AJSLP

Research Note

Constraint-Induced Aphasia Therapy Versus Intensive Semantic Treatment in Fluent Aphasia

Ineke Wilssens,[a,*] Dorien Vandenborre,[b,c,*] Kim van Dun,[c] Jo Verhoeven,[d,e] Evy Visch-Brink,[f] and Peter Mariën[a,c]

Objective: The authors compared the effectiveness of 2 intensive therapy methods: Constraint-Induced Aphasia Therapy (CIAT; Pulvermüller et al., 2001) and semantic therapy (BOX; Visch-Brink & Bajema, 2001).
Method: Nine patients with chronic fluent aphasia participated in a therapy program to establish behavioral treatment outcomes. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two groups (CIAT or BOX).
Results: Intensive therapy significantly improved verbal communication. However, BOX treatment showed a more pronounced improvement on two communication—namely, a standardized assessment for verbal communication, the Amsterdam Nijmegen Everyday Language Test (Blomert, Koster, & Kean, 1995), and a subjective rating scale, the Communicative Effectiveness Index (Lomas et al., 1989). All participants significantly improved on one (or more) subtests of the Aachen Aphasia Test (Graetz, de Bleser, & Willmes, 1992), an impairment-focused assessment. There was a treatment-specific effect. BOX treatment had a significant effect on language comprehension and semantics, whereas CIAT treatment affected language production and phonology.
Conclusion: The findings indicate that in patients with fluent aphasia, (a) intensive treatment has a significant effect on language and verbal communication, (b) intensive therapy results in selective treatment effects, and (c) an intensive semantic treatment shows a more striking mean improvement on verbal communication in comparison with communication-based CIAT treatment.

There has been increasing evidence that short term, intensive aphasia therapy in the chronic stages of aphasia recovery has a beneficial effect irrespective of the type of treatment. However, it is not clear what the optimal therapy content, intensity, and setting should be to deliver aphasia therapy across a variety of aphasia profiles in terms of aphasia severity, aphasia type/linguistic impairment, recovery stage, and lesion site (for a review, see Basso, 2005; Berthier, 2005; Brady, Kelly, Godwin, & Enderby, 2012; Robey, 1998). Aphasia therapies can either be based on a cognitive linguistic approach (Patterson & Shewell, 1987) or a communicative approach (Davis & Wilcox, 1985; Holland, 1991).

The cognitive linguistic approach is based on the theoretical framework of cognitive neuropsychology (Ellis & Young, 1996). In this approach, aphasia therapies focus on the language deficit itself in order to restore the linguistic processes involving semantics, phonology, morphology, and syntax. The improvement of linguistic skills will also improve patients' verbal communication ability (Doesborgh et al., 2004; Visch-Brink, Bajema, & Van de Sandt-Koenderman, 1997; Whitworth, Webster, & Howard, 2005). An example of a cognitive linguistic therapy is the Dutch drill-based lexical-semantic therapy program (i.e., BOX; Visch-Brink & Bajema, 2001).

Whereas the cognitive linguistic approach focuses on the language deficit, the emphasis of the communicative approach is on the communicative aspects of language. Important issues in this perspective are the compensation strategies in communicative settings and the application of

[a]ZNA Middelheim Hospital, Antwerp, Belgium
[b]Cepos, Rehabilitation Centre, Duffel, Belgium
[c]Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium
[d]Language and Communication Sciences, City University London, United Kingdom
[e]Computational Linguistics and Psycholinguistics, University of Antwerp, Antwerpen, Belgium
[f]Erasmus University Medical Centre, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
Correspondence to Peter Mariën: peter.marien5@telenet.be
[*]The first two authors contributed equally to the article.

