody across various types of communicative intent; all of these difficulties may result in breakdowns during reciprocal communication at school. **XxXx presented with significant difficulties in this area. He obtained a composite score of 74 and a percentile rank of 4 which is rated to be poor.**

***Conversational Adaptation Checklist***

Non-standardized assessments are critical in the assessment of a child’s speech and language abilities, as they provide qualitative insight into an SLPs observations of a child. It allows for a hologram of a child’s performance to be constructed by adding detailed information without using percentile rankings. The following are informal observations made regarding each pragmatic language area using the Conversational Adaptation Checklist:

Across tasks assessing XxXx’s awareness of basic social routines, XxXx consistently exhibited the ability to understand when interruptions were or weren’t appropriate, understand appropriate turn-taking, identify impolite requests, and identify polite language. This means-to-end and instrumental in nature component of pragmatics is one of XxXx’s strengths. He demonstrates the ability to clearly distinguish what is and what is not appropriate basic social routine language and can frequently express this when asked.XxXx was able to use social routine language, such as social greetings, interrupting appropriately, requesting for permission, etc. These types of tasks do not analyze paralinguistics or any components of higher-level language. Rather, it assesses insrumental language or the basic language used in social routines. XxXx was able to greet appropriately, interrupt, and ask for permission despite difficulty with inflection, prosody, and other higher-order language skills.

XxXx presented with difficulty with social context appraisal tasks. While he understood some idioms, XxXx demonstrated difficulty in comprehending sarcasm, humor, perspective taking, and identifying the emotions and viewpoints of others. Despite XxXx being able to identify when something went wrong, he often was unable to identify **what** went wrong. This is likely due to Social Context Appraisal being a non-instrumental task in which the student must consider higher-level emotive language and determine the meaning behind the actor’s sarcasm, humor, and affective presentations. Affective Expression tasks evaluate a student’s ability to express emotions adequately, negotiate to achieve compromise, and demonstrate conversational adaptation. In this task, XxXx was noted to struggle. Prosody and affect were noted to be absent. As the interlocutor, it was difficult to decipher XxXx’s intent owing to lack of emotive presence. While means-end language was noted to be adequate, XxXx was unable to convey sarcasm, achieve compromise, or demonstration adaption to situations.

In the area of paralinguistics (understanding of and use of nonverbal language), XxXx was noted with difficulty decoding facial expressions, such as anger, happiness, and surprise. In this portion of the assessment, XxXx was asked to critically analyze the components of language that do not include instrumental language, but rather, the higher-order component of communication used to convey emotions/feelings. XxXx was noted to struggle reading inflections, such as questions, sadness, sorrow, and empathy. He had great difficulty detecting sarcasm, as evidenced by his response of, “I don’t know” when asked what went wrong. XxXx’s poor performance on this task is likely due to it being a higher-level language task in which nonverbal is assessed. Further, XxXx presented with significant difficulties on tasks that assessed non-verbal cues, such as the use of genuine facial expressions, the use of appropriate tone of voice when expressing sarcasm, empathy, humor, etc., the demonstration of appropriate eye-contact and gaze, etc. He was noted with flat affect, limited eyebrow raising, no narrowing of the eyes, monotone tone of voice, and rising intonation while making statements. Additionally, he exhibited difficulty maintaining an adequate dB level while speaking and would often raise his voice in inappropriate situations.

***Pragmatic Language Summary***

An examination of XxXx’s pragmatic performance revealed his **greatest strengths to be on instrumental tasks**, which are awareness of basic social routines and use of social routine language. Performing well on these tasks demonstrates XxXx’s ability to decide whether greetings, requests, conversational turn-taking, etc. are appropriate or not, as well as demonstrates his ability to perform means-to-end tasks with appropriate language. Despite these strengths, **weaknesses were noted in the areas of non-instrumental tasks (social context appraisal and affective expression) and paralinguistic cohesion tasks (paralinguistic decoding and paralinguistic signals).** Non-instrumental tasks are considered higher order language tasks that require higher-level thought processing. Paralinguistic cohesion is both the ability to detect a speaker’s intent and express a variety of intent with the help of non-verbal signals, such as facial expressions, tone of voice, inflections in prosody, gestures, and overall body language. When asked to perform tasks that are not instrumental in nature, but rather, higher-level language use, XxXx was unable to perform at the level of typically developing peers.

