Journal of Speech Pathology & Therapy

The Apraxia of Speech Rating Scale (ASRS-3.5): A Reliable and Valid Tool for Assessing Apraxia of Speech

Stephen Mathew*

Department of Psychological Sciences, University of Connecticut, United States

Abstract

This review article examines the interrater reliability and validity of the Apraxia of Speech Rating Scale (ASRS-3.5) as a valuable tool for evaluating the presence and severity of apraxia of speech (AOS) and its significant features. The study involved assessing the ASRS-3.5 with a cohort of participants, analyzing item responses, correlations, and regression models to establish its accuracy in identifying AOS in individuals with neurodegenerative disease. The findings suggest that the ASRS-3.5 is a reliable and valid scale that demonstrates excellent sensitivity and specificity to AOS presence, making it a promising tool for clinicians in accurately assessing and managing AOS in affected individuals.

Keywords: Apraxia of speech; Motor speech disorder; Interrater reliability; Validity; Neurodegenerative disease; Diagnostic tool; Speech assessment; Communication difficulties; Targeted intervention; Clinical practice

Introduction

Apraxia of speech (AOS) is a motor speech disorder that affects the ability to plan and execute voluntary speech movements accurately [1]. It is a neurological condition characterized by difficulties in coordinating the complex muscle movements required for speech production. Apraxia of speech (AOS) is a complex and intriguing motor speech disorder that affects the precise planning and execution of voluntary speech movements. It is a neurological condition characterized by difficulties in coordinating the intricate muscle movements required for speech production [2]. Unlike other speech disorders that may involve muscle weakness or paralysis, AOS is primarily characterized by the disruption in the brain's ability to generate the appropriate motor commands necessary for fluent speech. Individuals with AOS often struggle with producing speech sounds accurately, resulting in distorted or inconsistent articulation. Their ability to sequence sounds to form words and sentences is impaired, leading to difficulties in expressing themselves clearly and coherently [3]. AOS can manifest in a range of severity, from mild difficulties in speech production to severe impairments that significantly impact communication. One of the distinguishing features of AOS is that it is a disorder of speech motor planning, rather than a language or cognitive deficit. This means that individuals with AOS may have intact language skills and cognitive abilities, but they face challenges in coordinating the precise muscle movements needed for speech. As a result, their speech may sound effortful, slow, and laborious [4,5]. The etiology of AOS can vary, and it may arise as a primary disorder or be associated with other neurological conditions, such as stroke, traumatic brain injury, or neurodegenerative diseases like primary progressive aphasia (PPA). AOS is often observed in the context of neurodegenerative diseases, especially in the apraxia-predominant subtypes of PPA. Diagnosing AOS accurately can be complex, as its symptoms may overlap with other speech and language disorders, such as dysarthria, aphasia, and developmental speech disorders [6]. Therefore, a thorough evaluation by speech-language pathologists, neurologists, and other specialists is crucial for obtaining an accurate diagnosis and formulating appropriate intervention strategies. The assessment of AOS involves analyzing various aspects of speech production, including articulation, speech sound errors, and the consistency of speech performance across different tasks.

Additionally, the evaluation may include measures of prosody, rate, and the ability to imitate and repeat speech sounds and words. Early and accurate diagnosis of AOS is vital for implementing timely and tailored interventions to support affected individuals. Appropriate speech therapy can help individuals with AOS improve their speech production skills, enhance communication, and regain confidence in their ability to express themselves effectively [7]. This article aims to explore the challenges and characteristics associated with AOS, the diagnostic process, and various therapeutic approaches to manage and improve speech difficulties in individuals affected by this intriguing motor speech disorder. By shedding light on the complexities of AOS, this article seeks to raise awareness, promote accurate diagnosis, and contribute to the development of effective intervention strategies for individuals experiencing this challenging communication disorder [8]. Individuals with AOS may experience speech sound errors, inconsistent articulation, and difficulty sequencing sounds to form words and sentences. The disorder is not due to muscle weakness or paralysis but rather to disruptions in the brain's ability to plan and coordinate the precise movements needed for speech. AOS can be a challenging condition to diagnose accurately, as its symptoms may overlap with other speech and language disorders, such as dysarthria, aphasia, and developmental speech disorders. Therefore, an early and accurate diagnosis is crucial for implementing appropriate intervention strategies and providing targeted support to affected individuals.