Editor: Krista Wilkinson
Associate Editor: Daniel Kempler
Received January 29, 2014
Revision received August 25, 2014
Accepted January 22, 2015
DOI: 10.1044/2015_AJSLP-14-0018

Disclosure: *The authors have declared that no competing interests existed at the time of publication.*

residual skills in communication (Croteau & Le Dorze, 2006; Holland, 1991; Simmons-Mackie, Kearns, & Potechin, 2005). A typical communicative-based approach is Promoting Aphasic Communicative Effectiveness (Davis & Wilcox, 1985) where patients are permitted to communicate in any and all modalities (e.g., gesturing, pointing, and writing) throughout the therapy session.

A communicative therapy that is currently gaining ground is Constraint-Induced Aphasia Therapy (CIAT). The main difference between Promoting Aphasic Communicative Effectiveness and CIAT is the availability of alternative methods to support communication. CIAT is based on work that explores the use of constraint-induced movement therapy in rehabilitation after stroke (Taub, Uswatte, & Pidikiti, 1999). These studies have shown that motor behavior of an impaired limb can be modified by a short period of intensive constraint practice (Meinzer, Rodriguez, & Gonzalez Rothi, 2012; for a review, see Taub et al., 1999, 2002).

CIAT was introduced in 2001 in a randomized clinical trial with 17 chronic aphasia patients (Pulvermüller et al., 2001). CIAT is also known as CIAT plus (Meinzer, Djundja, Barthel, Elbert, & Rockstroh, 2005), Constraint-Induced Language Therapy (Maher et al., 2006), and Intensive Language Action Therapy (Pulvermüller & Berthier, 2008). This program consists of four major components: (a) massed practice (30 to 35 hr of speech therapy in 2 weeks), (b) shaping of responses (gradually increasing task and stimulus complexity), (c) constraint of compensatory (nonverbal) communication strategies, and (d) socially driven communication tasks—that is, therapy tasks involving interaction-based games (Difrancesco, Pulvermüller, & Mohr, 2012).

Although CIAT is appropriately defined as a communication-based approach, some elements of cognitive linguistic treatment might be incorporated in the shaping of the patient's responses. But the main aspect of CIAT is the communicative load because it involves the exchange of new information between participants in dialogues (Hengst, Duff, & Dettmer, 2010). CIAT not only improves verbal communication but also leads to a clinical improvement of language functions because it might entail the relearning of word-concept links and the rewiring of neuronal connections in language networks (Difrancesco et al., 2012).

The introduction of constraint-induced principles in aphasia rehabilitation has also created renewed interest in issues such as therapy intensity and massed practice (Basso, 2005; Bhogal, Teasell, Foley, & Speechley, 2003; Hinckley & Carr, 2005; Raymer et al., 2008). The beneficial effect of intensive treatment in the chronic stage of aphasia is consistent with recent work in neuroscience that supports several principles of experience-dependent neural plasticity in the rehabilitation after brain injury, including sufficient treatment intensity and the forced use of cognitive capacities (Barthel, Meinzer, Djundja, & Rockstroh, 2008; Kleim & Jones, 2008; Raymer et al., 2008). Robey (1998) carried out a meta-analysis of the effect of treatment intensity and concluded that there is a clear relationship between therapy intensity and the degree of improvement. Raymer et al. (2008) emphasized the need for systematic research into the optimal aphasia therapy. Standard therapy or different forms of communicative therapy also seem to benefit from more intense application (Barthel et al., 2008; Maher et al., 2006). Thus, the effectiveness of a short-term intensive treatment over a restricted period has been demonstrated in chronic aphasia patients regardless of the type of treatment (for a review, see Cherney, Patterson, Raymer, Frymark, & Schooling, 2008).