# Shortened VERSION

The CAPs is a norm-referenced video-based pragmatic language battery of tests for children and young adults ages 7 through 18 years old. It is composed of six subtests that fall under two domains: pragmatic judgement and pragmatic performance.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subtest and Index Performance | Raw  Score | %ile  Rank | Scaled  Score |
| Instrumental Performance Appraisal (Awareness of Basic Social Routines) | 8 | 9 | 6 |
| Social Context Appraisal (Reading Context Cues) | 10 | 2 | 4 |
| Paralinguistic Decoding (Reading Nonverbal Cues) | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| Instrumental Performance (Using Social Routine Language) | 6 | 16 | 7 |
| Affective Expression (Expressing Emotions) | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Paralinguistic Signals (Using Nonverbal Cues) | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Total of Scaled Scores | | | 27 |
| CORE PRAGMATIC LANGUAGE COMPOSITE | | | **64** |
| Pragmatic Judgement Index | | | **77** |
| Pragmatic Performance Index | | | **74** |
| Paralinguistic Index | | | **74** |

In order to investigate specific aspects of XxXx’s pragmatic language comprehension and usage, the full battery of the CAPs was administered with the following results.

Awareness of Basic Social Routines

This subtest measures awareness of basic social routines and the ability to judge their appropriateness. XxXx demonstrated the ability to analyze social situations in videos and determine whether the individuals were demonstrating appropriate conversational turn-taking, polite introductions and requests, etc. or whether rudeness, impolite language, or poor conversational turn-taking was occurring. XxXx exhibited the ability to determine if anything went wrong by saying, “yes” or “no”. With a scaled score of 6 and percentile rank of 9, XxXx’s performance on this subtest was in the **below average** range.

Reading Context Cues

This subtest measures awareness of social context cues and the ability to understand the intent of others and infer what others are thinking (perspective thinking). This also includes detecting non-verbal cues, understanding of indirectly implied requests and/or statements (e.g. idioms, expressions), making appropriate inferences (e.g. sarcasm) and making judgements about social context when situational cues change. XxXx obtained a scaled score of 4 and a percentile rank of 2 which is rated to be **poor.**

Reading Nonverbal Cues (e.g., Reading Faces)

This subtest measures the ability to detect a speaker’s intent by recognizing meanings of various non-verbal cues, such as facial expressions, tone of voice, inflections in prosody, gestures, and overall body language. Understanding facial expressions, tone of voice, inflections in prosody, gestures, and overall body language was noted to be difficult for XxXx across all tasks presented to him. XxXx provided rationales that were either incorrect or vague in nature. With a scaled score of 6 and percentile rank of 9, XxXx’s performance on this subtest was rated to be **poor**.

Using Social Routine Language

This subtest measures language skills that are necessary to satisfy an individual’s basic needs to express communicative intent. This includes the ability to use social routine language, such as expressing greetings, introductions, politeness, making requests, responding to gratitude, requesting help, requesting information (e.g. directions), and asking for permission. Using Social Routine Language is noted to be a strength of XxXx’s. He performed in the below average range on this subtest and was able to provide appropriate responses to specific social situations. XxXx obtained a scaled score of 7 and a percentile rank of 16 which is in the **below average** range**.**

Expressing Emotions

This subtest measures the ability to appropriately express higher order pragmatic language that is emotive in nature, such as regret, sorrow, peer support, praise, empathy, gratitude, encouragement, etc. XxXx exhibited difficulty in expressing regret, support, empathy, etc. XxXx obtained a scaled score of 3 and a percentile rank of 1 which is in the **deficient** range**.**

Using Nonverbal Cues

This subtest measures the ability to use various non-verbal cues, such as facial expressions, tone of voice, inflections in prosody, gestures, and overall body language. XxXx was noted to struggle with this task. Overall, his responses were characterized by diminished gestures, raised inflections at the end of statements, and flat affect. Overall, XxXx is currently performing at below the 1st percentile for using non-verbal cues and presents with **severe deficits** in this area.

