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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 culturally expected 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 visual attention via non-standardized means. Please see below for XxXx’s performance across standardized and non-standardized measures.

When performing a comprehensive language assessment, Bloom & Lahey (1978) argue that form (syntax), content (semantics), and use (pragmatics) should be examined 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 judgment and pragmatic performance.

Pragmatic Judgment is considered equivalent to receptive pragmatics. It is measured by the individual’s ability to adequately understand and use appropriate language. This requires the individual 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.

The Pragmatic Judgment tasks include the following: 1) instrumental performance appraisal, 2) social context appraisal, and 3) paralinguistic decoding.

Pragmatic Performance 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 an individual's response include answers to questions/statements and responses to expressed emotions in video-based scenarios.

The Pragmatic Performance tasks include: 1) instrumental performance, 2) affective expression, and 3) paralinguistic signals.

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 Judgment Index | | | **77** |
| Pragmatic Performance Index | | | **74** |
| Paralinguistic Index | | | **74** |

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

*This subtest measures an individual’s awareness and ability to judge the appropriateness of basic social routines according to cultural expectations. This includes: 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 the rules of conversational turn-taking.*

*When compared to same-aged peers, XxXx performed in the* ***below average*** *range on this subtest. XxXx demonstrated strengths in this sub test, including: analyzing whether the individuals performing in recorded social situations were demonstrating appropriate conversational turn-taking, polite introductions and requests, etc. or whether rudeness, impolite language, or poor conversational turn-taking was occurring. XxXx used “yes” or “no” answers to verbally indicate if anything went wrong with an interaction. Additionally, he was* ***frequently*** *able to identify and communicate what went wrong. Example scenarios that XxXx viewed and his responses follow:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Examples of Video based Social Situations*** | ***Comments regarding individual’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 individuals 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?* | At the end of the scenario, the SLP asked XxXx: “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.  At the end of the scenario, the SLP asked XxXx: “Did anything go wrong,” to 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 when compared to cultural expectations of same aged peers.

*Social Context Appraisal (Reading Context Cues)*

*This subtest measures an individual’s awareness of social context cues and their ability to understand the intent of others as well as infer what others are thinking (perspective taking). This subtext also includes: detecting non-verbal cues, understanding indirectly implied requests and/or statements (e.g. idioms, expressions), making appropriate inferences (e.g. sarcasm), and making judgments about social context when situational cues change.*

*XxXx presented a**performance on this subtest that is* ***approaching significant differences*** *from cultural expectations of same aged peers. He demonstrated difficulty with perspective taking (theory of mind). Across several tasks, it was noted that he had difficulty with providing a rationale for what went wrong in a situation in which sarcasm or irony was used. Example scenarios that XxXx viewed and his responses follow:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Examples of Video based Social Situations*** | ***Comments regarding individual’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 individuals 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 ***approaching significant differences*** from cultural expectations**.**

Paralinguistic Decoding (Reading Nonverbal Cues)

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

XxXx exhibited paralinguistic decoding skills that are ***approaching significant differences*** from cultural expectations of same aged peers. It was noted to be difficult for XxXx to demonstrate culturally expected understanding facial expressions, tone of voice, inflections in prosody, gestures, and overall body language across all tasks presented to him. XxXx provided rationales that were either incorrect or vague in nature. *Example scenarios that XxXx viewed and his responses follow:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Examples of Video based Social Situations*** | ***Comments regarding individual’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 in 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 as **approaching significant differences** from cultural expectations of same aged peers.

Instrumental Performance (Using Social Routine Language)

This subtest measures an individual’s ability to accurately use language 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. For example, XxXx was presented with the following situation:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Examples of Video based Social Situations*** | ***Comments regarding individual’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 when compared to cultural expectations**.**

Affective Expression (Expressing Emotions)

This subtest measures the ability of an individual to appropriately express higher order pragmatic language that is emotive in nature, such as: regret, sorrow, peer support, praise, empathy, gratitude, encouragement, etc… based on cultural norms.