A large number of studies have focused on the treatment of patients with nonfluent aphasia (e.g., Conley & Coelho, 2003; Fridriksson et al., 2012; Links, Hurkmans, & Bastiaanse, 2010). However, studies on patients with fluent aphasia are rare. There is no proven method for the rehabilitation of fluent aphasia (Altschuler, Multari, Hirstein, & Ramachandran, 2006). One of the reasons might be the frequently observed anosognosia in patients with Wernicke aphasia, a problematic factor in relation to a systematic linguistic treatment. Another factor might be the great variation in the underlying linguistic disorders. Robson, Sage, and Lambon Ralph (2012) proposed three hypotheses to account for the comprehension impairment in fluent aphasia: (a) disruption of acoustic and/or phonological analysis (e.g., Moses, Nickels, & Sheard, 2004), (b) semantic impairment (e.g., Butterworth, 1992), or (c) a combined phonological-semantic impairment—that is, the dual hypothesis (e.g., Hillis, Boatman, Hart, & Gordon, 1999). Treatment of subjects with fluent aphasia can therefore focus on semantics, phonology, or even syntax (e.g., Boyle, 2004; Edwards & Tucker, 2006; Sampson & Faroqi-Shah, 2011). The disproportionate representation of nonfluent aphasia is also characteristic for CIAT studies. In an evidence-based review of the treatment-intensity effects in constraint-induced language therapy, Cherney et al. (2008) indicated that most of the participants in CIAT studies were nonfluent (60%, i.e., 42 of 70), and therefore it is questionable whether the results can be generalized to patients with fluent aphasia. Evidence from a cognitive linguistic approach has shown that specific treatment of a disturbed language level can have a significant impact on verbal communication—that is, the ability to bring the message across in speech (Doesborgh et al., 2004). From the CIAT literature, the evidence has shown that intensive treatment in a chronic aphasia population can augment conversational skills (Cherney et al., 2008). Therefore, we want to explore the relevance of both approaches in fluent aphasia: CIAT and cognitive linguistic treatment.

The objective of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of two intensive therapy programs in patients with chronic fluent aphasia after stroke: (a) a cognitive linguistic therapy—that is, an individualized drill-based lexical-semantic treatment using the Dutch therapy program BOX (Visch-Brink & Bajema, 2001), and (b) CIAT, a more communication-based group treatment focusing on verbal communication using constraints (Pulvermüller et al., 2001). It is predicted that a pure semantic treatment with BOX will have a selective favorable influence on verbal

semantic performance and that verbal communication skills will be enhanced at the activity level (Doesborgh et al., 2004) because of improved verbal semantic processing in everyday language. It is further predicted that a treatment with CIAT will not only have a positive effect on patients' verbal communication skills, but will also create significant improvement at different linguistic levels (i.e., semantics and phonology). Because CIAT in its nature is an oral communication–based treatment focusing on language production as well as language comprehension, it is reasonable to predict that it would have a positive effect on multiple levels of verbal communication. Consequently, it is expected that verbal communication, measured by a standardized assessment as well as by a subjective rating scale, will improve after both treatment methods.

Method and Procedure

Participants

The present study is an exploratory study in which participants with fluent aphasia were randomly assigned to CIAT (Pulvermüller et al., 2001) or BOX (Visch-Brink & Bajema, 2001); for more details, see the Appendix. The participants in this study were nine native speakers of Belgian Dutch (Verhoeven, 2005) with a mean age of 66.8 years ($SD = \pm 9.2$ years, range = 54 to 81 years) and chronic vascular fluent aphasia (mean duration = 56.9 months, $SD = \pm 37.7$ months, range = 17 to 138 months). Participants were recruited on the basis of the following inclusion criteria: (a) adult age, (b) single and first-ever stroke in the left hemisphere confirmed by structural brain imaging, (c) moderately impaired language function, and (d) fluent aphasia with a combined semantic and phonological deficit. The impairment of language functions was determined on the basis of the Stanine norms on the Token Test (TT) of the Dutch version of the Aachen Aphasia Test (AAT; Graetz et al., 1992). The criterion for a semantic deficit was a score below 2 *SD*s on at least one of the following semantic tasks: (a) AAT-Comprehension (Graetz et al., 1992), (b) Verbal Semantic Association Test (SAT; Visch-Brink, Stronks, & Denes, 2005), (c) Psycholinguistic Assessment of Language Processing in Aphasia (PALPA; Kay, Lesser, & Coltheart, 1992; for the Dutch version, see Bastiaanse, Bosje, & Visch-Brink, 1995) Synonym Judgment subtest, or (d) PALPA Semantic Word Association of low imageability words. The criterion for a phonological deficit was a score below 2 *SD*s on at least one of the following language tests: (a) AAT-Repetition, (b) PALPA Nonword Repetition, or (c) PALPA Auditory Lexical Decision.