# Contextualized Assessment of Pragmatic Skills Checklist

Non-standardized assessments are critical in the assessment of a child’s speech and language abilities, as they provide qualitative insight into an SLPs observations of a child. It allows for a hologram of a child’s performance to be constructed by adding detailed information without using percentile rankings. Please see below informal observations made using the video-based Contextualized Assessment of Pragmatics Skills Checklist (which required XxXx to watch a series of videos of various social situations, judge whether anything went wrong in the situations and provide responses to various social situational prompts):

***Instrumental Performance Appraisal (Awareness of Basic Social Routines)***

This domain measures awareness of basic social routines and the ability to judge their appropriateness. Across tasks assessing XxXx’s instrumental performance appraisal or awareness of basic social routines, XxXx consistently exhibited the ability to understand when interruptions were or weren’t appropriate, understand appropriate turn-taking, identify impolite requests, and identify polite language. This instrumental and means-end component of pragmatics is one of XxXx’s strengths. He demonstrates the ability to clearly distinguish what is and what is not appropriate instrumental language and can frequently express this when asked.

***Social Context Appraisal (Reading Context Cues)***

This domain measures awareness of social context cues and the ability to understand the intent of others and infer what others are thinking (perspective thinking). This also includes detecting non-verbal cues, understanding of indirectly implied requests and/or statements (e.g. idioms, expressions), making appropriate inferences (e.g. sarcasm) and making judgements about social context when situational cues change. XxXx presented with difficulty with social context appraisal tasks. While he understood some idioms, XxXx demonstrated difficulty in comprehending sarcasm, humor, difficulty in perspective taking, and identifying the emotions and viewpoints of others. Despite XxXx being able to identify when something went wrong, he often was unable to identify **what** went wrong. This is likely due to Social Context Appraisal being a non-instrumental task in which the student must consider higher-level emotive language and determine the meaning behind the actor’s sarcasm, humor, and affective presentations.

***Paralinguistic Decoding (Reading Non-verbal Cues)***

This domain measures the ability to detect a speaker’s intent by recognizing meanings of various non-verbal cues, such as facial expressions, tone of voice, inflections in prosody, gestures, and overall body language. XxXx was noted with difficulty decoding facial expressions, such as anger, happiness, and surprise. Additionally, he was noted to struggle reading inflections, such as questions, sadness, sorrow, and empathy. He had great difficulty detecting sarcasm, as evidenced by his response of, “I don’t know” when asked what went wrong. XxXx’s poor performance on this task is likely due to it being a higher-level language task in which the glue (paralinguistics) is assessed. In this portion of the assessment, XxXx was asked to critically analyze the components of language that do not include means-end language, but rather, the final component of communication used to convey emotions/feelings.

***Instrumental Performance (Using Social Routine Language)***

This subtest measures language skills that are necessary to satisfy an individual’s basic needs to express communicative intent that is instrumental in nature. This includes the ability to use social routine language, such as expressing greetings, introductions, politeness, making requests, etc. XxXx’s greatest strength was on Instrumental Performance. This task assessed XxXx’s ability to use social routine language, such as demonstrating appropriate social greetings, interrupting appropriately, requesting for permission, etc. This task does not analyze paralinguistics or any components of higher-level language. Rather, it assesses instrumental language or the basic language used in social routines. XxXx was able to greet appropriately, interrupt, and ask for permission despite difficulty with inflection, prosody, and other higher-order language skills. When asked simple and/or personally relevant questions, XxXx was able to maintain topic. However, expressing genuine interest in others' interests that aren't related to his own appeared to be a deficit area. Most of XxXx's observed interactions appeared to be instrumental in nature. XxXx engaged in what might appear to be reciprocal conversation, but the purpose of the conversation was instrumental.

***Affective Expression (Expressing Emotions)***

This domain measures the ability to appropriately express higher order pragmatic language that is emotive in nature, such as regret, sorrow, peer support, praise, empathy, gratitude, encouragement, etc. This task looks at a child’s ability to express emotions adequately, negotiate to achieve compromise, and demonstrate conversational adaptation. In this task, XxXx was noted to struggle. Prosody and affect were noted to be absent. As the interlocutor, it was difficult to decipher XxXx’s intent owing to lack of emotive presence. While instrumental language was noted to be adequate, XxXx was unable to convey sarcasm, achieve compromise, or demonstrate adaption to situations. Further, XxXx's ability to understand other people's perception of his verbal and nonverbal communicative acts was observed to be minimal. XxXx was observed to employ minimal repair strategies (i.e., repeat what he's said) in response to a confused look or non-response from his listener. He presented with limited understanding that his experience with himself differs from others' experience with him. This difficulty is likely due to impaired theory of mind; which is the ability to understand that other people have ideas and intentions that differ from our own.