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 culturally accepted appropriate emotive responses. For example, XxXx was provided with the following scenario:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Examples of Video based Social Situations*** | ***Comments regarding individual’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,”, 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 indicates he has demonstrated a **significant difference** from cultural expectations in this area**.**

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 individual’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 culturally expected non-verbal cues and presents with **a significant difference** from cultural expectations in this area.

Pragmatic Judgment 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 Judgments about social context when situational cues vary, such as conversational adaptation. Additionally, the Pragmatic Judgment Index measures awareness of basic social routines and the ability to judge their appropriateness. Examinees who do well on the Pragmatic Judgment 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 *approaching significant differences* from cultural expectations.**

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 *approaching significant differences* from cultural expectations.**

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 difficulties in this area. He obtained a composite score of 74 and a percentile rank of 4 which is rated to be *approaching significant differences* from cultural expectations**

***Conversational Adaptation Checklist***

Non-standardized assessments are critical in the assessment of an individual's speech and language abilities, as they provide qualitative insight into an SLPs observations of an individual. It allows for a hologram of an individual'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 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.

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 individual must consider higher-level emotive language and determine the meaning behind the actor’s sarcasm, humor, and affective presentations. Affective Expression tasks evaluate an individual'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 demonstrate adaptation 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 did not perform at the level of typical 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 Judgment 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 Judgment 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 Judgments 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* ***approaching significant differences*** *from cultural expectations****.***

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 ***approaching significant differences*** from cultural expectations.

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 indicates a **significant difference** from cultural expectations in this area**.**

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 a **significant difference** from cultural expectations in this area.

# Contextualized Assessment of Pragmatic Skills Checklist

FULL CHECKLIST WITH VIDEOS IS AVAILABLE AT VIDEOLEARNINGSQUAD.COM

Non-standardized assessments are critical in the assessment of an individual's speech and language abilities, as they provide qualitative insight into an SLPs observations of an individual. It allows for a hologram of an individual'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 Judgments 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 individual 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 culturally 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 the topic. However, expressing genuine interest in others' interests that aren't related to his own appeared to be an area in which he demonstrated significant difficulty. 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 an individual'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 adaptation 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.