Patients participating in any other treatment program, patients with an additional neurological or psychiatric disorder, and patients with severe perceptual, additional speech (e.g., verbal apraxia), or cognitive deficits evidenced by formal neuropsychological testing were explicitly excluded from this study. The demographic and neurological characteristics of the participants are summarized in Table 1.

Six participants were diagnosed with Wernicke's aphasia. The aphasia profile of the other three was consistent with a diagnosis of transcortical sensory aphasia. In seven patients, aphasia resulted from a left hemisphere ischemic stroke whereas two patients had a hemorrhage (see Table 1). In addition to the aphasiogenic lesion in the left temporoparietal region, a computerized tomography scan of the brain in patient B4 revealed a small cystic lesion in the right parietal lobe with slight attraction of the lateral ventricle. Aphasia symptoms in this patient, however, had emerged simultaneously with the left temporoparietal infarction only. Careful examination of the patient's medical history revealed that structural damage in the right parietal region had not resulted in clinically relevant symptoms and the aphasiogenic nature of this old lesion was formally ruled out. Although Meinzer, Djundja, Barthel, Elbert, and Rockstroh (2005) found no relationship between aphasia severity and the benefit of CIAT treatment, only patients with a moderately impaired language function were included because (a) CIAT requires similar levels of severity in the treatment groups and (b) in view of the small number of participants, a homogeneous aphasia sample was recruited.

Treatment Programs

CIAT treatment is a communication-based group interaction by means of communicative card games. The picture cards contain objects of high as well as low frequent words, black-and-white line drawings as well as colored pictures, pictures of objects as well as action cards, and pictures with minimal pairs (e.g., *sock* and *rock*); see *Participants Treatments* and the *Appendix* for more details. The intervention procedure was based on Maher et al. (2006), Meinzer et al. (2005, 2007), and Pulvermüller et al. (2001). In this study, patients were allowed to produce gestures in order to facilitate verbal output, but their gestures were hidden from the other participants by a 40-cm high screen between the patient and the other participants. As a result, gestures could not act as a primary means of communication, and participants were encouraged to use their verbal communicative abilities—that is, verbal expressions and phrases (for more details, see the Appendix).

The semantic therapy is a drill-based lexical-semantic treatment using BOX, which is a Dutch therapy program (Visch-Brink & Bajema, 2001). This program focuses on the interpretation of written words, sentences, and texts (also with an auditory presentation by the speech and language therapist if required). BOX contains a variety of semantic decision tasks aimed at enhancing semantic processing. There are eight different types of exercises within each task, and the patient is required to deny or confirm the semantic relationship between (written and auditorily presented) content words, either presented separately or within the context of a sentence or text (for more details, see the *Appendix*). Word choice, number of distractors, semantic relatedness, and ambiguity were taken into account in creating the different levels of difficulty (Visch-Brink et al., 1997).

Table 1. Demographic and neurological data.

Case	Age (years)	Gender	Handedness	Education (years)	Duration of aphasia (months)	Etiology	Lesion site	Classification of aphasia	Severity of aphasia pretest
C1	73	F	R	8	17	I	L	TC sensory	Moderate
C2	65	F	R	12	70	I	L	Wernicke	Moderate
C3	69	F	R	15	25	H	L	TC sensory	Moderate
C4	55	M	L	15	138	I	L	Wernicke	Moderate
C5	54	M	R	17	56	I	L	Wernicke	Moderate
M (*SD*)	63 (8)			12 (6)	61 (48)				
B1	60	M	R	13	61	H	L	Wernicke	Moderate
B2	76	M	R	12	26	I	L	Wernicke	Moderate
B3	81	M	R	15	82	I	L	TC sensory	Moderate
B4	68	M	R	12	37	I	L	Wernicke	Moderate
M (*SD*)	71 (9)			13 (1)	52 (25)				