***Paralinguistic Signals (Using Non-verbal Cues)***

This domain measures the ability to use various non-verbal cues, such as facial expressions, tone of voice, inflections in prosody, gestures, and overall body language to express various communicative intents. This task analyzes non-verbal cues, such as the use of genuine facial expressions, the use of appropriate tone of voice when expressing sarcasm, empathy, humor, etc., the demonstration of appropriate eye-contact and gaze, etc. XxXx demonstrated limited abilities across this area. He was noted with flat affect, limited eyebrow raising, no narrowing of the eyes, monotone tone of voice, and rising intonation while making statements. Additionally, he exhibited difficulty maintaining an adequate dB level while speaking and would often raise his voice in inappropriate situations.

SUGGESTED IEP GOALS

**Conversational Adaptation**

Will demonstrate ability to establish and maintain up to # turns on conversational topics of mutual interest

Will demonstrate ability to acknowledge his/her conversational partner’s interests by asking up to # relevant questions or making relevant comments

Will initiate and maintain (up to #) conversational turns around various topics outside of personal interest

Will demonstrate ability to interrupt conversations using socially appropriate apologies or excuses

**Sarcasm, deceit, irony**

Will demonstrate ability to recognize sarcasm, deceit and irony by correctly decoding facial expressions/vocal inflections/tone of voice and making relevant comments to

Will recognize implied communicative intent (e.g., sarcasm, deceit, irony) by correctly decoding facial expressions/vocal inflections and making relevant comments

**Empathy, Peer Support, Encouragement**

Will demonstrate ability to recognize disappointment, sorrow, sadness by correctly decoding facial expressions/vocal inflections/tone of voice and making relevant comments or asking relevant questions

Will demonstrate ability to recognize his/her conversational partner’s needs (need for empathy, emotional support) by using relevant facial expressions and vocal inflections

**Idioms, Expressions**

Will demonstrate ability to respond appropriately to comments containing idioms, expressions or metaphors or politely ask about their meaning if familiar with

**Making/Maintaining Friendships**

Will demonstrate ability to establish and maintain up to # turns on conversational topics of mutual interest

Will demonstrate ability to acknowledge his/her conversational partner’s interests by asking up to # relevant questions or making relevant comments

Will initiate and maintain (up to #) conversational turns around various topics outside of personal interest

Will demonstrate ability to interrupt conversations using socially appropriate apologies or excuses

Will demonstrate ability to recognize his/her conversational partner’s state of mind/mood (by correctly decoding facial expressions and vocal inflections) by making relevant comments and/or asking relevant questions

**Negotiations and Compromise**

Will demonstrate ability to express displeasure and /or accept “no”, an unwanted answer, or a loss in a game using socially appropriate responses with adequate tone of voice and facial expressions.

Will demonstrate ability to politely disagree or state opinion using socially appropriate responses, tone of voice and facial expressions.

SUGGESTED INTERVENTION PROGRAM

Video LearningSquad.com

The Social Skills Squad program has been clinically used and field-tested with children and teens (between the ages of 7 and 18) with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), Social Communication Disorder (SCD) or pragmatic language impairment, Emotional Disturbance (ED) and Intellectual Disability (ID).

[Interactive Therapy Approach](https://videolearningsquad.com/)

This program uses the authenticity of real-life social situations to teach and obtain the most naturalistic responses through an interactive and fun therapeutic technique. It uses videos as a powerful and prolific therapy tool that is both effective and easy.

[Reading Facial Expressions and Vocal Inflections](https://videolearningsquad.com/)

This program focuses on teaching how to read and use facial expressions and vocal inflections, using visual bombardment, selfies and role-plays

[Social Mind and Big Heart](https://videolearningsquad.com/)

It is a rule based program that focuses on 2 key concepts: big heart and social mind.  Big heart refers to an individual’s ability to understand, be supportive and demonstrate mindfullness and empathy.  Social mind refers to an individual’s ability to read and detect social cues.