Universidad de Granada

Communication Domain

José-Luis Padilla, Isabel Benítez, and Miguel Castillo

University of Granada (Granada, Spain)

Luxembourg, 3-5 November 2010

Contents

- Introduction
  - – Importance of communication domain
  - – "Communication" construct

- Aims of cognitive testing and field test
- Cognitive interview findings
- Field test findings

- Discussion

- Recomendations
  - **- Are the questions tapping the intended construct?**
  - **- Are they getting at the same construct?**
  - **- Are there cross-country biases?**

Introduction: Importance of "comunication"

- Communication is a key domain of function for expressing our 'humanness'.

- People with difficulties in communicating face significant barriers in their everyday lives.

- A person must be able to express him/herself (**expressive communication**) and understand others (**receptive communication**).

Introduction: The "Comunication" construct

- Two communication dimensions:

  - "Successful expresive"

    Functioning cognitive system

    Knowledge of lenguage rules (grammar, semantic, phonology)

    Intact voice and oral structures

    Hands (for sign languages)

  - "Successful receptive"

    Functioning cognitive system

    Hearing of communication segments

    Ability // Knowledge of language rule

    Seeing for sign language

- Which kinds of problems are **intended**?

    – Physical impairments: problems with the tongue or mouth.

    – Cognition-related problems: difficulties focusing on what other are saying or to speak

    – Hearing-related problems.

- Which are "**out-of-scope**" problems?

    – Social or interactional difficulties: "Shyness", "Fast talking", "Interpersonal problems", "Education" and "Language".

- To study how well questions tapped into the intended construct of communication

- To find out the extent to which the second and third (only for ESCAP), questions were able to add additional information about those difficulties.

- To examine the questions' performance across countries to identify potential biases.

The WG quetions for the comunication domain

- **COM_SS**: Using your usual language, do you have difficulty communicating, for example understanding or being understood?

  1. No difficulty 2. Some difficulty 3. A loto f difficulty 4. Cannot do at all/ Unable to do

- **COM_ES**: Do people have difficulty understanding you when you speak?

  1. No difficulty 2. Some difficulty 3. A loto f difficulty 4. Cannot do at all/ Unable to do

Cognitive testing findings

Table1. Responses for the Granada Group and ESCAP project on Q1

COM_SS	Response categories	Granada Group	ESCAP
Using your usual language, do you have difficulty communicating, for example understanding or being understood?	No difficulty	59.1 (55)	80.0 (103)
	Some difficulty	35.4 (33)	12.4 (16)
	A lot of difficulty	3.2 (3)	7.7 (10)
	Unable to do	2.1 (2)	0.0 (0)

Cognitive testing findings

Table 2. Responses for the Granada Group and ESCAP project on Q2

COM_ES	Response categories	Granada Group	ESCAP
Do people have difficulty understanding you when you speak?	No difficulty	52.9 (45)	72.5 (95)
	Some difficulty	41.1 (37)	21.4 (28)
	A lot of difficulty	2.3 (2)	4.5 (6)
	Unable to do	1.1 (1)	1.5 (2)

Difficulties responding

- **COM_SS**: At least 15 respondents (9 in ESCAP) experienced some kind of comprehension difficulty: asked to repeat the question, asked for clarification or expressed doubts.

    - IT03: *"She asked to read again the question: "it seems a weird question". and then, without hesitation, she said "No".*

    - USAS5: *"He asked if this was asking "Can I have a conversation?"*

- **COM_ES**: Fewer difficulties associated with the second question

Cognitive testing findings: Interpretations

Table 3. Frequency of "intended" communication problems (Q1)

Country	General communication skills	Physical	Cognition	Hearing
France	6			
Germany				
Italy	10			
Portugal				
Spain	6	2		5
Switzerland	3			
USA (English)	4	3	1	
USA (Spanish)	2			

Cognitive testing findings: Interpretations

Table 4. Frequency of "out-of-scope" communication problems (Q1)

Country	Social / Interactional				Language
	Shy	**Fast-talking**	**Interpersonal**	**Education**	
France	1		2	3	3
Germany					3
Italy	1		2	4	1
Portugal	1		3		
Spain		1	1	3	3
Switzerland	1		1	2	3
USA (E)		3	3	3	2
USA (S)				1	8

Cognitive testing findings: Comparing Interpretations

Table 5. Comparing "intended" communication problems Granada and ESCAP

Projects	General communication skills	Physical	Cognition	Hearing
Granada Total (101)	31	5	1	5
% (out of 101)	31	5	1	5
ESCAP Total (70)	29	3	2	8
% (out of 70)	41	4	3	11

Cognitive testing findings: Comparing Interpretations

Table 6. Comparing "out-of-scope" communication problems Granada and ESCAP

Projects	Social / Interactional				Language
	Shy	**Fast-talking**	**Interpersonal**	**Education**	
Granada Total (101)	4	4	12	16	23
% (out of 101)	4	4	12	16	23
ESCAP Total	2	4	7	5	
% (out of 70)	3	6	10	7	17