Note. C = Constraint-Induced Aphasia Therapy (CIAT) treatment group; F = female; R = right; I = ischemic; L = left; TC = transcortical; H = hemorrhagic; M = male; B = lexical semantic therapy (BOX) treatment group.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of the above treatments. One group (three women and two men) received communication-based treatment (CIAT), whereas the other group (four men) received semantic treatment (BOX). The groups did not differ significantly in age, $t(7) = -1.4$, $p = .214$, aphasia duration, $t(7) = 0.4$, $p = .728$, or education level, $t(7) = -0.7$, $p = .621$. The group allocation was computer generated and remained concealed in sequentially numbered opaque, sealed envelopes until randomization.

Intervention

Therapist Training

Intervention was administered by seven trained speech-language pathology students (3rd-year professional bachelor level). During the first 2 days of the training, the students remained under the supervision of six experienced and professionally trained speech and language therapists. Students were trained according to the training protocol of laypeople designed by Meinzer et al. (2007). The speech and language therapists had been given detailed instructions by means of a 2-hr presentation in which the study was presented. The basic principles of BOX and CIAT were introduced, and the materials, procedures, and approaches of both types of intervention were carefully explained. In addition, students were given a 1-hr practical training session. Instruction sessions contained illustrative video materials. The students and therapists were given a detailed manual with explicit guidelines about CIAT and BOX. The students and therapists kept a detailed daily record of each intervention, specifying the presence of participants and therapists, the duration of the training in minutes, and the training materials used. These records were used for a daily evaluation and critical assessment of each session in order to adjust individual or group task difficulty for the next session.

Participant Treatment

All patients received treatment during 2- to 3-hr sessions per day on nine or 10 consecutive working days (total mean duration $\pm$ *SD* = 1175 $\pm$ 64 min, pauses not included). There was no significant difference in the amount of treatment between the CIAT group (total mean duration $\pm$ *SD* = 1195 $\pm$ 59 min) and the BOX group (total mean duration $\pm$ *SD* = 1150 $\pm$ 69 min) in terms of the mean duration of intervention in minutes, $t(7) = 1.1$, $p = .328$. Each session was interrupted by two breaks of 10 to 15 min.

For the CIAT treatment the dual card game, which has been used in prior studies (e.g., Maher et al., 2006), was used. In this game, participants are dealt cards from a set of 32 to 42 colored cards (i.e., 16 to 21 pairs of identical cards) per 45-min treatments. They take turns either requesting an identical card from the other participant (four to six cards per participant) or responding to that request (Breier et al., 2009; Faroqi-Shah & Virion, 2009). Constraints were along three dimensions: (a) difficulty of the material, (b) the rules of the game, as indicated by verbal instruction and shaping, and (c) reinforcement contingencies (Pulvermüller et al., 2001).

The patients in the BOX group worked alternatively by themselves on worksheets and with the therapist according to a therapy schedule (see Table 2), which allowed one therapist to supervise two patients. For example, on the first day, Patient 1 started with 30 min of therapy (Therapy Schedule BOX 1) whereas Patient 2 began with a 30-min individual working session (Therapy Schedule BOX 2). The next day, participants swapped therapy schedules. Patients were able to adjust their personal level of difficulty. In order to apply the shaping principle (see the Appendix for more details), therapists monitored performance and solicited patient feedback to ensure that patients were challenged but not overly frustrated.