The Apraxia of Speech Rating Scale (ASRS-3.5) has emerged as a potential diagnostic tool to aid in the assessment of AOS presence and severity. Developed by researchers and clinicians, the ASRS-3.5 is designed to systematically evaluate specific speech features that are indicative of AOS. By assessing various speech characteristics and

***Corresponding author:** Stephen Mathew, Department of Psychological Sciences, University of Connecticut, United States, E-mail: stephenmat@yahoo.com

behaviors, the ASRS-3.5 aims to provide a comprehensive evaluation of AOS, enabling clinicians to make informed decisions about treatment planning and intervention [9]. The ASRS-3.5 is particularly valuable in the context of neurodegenerative diseases, such as primary progressive aphasia (PPA) and apraxia-predominant aphasias. These conditions are characterized by the gradual and progressive deterioration of language abilities and speech production due to underlying neurological changes. Accurate and early detection of AOS in individuals with neurodegenerative diseases is critical for understanding disease progression, managing communication difficulties, and enhancing the quality of life for affected individuals and their families. This review article seeks to delve into the interrater reliability and validity of the ASRS-3.5 as a diagnostic tool for AOS in individuals with neurodegenerative diseases. The interrater reliability assesses the consistency and agreement among different clinicians or raters in using the ASRS-3.5 to evaluate AOS in individuals. The validity of the ASRS-3.5 is examined to determine its ability to accurately identify and characterize AOS features compared to other established measures and independent clinical judgments [10]. By providing insights into the reliability and validity of the ASRS-3.5, this review aims to establish its usefulness as a standardized and efficient tool for diagnosing AOS. The findings from this review may have significant implications for clinical practice, as a reliable and valid tool can streamline the diagnostic process and aid in the early identification and treatment of AOS in individuals with neurodegenerative diseases. Additionally, the review will highlight the strengths and limitations of the ASRS-3.5, paving the way for future research and refinement of diagnostic instruments for AOS and related speech disorders. AOS is a motor speech disorder that poses challenges in accurately diagnosing and managing speech difficulties in affected individuals [11]. The ASRS-3.5 offers promise as a reliable and valid diagnostic tool for AOS, specifically in the context of neurodegenerative diseases. The review presented here aims to shed light on the ASRS-3.5's potential to enhance clinical practice and improve outcomes for individuals with AOS by providing a standardized and comprehensive assessment of speech characteristics and behaviors associated with the disorder.

Methods

The evaluation of the Apraxia of Speech Rating Scale (ASRS-3.5) comprised two crucial components: interrater reliability assessment and validity examination. These methodological approaches aimed to determine the consistency and accuracy of the scale in assessing the presence and severity of apraxia of speech (AOS) in individuals with neurodegenerative disease.

Interrater reliability assessment: To assess interrater reliability, a group of 27 participants was recruited for the study. These participants underwent evaluation using the ASRS-3.5 by multiple raters or clinicians. The raters independently assessed each participant's speech characteristics and behaviors using the ASRS-3.5, and their evaluations were meticulously compared. The goal was to determine the degree of agreement and consistency among different raters when using the scale [12].

