



NSW Speech Pathology Evidence Based Practice Interest Group

Critically Appraised Paper (CAP)

CLINICAL BOTTOM LINE: There is little significant difference in the phonological awareness and speech production skills of children following a 10 week block of either articulation or metaphonologically-based therapy.

Clinical Question [patient/problem, intervention, (comparison), outcome]: In a child with phonological impairment of unknown origin, is a Metaphon approach effective in improving speech accuracy (e.g., as measured by PCC, error analysis, or consonant probe) over time?

Search Terms:

Search Systems:

Citation: Hesketh, A., Adams, C., Nightingale, C., & Hall, R. (2000). Phonological awareness therapy and articulatory training approaches for children with phonological disorders: a comparative outcome study. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 35, 337-354.

Design: Pseudo-randomised controlled trial

Participants: 61 children aged 3;6 – 5;0 with a known phonological disorder. All subjects were found to have nil language difficulties (as indicated by inclusion criteria)

Experimental Group: Divided semi-randomly into even numbered-groups who received articulation or metaphonologically-based therapy. All children received 10 weekly individual sessions. Target processes or phonemes for intervention was selected according to individuals

Control Group: 59 control children with typically-developing speech and language aged between 3;6 and 5;0. Standard score of > 85 on the EAT and no known language or hearing difficulty. All received a detailed assessment of metaphonological abilities on two occasions, 12 weeks apart. No intervention received.

Results: Phonologically disordered children improved significantly in both phonological output and awareness skills compared with control. There was no significant difference on the awareness measure between ART and MET groups. ART children made more gains on one measure of speech production only when compared with MET group. There was little change between the groups three months post intervention.

Comments on Design: Unclear of what happens in therapy sessions, unclear as to what sounds were targeted, little longitudinal data

Level of Evidence (NH&MRC): III (1)

Appraised By: Members of the EBP paediatric speech group
Clinical Group: Paediatric Speech Group

Date: December 2004