Table 7. Comparison of responses for Q1 and Q2 (GG and ESCAP respondents)

COM_ES	COM_SS			
	ND	SD	ALD	UTD
ND	31 (FR: 6; GR: 1; IT: 8; PO: 3; SP: 6; USA: 6; USAS: 1) // **ESCAP: 97**	10 (GR:1; PO: 1, SP: 3; SW: 1:, US: 2, USAS: 2) // **ESCAP: 6**	1 (SP: 1) // **ESCAP: 3**	**1 USA**
SD	14 (FR: 2; GR... IT: 2; PO: 1; S... USA: 5;... ESCAP...			
ALD	0			
UTD	1 SW...		... // **ESCAP: 2**	0

Q1: His fiance broke up with him 3 month ago… He …id … …ing that he didn't

Q1: Actually he first didn't understand the question, and after 3 times explaining it to him …ad relaying **he answered he didn't have problems at all.**
Q2: He didn't understate the question, first he said unable to do, after the question was …7 **explained he said: "super".**

ESCAP Field Testing: Aims and main findings

- Objetives: To determine the actual prevalence of the interpretation patterns found in cognitive testing.

- Results:

  - COM_SS: Approximately one in twenty respondents (5.1 percent) reported at least some difficulty with communication.

  - COM_ES: Approximately one in twenty respondents (4.9 percent) reported at least some difficulty with being understood by others when speaking.

Table 8. Difficulty communicating by country (Q1)

Country	No difficulty	Some	A lot	Unable
Kazkhstan	93	5	1	0
Cambodia	93	4	1	0
Sri Lanka	95	4	0	1
Maldives	96	3	1	0
Mongolia	95	4	1	0
Philippines	95	3	2	0
All countries	95	4	1	0

ESCAP Field Testing: Aims and main findings

Table 9. Difficulty communicating by country (Q2)

Country	No difficulty	Some	A lot	Unable
Kazkhstan	92	6	1	0
Cambodia	96	4	1	0
Sri Lanka	97	2	0	1
Maldives	94	4	1	0
Mongolia	95	4	1	0
Philippines	96	4	1	0
All countries	95	4	1	0

ESCAP Field Testing: Main findings

Table 9. Reasons for communicating problems and chosing response categories

Feelings	% All countries
Mouth	35
Hear	34
Shy	47
Fast	30
Language	31

Some difficulty	A lot of difficulty	Feelings
29	56	Mouth
39	42	Hear
52	30	Shy
29	18	Fast
39	26	Language

Discussion: Are COM_SS and COM_ES tapping the intended construct?

- Cognitive testing evidence:

    - "Intended" problems (Hearing, Physical, and Cognition): 11% Granada and 18% ESCAP.

    - General communication skills: 31% (Granada) and 41% ESCAP.

    - "Out-of-scope" problems (Social/Interactional): 36% Granada and 26% ESCAP.

    - Language: 23% Granada and 17% ESCAP.

- Field testing evidence: "Intended" reasons (34%-35%) vs. "out-of-scope" reasons: (31%-47%).

- **RESPONSE: Along with the "intended" problems, communication questions are notably tapping "non-intended" aspects**.

Discussion: Are COM_SS and COM_ES getting at the same construct?

- Cognitive testing evidence:

  - Granada: 80 of 84 gave the same response or the next one to both questions.
  - ESCAP: 123 OF 127, idem.
  - Granada narratives: 56 of 77 respondents talked about the same themes when were asked of.

- Field testing evidence: Almost two thirds gave the same reasons for communication difficulties.

- **RESPONSE**: Both questions seem to get at the same construct based on cognitive and field testing evidence..

Discussion: Are there country biases?

- Cogntive testing findings:

  - Response distributions for both questions are very simalars for Granada and ESCAP countries.
  - Theme frecuencies are also quite similar across the two sets of countries.

- Field test findings:

  - Similar response and reason distributions for all countries but Kazhastan.

- RESPONSE: Lack of construct and, likley, method biases can be assumed.

Recommendations for WG short set

- Aim: to get a core set of questions for Census

- To mantain COM_SS (question 1) after considering making some changes.

- To remove COM_ES (question 2).

- To keep questions on forms of communication (or use of sing language).

Recommendation for COM_SS (question 1)

COM_ES
Using your usual language, do you have difficulty communicating, for example understanding or being understood?
New version for COM_ES
Due to health or physical problems, do you have difficulty communicating, for example understanding or being understood?

Changes:

a) To remove the clause "Using your usual language".

b) To include a new clause to focus respondents on the "intended" communication problems

Thanks for your attention

Don't hesitate to contact me for comments, doubts, or suggestions.

Jose-Luis Padilla

Email: jpadilla@ugr.es