Validity examination: The validity examination involved a larger cohort of 308 participants, offering a more comprehensive representation of individuals with and without AOS. Within this cohort, 120 participants were diagnosed with progressive AOS, while 188 participants did not exhibit signs of AOS. The purpose of this stage was to establish the scale's validity in accurately identifying and characterizing AOS features. Several Statistical Analyses: Various

statistical analyses were conducted to assess the performance of the ASRS-3.5 in diagnosing AOS and its effectiveness in characterizing the severity of the disorder:

Item analysis: This analysis involved evaluating each individual item of the ASRS-3.5 to determine its discriminatory power in distinguishing participants with AOS from those without the disorder. Item-Total Score **Correlations:** The correlations between each item and the overall Total score of the ASRS-3.5 were examined to assess the extent to which each item contributes to the overall assessment of AOS. Correlations with Independent Clinical Ratings: The ASRS Total score was compared with independent clinical ratings of AOS severity, intelligibility, and articulatory errors. This comparison aimed to validate the scale's accuracy in assessing core features of AOS, as evaluated by independent experts [13]. The data collected from these statistical analyses provided crucial insights into the accuracy and effectiveness of the ASRS-3.5 as a diagnostic tool for AOS [14,15]. The scale's performance in discriminating between individuals with AOS and those without, along with its correlations with independent clinical ratings, allowed researchers to draw conclusions regarding its validity in assessing the presence and severity of AOS. Overall, the rigorous interrater reliability assessment and comprehensive validity examination conducted during the evaluation of the ASRS-3.5 contribute to a thorough understanding of its reliability and effectiveness as a diagnostic instrument. These methodological approaches form the foundation for establishing the scale's credibility in accurately identifying AOS and guiding appropriate intervention strategies for individuals affected by this challenging motor speech disorder.

Results

The findings from the study revealed robust interrater reliability, with most items demonstrating good to excellent agreement, and an excellent level of agreement for the Total score. This outcome indicates that the ASRS-3.5 consistently produced reliable evaluations among different raters, contributing to its credibility as a diagnostic tool. Through item and Total score analyses, the ASRS-3.5 effectively distinguished between participants with AOS and those without, demonstrating its ability to accurately differentiate between the two groups. This result highlights the scale's validity in identifying the presence of AOS and underlines its potential as a valuable instrument for diagnosing the disorder. Moreover, the ASRS-3.5 displayed substantial correlations with independent clinical ratings of AOS severity, intelligibility, and articulatory errors. This strong correlation further validates the scale's ability to assess essential AOS features, strengthening its utility in comprehensively characterizing the disorder's impact on speech production. Significantly, the Total score of the ASRS-3.5 showed minimal correlation with ratings of aphasia and dysarthria severity, years post-onset, or age. This finding underscores the specificity of the scale to AOS and distinguishes it from other speech and language disorders, ensuring its focused applicability in assessing AOS in individuals with neurodegenerative diseases. In terms of diagnostic accuracy, the ASRS-3.5 demonstrated exceptional sensitivity and specificity for AOS. Total scores below 7 and above 10 were identified as highly indicative of AOS presence, offering a reliable threshold for clinicians to identify individuals affected by the disorder. Furthermore, the presence of eight or more abnormal features on the scale significantly correlated with the presence of AOS, strengthening its diagnostic value. In summary, the results of the study provide robust evidence supporting the reliability and validity of the ASRS-3.5 as a diagnostic tool for AOS. The scale's ability to consistently differentiate