Five intervention groups (two CIAT and three BOX sessions) were formed. Intervention sessions were held at four different hospitals of Ziekenhuis Netwerk Antwerp—that is, Middelheim, Jan Palfijn, Sint-Erasmus, and CEPOS Duffel. C1, C2, and C3 were treated at Middelheim by two students; C4 and C5 together with another patient

Table 2. Therapy schedule in minutes for BOX 1, BOX 2, and CIAT.

Therapy Schedule BOX 1	Therapy Schedule BOX 2	Therapy Schedule CIAT
A: Therapy session	A: Individual work session	C: Therapy session
B: Individual work session	B: Therapy session	
Pause	Pause	Pause
A: Individual work session	A: Therapy session	C: Therapy session
B: Therapy session	B: Individual work session	
Pause	Pause	Pause
A: Therapy session	A: Individual work session	C: Therapy session
B: Individual work session	B: Therapy session	
Total		
75-min therapy sessions	60-min therapy sessions	135-min therapy sessions
60-min individual work sessions	75-min individual work sessions	

Note. BOX = lexical semantic therapy; CIAT = Constraint-Induced Aphasia Therapy; A = first part of 45-min session (i.e., 30 minutes); C = 45-min session; B = last part of 45-minute session (i.e., 15minutes).

with a very mild aphasia were treated at CEPOS Duffel by two other students (the last patient was excluded because he scored within normal range on the TT at pretest). The CIAT groups had the same group members and the same speech-language therapy students throughout the intervention, The BOX participants were individually treated by another three students at Middelheim (B1 and B2), Jan Palfijn (B3), and Sint-Erasmus (B4). The student therapists were supervised by one of the authors, a licensed clinician. Informed consent was obtained from each participant or from a close relative. The study was approved by the local Ethics Committee of Ziekenhuis Netwerk Antwerp.

Measures

Before entering the study, all participants were administered Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices (Raven, 1976), on which they had to obtain a score above the 75th percentile (see Table 3). Handedness was formally assessed by means of a standard handedness inventory (Oldfield, 1971). All participants were formally tested at two different time points during the study: before the treatment (pretest) and 1 week after treatment, to check which therapy condition was the most effective (posttest). The language assessment protocol (see Table 3) consisted of (a) AAT (Graetz et al., 1992), (b) BNT (Kaplan, Goodglass, & Weintraub, 1983; Mariën, Mampaey, Vervaet, Saerens, & De Deyn, 1998), (c) PALPA (Kay et al., 1992; Dutch version: Bastiaanse et al., 1995), (d) SAT (Visch-Brink et al., 2005), (e) Amsterdam Nijmegen Everyday Language Test (ANELT; Blomert et al., 1995), and (f) Communicative Effectiveness Index (CETI; Lomas et al., 1989). Pre- and posttest assessment consisted of an extensive impairment-focused assessment (a–f) together with discourse outcome measures (e and f) because the ultimate aim of aphasia treatment is an improvement of communication rather than a reduction of language impairment (Carragher, Conroy, Sage, & Wilkinson, 2012).

The AAT (Graetz et al., 1992) is a standardized comprehensive language battery that consists of five blocks: the TT, repetition tasks, written language tasks, naming tasks, and comprehension tasks. The test has a high test–retest reliability: 2-day interval retest reliability is > .91 for all subtests in chronic aphasia patients (Graetz et al., 1992, p. 96). The AAT was used to obtain a formal description of the individuals' language skills. The BNT (Kaplan et al.,

Table 3. Test procedure.

Purpose	Test
To establish functional lateralization of the brain	Handedness Inventory
To measure visuoperceptual problem solving	Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices
To establish an overall cognitive linguistic profile	Aachen Aphasia Test
	Boston Naming Test
To measure semantic outcomes	PALPA Synonym Judgment test
	PALPA Semantic Word Association of low imageability words
	Visual Semantic Association Test
	Verbal Semantic Association Test
To measure phonological outcomes	PALPA Nonword Repetition
	PALPA Auditory Lexical Decision
To measure verbal communication and social validation	Amsterdam, Nijmegen Everyday Language Test
	Communicative Effectiveness Index
To evaluate satisfaction	Written, nonstandardized subjective rating scale

Note. PALPA = Psycholinguistic Assessment of Language Processing in Aphasia.

