

## iCAHE JC Critical Appraisal Summary

### Journal Club Details

---

|                              |                |
|------------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Date of submission</b>    | 2012           |
| <b>Journal Club location</b> | FMC            |
| <b>JC Facilitator</b>        | Sarah Ellinger |
| <b>JC Discipline</b>         | Speech         |

### Clinical Scenario

Article provided by journal club.

### Article/Paper

Ferguson A, Duffield G & Worrall L (2010) Legal decision-making by people with aphasia: critical incidents for speech pathologists, *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 45:2; 244-258.

*Please note: due to copyright regulations CAHE is unable to supply a copy of the critically appraised paper/article. If you are an employee of the South Australian government you can obtain a copy of articles from the [DOHSA librarian](#).*

|                              |               |
|------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Article Methodology:</b>  | Qualitative   |
| <b>Returned JC on:</b>       | 2012          |
| <b>By CAHE staff member:</b> | Olivia Thorpe |



CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe  
 karen.grimmer-somers  
 @unisa.edu.au  
 Telephone (08) 8302 2769  
 Facsimile (08) 8302 2766

University of South Australia  
 GPO Box 2471  
 Adelaide SA 5001  
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number  
 001218



iCAHE

University of South Australia | International Centre for Allied Health Evidence

A member of the Sansom Institute

| Ques No. | Yes | Can't Tell | No | Comments   |
|----------|-----|------------|----|--|
| 1        | ✓   |            |    | <p><b>Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?</b></p> <p>The aim of this study was to identify the main issues for speech pathologists when decision-making capacity for legal and related matters arose for patients with aphasia and to describe the nature of these issues and the practices of the speech pathologists in these situations.</p>   |
| 2        | ✓   |            |    | <p><b>Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?</b></p> <p>A qualitative study seeks to illuminate, understand or explore any phenomenon about which little is yet known. Taking the study aims into consideration it is appropriate to address these issues using a qualitative methodology.</p> <p><b>Is it worth continuing? YES</b></p>  |
| 3        | ✓   |            |    | <p><b>Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?</b></p> <p>It has not been explicitly stated which research design has been used; however, it is likely to be descriptive qualitative. This design is appropriate to address the aims of the research.</p> <p>Qualitative descriptive is a distinct method of naturalistic inquiry that uses low inference interpretation to present facts using everyday language. This type of qualitative study provides a straight description (closer to the data as given) of the participants' views and perspectives.</p> |
| 4        | ✓   |            |    | <p><b>Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?</b></p> <p>The participants were invited to participate in the study through a regional area health service e-mail distribution, and through distribution of information about the project at a metropolitan professional development forum.</p>   |
| 5        | ✓   |            |    | <p><b>Were the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?</b></p> <p>Data was collected using semi-structured telephone interviews conducted by author one and verbatim notes were typed simultaneous to the interview.</p>  |

CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe  
 karen.grimmer-somers  
 @unisa.edu.au  
 Telephone (08) 8302 2769  
 Facsimile (08) 8302 2766

University of South Australia  
 GPO Box 2471  
 Adelaide SA 5001  
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number  
 001218



iCAHE

University of South Australia | International Centre for Allied Health Evidence

A member of the Sansom Institute

|    |   |  |   |
|----|---|--|---|
| 6  | ✓ |  | <p><b>Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?</b><br/>                 The relationship between the researchers and the participants is unclear.</p> <p>Were the interviewers (or authors) previously known to participants? Did participants have a dependent relationship to them such as their health workers? These types of factors will influence the information participants are willing to share and therefore the quality of the data collected.</p> |
| 7  | ✓ |  | <p><b>Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</b><br/>                 The study was approved by the University of Newcastle Human Research Ethics Committee and the Hunter Area Research Ethics Committee.</p>  |
| 8  | ✓ |  | <p><b>Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b><br/>                 The method of analysis is unclear; however, it is likely to be content analysis.</p> <p>Rigor was maintained through the use of verbatim notes, collecting data until data saturation was reached and having two authors independently involved in the analysis for validation.</p>   |
| 9  | ✓ |  | <p><b>Is there a clear statement of findings?</b><br/>                 The main incidents reported were related to legal decisions were decisions involving consent for medical treatment, discharge, accommodation, and business/financial decisions. Although there were some standardized assessment practices this was of lesser importance than informal observations in function.</p>   |
| 10 |   |  | <p><b>How valuable is the research?</b><br/>                 Journal club to answer.</p>  |