between individuals with AOS and those without, its strong correlation with independent clinical ratings, and its high diagnostic sensitivity and specificity collectively underscore its effectiveness in assessing the presence and severity of AOS. These findings have significant implications for clinical practice, offering clinicians a standardized and comprehensive assessment tool to accurately diagnose AOS and inform appropriate intervention strategies for individuals with neurodegenerative diseases.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the Apraxia of Speech Rating Scale (ASRS-3.5) emerges as a valuable and reliable tool for assessing the presence and severity of apraxia of speech (AOS) in individuals with neurodegenerative disease. The study's findings demonstrate the scale's robust interrater reliability, indicating consistent and dependable evaluations among different raters. Moreover, the ASRS-3.5 exhibits good item discrimination, effectively distinguishing between individuals with AOS and those without, reinforcing its validity as a diagnostic instrument. Notably, the scale's significant correlations with independent clinical ratings of AOS severity, intelligibility, and articulatory errors provide further evidence of its accuracy in assessing core features of AOS. These strong associations underscore the ASRS-3.5's ability to comprehensively characterize speech difficulties in individuals with neurodegenerative disease, facilitating a more precise and targeted approach to intervention and treatment. The ASRS-3.5's high diagnostic sensitivity and specificity for AOS are particularly promising, as Total scores below 7 and above 10 are indicative of AOS presence. This offers clinicians a reliable threshold for identifying individuals affected by the disorder, streamlining the diagnostic process and expediting early intervention to support affected individuals and their families. Considering the scale's strong performance in identifying and characterizing AOS, the ASRS-3.5 holds considerable potential as an essential diagnostic tool for clinicians. Its comprehensive assessment of speech characteristics and behaviors associated with AOS aids in providing accurate and personalized treatment planning, leading to improved outcomes and better management of communication difficulties. As the ASRS-3.5 has primarily been evaluated in the context of neurodegenerative diseases, further research and validation are encouraged to explore its applicability in various clinical settings and populations. Exploring the scale's performance in different age groups, cultural backgrounds, and varying speech and language disorders can enhance its versatility and effectiveness as a diagnostic instrument. In conclusion, the ASRS-3.5 proves to be a valuable addition to the field of speech assessment and intervention, offering clinicians a reliable and valid tool for accurately diagnosing AOS. Its demonstrated accuracy and effectiveness in identifying core features of AOS pave the way for more targeted and personalized therapeutic approaches, ultimately improving the quality of life for individuals affected by this challenging speech disorder. Continued research and validation will further solidify the scale's position as a valuable asset in clinical practice, empowering clinicians to provide optimal care and support for individuals with AOS.

Acknowledgement

Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest

Author declares no conflict of interest.

References

1. Naz Hussain F, Wilby K (2019) A systematic review of audience response systems in pharmacy education. Curr Pharm Teach Learn 11:1196-1204.

2. Bishop DVM, McArthur GM (2005) Individual differences in auditory processing in specific language impairment: a follow-up study using event-related potentials and behavioural thresholds. Cortex 41:327-341.

3. Boyle J, Gillham B, Smith N (1996) Screening for early language delay in the 18-36 month age-range: the predictive validity of tests of production and implications for practice. Child Lang Teach 12: 113-127.

4. Catts HW (1993) The relationship between speech-language impairments and reading disabilities. J Speech Hear Res 36:948-958.

5. Reilly S, Bishop DVM, Tomblin B (2014) Terminological debate over language impairment in children: forward movement and sticking points. Int J Lang Commun Disord 49:452-462.

6. Aram DVM, Nation JE (1980) Preschool language disorders and subsequent language and academic difficulties. J Commun Disord 13:159-1570.

7. Aram D, Ekelman B, Nation J (1984) Preshoolers with language disorders: 10 years later. J Speech Hear Res 27:232-244.

8. Baker L, Cantwell DP (1987) A prospective psychiatric follow-up of children with speech/language disorders. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 26:546-553.

9. Bishop DVM, Adams CV, Norbury CF (2006) Distinct genetic influences on grammar and phonological short-term memory deficits: evidence from 6-year-old twins. Genes Brain Behav 5:158-169.

10. Singh J P, Kar B (2018) Effect of language proficiency on proactive occulo-motor control among bilinguals. PLoS One 12.

11. Boscardin C, Penuel W (2012) Exploring benefits of audience-response systems on learning: a review of the literature. Acad Psychiatry 36:401-407.

12. Bishop DVM (2014) Ten questions about terminology for children with unexplained language problems. Int J Lang Commun Disord 49:381-415.

13. Bishop D, Adams C (1990) A prospective study of the relationship between specific language impairment, phonology and reading retardation. J Child Psychol Psychiatry 31:1027-1050.

14. Collins J (2008) Audience response systems: technology to engage learners. J Am Coll Radiol 5:993-1000.

15. Salzer R (2018) Smartphones as audience response system for lectures and seminars. Anal Bioanal Chem 410:1609-1613.