## Impact Social Communication Rating Scale - Report Summary

FULL TEST AVAILABLE AT VIDEOASSESSMENTTOOLS.COM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | ***The IMPACT Social Communication Rating Scale*** is a 35-item, norm-referenced rating scale that is designed with three separate forms for clinicians, parents, and teachers to complete. In order to fully understand and interpret a child’s social language abilities, it is important to obtain information on how a child performs across different environments in everyday situations. Parents and teachers can be incredible resources and provide invaluable information regarding a child’s social communication in both the home and in the classroom environment (Carter Young, Diehl, Morris, Hyman, & Bennetto, 2005). Parent and/or teacher input may be beneficial during pragmatic language evaluation because it allows for the assessment to take place in an authentic setting and it is completed by someone who knows the child well and thus, is more likely to be a true representation of the child’s social communication skills (Volden & Phillips, 2010).  ***The IMPACT Social Communication Rating Scale*** measures a child’s awareness of social context, intent to socialize, nonverbal language, social interactions, theory of mind, ability to accept change, social language and conversational adaptation, social reasoning, and cognitive flexibility. The current rating scale asks parents, teachers, and clinicians to rate the various components of social communication on a 4-point scale (“never,” “sometimes,” “often,” and “typically”) and yields a percentile and standard score. By utilizing *The IMPACT Social Communication Rating Scale*, we are able to develop a better understanding as to how a student’s pragmatic language skills may impact their academic performance and progress in school.  In order to investigate specific aspects of Student's pragmatic language comprehension and usage, the full *IMPACT Social Communication Rating Scale* was administered and yielded the following results: | |
| Clinician's Rating Scale Scores  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Standard Score  100 | Percentile Rank  50 | | Educational and Social Impact?  Results indicate that the student's pragmatic language skills will most likely not have a negative impact on everyday interactions and academic performance. | | |
| Based on observations and information obtained on the rating scale, Student presented with strengths in the following areas:Awareness of Social Context Intent to Socialize Nonverbal Language Social Interactions Theory of Mind-Perspective Taking Accepting Change Social Language and Conversational Adaptation Social Reasoning Cognitive Flexibility |
| Based on observations and information obtained on the rating scale, Student presented with weaknesses in the following areas: |
| |  | | --- | | Description of Testing Areas | |
| |  | | --- | | **Awareness of Social Context** The awareness of social context rating scale item(s) measure how a student responds to their social environment and the people in that environment. For example, items may look at whether a student acknowledges their friends, family members, teachers, and peers.  **Intent to Socialize** The intent to socialize rating scale item(s) takes a look at whether a student attempts to initiate interactions with others on a day-to-day basis. For example, questions look at whether the student seeks companionship/friendship, attention, or daily interactions with their peers. Does the student initiate conversation to gain peers' attention or engage in playful social exchanges?  **Nonverbal Language** The nonverbal language rating scale items measures how a student uses facial expressions, tone of voice, and gestures to show emotions.  **Social Interactions** The social interactions rating scale items looks at how the student interacts with others. For example, items may ask whether the student shows interest in social interactions during recess, lunch, or when friends come over. Do they appear to enjoy interactions with others?  **Theory of Mind** The theory of mind rating scale items measures how the student is able to engage in pretend or imaginative play. Is the student able to role-play different scenarios or put themselves in “someone else’s shoes”?  **Accepting Change** The ability to accept change rating scale items looks at how the student responds to a change. Perhaps the student has a change in their schedule, or the lunch menu has changed for the day. Is the student able to respond appropriately without excessive reassurance?  **Social Language and Conversational Adaptation** The social language and conversational adaptation items measure how a child is able to engage in social conversations. Does the child understanding humor and jokes, can they stay on topic, if there is a communication breakdown or confusion in the conversation, can they provide clarity? Does the student understand nonliteral language?  **Social Reasoning** The social reasoning rating scale item measures a child’s ability to see the whole picture instead of focusing on irrelevant details.  **Cognitive Flexibility** The cognitive flexibility rating scale item looks at awareness and adaptability. For example, is the child able to understand that sometimes things are not fair or, does the child excessively insist on fairness? | |
| Teacher's Rating Scale Scores  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Were teacher ratings made available for Student?  Yes | Standard Score  104 | Percentile Rank  55 | | Educational and Social Impact?  Results indicate that the student's pragmatic language skills will most likely not have a negative impact on everyday interactions and academic performance. | | | |
| Is there another teacher rating available for Student?No |
| Parent's Rating Scale Scores  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Were parent ratings made available for Student?  Yes | Standard Score  100 | Percentile Rank  50 | | Educational and Social Impact?  Results indicate that the student's pragmatic language skills will most likely not have a negative impact on everyday interactions and academic performance.  Impact Statement:  The diagnostic accuracy of an assessment tool is key in identifying those who have a language impairment (sensitivity) and those with typical language development (specificity) (Plante & Vance, 1994). A student’s language abilities are measured along a range, and as such, assessment tools benefit from having determined thresholds called “cut scores” to measure the sensitivity and specificity of a test. Cut scores are thresholds that are used to distinguish between those who have a language impairment and those with typical language development. For example, if a statistically significant cut score of 77 distinguishes a student with typical social communication development from a student with social communication disorder, and a student achieves a score of 80, this is above the cut score and thus, suggests that the student’s performance is *not significant enough* to negatively impact social interactions.  STUDENT A was assessed using the *IMPACT Social Communication Rating Scale.* STUDENT A achieved a score of \_\_\_, which was ***below/above*** the cut score. The results of this test suggest STUDENT A’s social communication performance is ***indicative/not indicative*** of a social communication disorder and/or is ***significant/not significant*** enough to negatively impact his/her social interactions. | | | |

Suggested Goal Bank (neurodiversity-affirming):

<https://videolearningsquad.com/nd-goals>

Suggested intervention program to include video-modeling scenes:

<https://videolearningsquad.com>