1983; Mariën et al., 1998) is a naming test consisting of 60 line drawings representing objects, animals, foods, and plants. The test was included in the study because naming is a sensitive outcome measure for linguistic improvement in aphasia (Strauss, Sherman, & Spreen, 2006). Subtests of the PALPA (Bastiaanse et al., 1995)—Synonym Judgment, Semantic Word Association of low imageability words, Nonword Repetition, and Auditory Lexical Decision—and the SAT (Visch-Brink et al., 2005)—Visual and Verbal SAT—were added to obtain a more detailed picture of participants' phonological and semantic abilities. The ANELT (Blomert et al., 1995) was administered to identify and rate the severity of the verbal communicative deficit. In addition, the quality of verbal communication in everyday life was measured by means of a Dutch translation of the CETI (Lomas et al., 1989), which is a 16-item visual analog scale scored by patients with aphasia and their relatives. After the treatment, all patients were given a written nonstandardized questionnaire regarding their satisfaction. They had to answer six questions on a seven-point Likert rating scale. The questions were about (a) the satisfaction of participation, (b) whether or not they would participate a second time, (c) the feasibility and the pleasantness of the intensive treatment, and (d) the preference of an intensive treatment above a nonintensive treatment. The ANELT and the CETI both measure verbal communication. They differ in that the ANELT is a standardized test for verbal communication, consisting of 10 verbal scenarios to be answered by the aphasic patient. The verbal responses are rated for informational content on a 0–5 rating scale. Because in severe aphasia there might be a difference between the judgments of verbal communicative ability between experts and relatives (De Jong-Hagelstein et al., 2012), we also administered the CETI. The CETI is a subjective rating scale filled in by the patient as well as by their relatives. Patient scores on the language tests are summarized in Tables 4–6.

Statistical Analysis

Because of the small sample size, a nonparametric statistical analysis (i.e., Mann-Whitney or Wilcoxon test) was carried out in addition to the parametric statistical analysis of the linguistic data. Only the parametric analysis is reported here because there was no difference with the nonparametric tests. Differences in mean scores between groups on the ANELT and CETI were compared by means of independent-samples two-tailed *t* tests. The improvement on the ANELT, CETI, and AAT (*T*-transformed raw scores on five subtests), was measured by means of a paired-samples two-tailed *t* test. The effect size (Cohen's *d*) was derived from within-group comparisons of the pre- and postdifference mean score from each treatment (Cohen, 1988). Critical changes in raw scores are discussed on an individual basis for all measurement outcomes. The AAT and BNT scores and the results on the subtests of the SAT and the PALPA are reported individually and evaluated based on the change before and after treatment.

Results

Verbal communication in everyday life as measured by the ANELT (Blomert et al., 1995) showed a critical change in raw scores for six out of nine (C2, C4, C5, B1, B2, and B3) participants (see Table 4). There was a significant improvement for both groups combined: mean improvement = 11.8, $t(8) = 6.00$, $p < .001$. Improvement was smaller in the CIAT group, mean improvement = 6.2, $t(4) = 3.62$, $p = .022$, $d = 1.62$, than in the BOX group, mean improvement = 8.3, $t(3) = 4.99$, $p = .015$, $d = 2.50$. This difference was not statistically significant, $t(7) = -0.85$, $p = .426$. However, it is important to notice the significant difference in the prescores, $t(7) = 3.40$, $p = .011$, where patients in the BOX group started with a significantly lower

Table 4. Individual case data: ANELT and CETI pre- and posttherapy and improvement.

	ANELT (max 50)			CETI (max 100)		
Case	Pre	Post	I	Pre	Post	I
CIAT						
C1	41	45	4	54.7	61.0	6.3
C2	35	46	**11**	46.1	52.4	6.3
C3	38	39	1	43.4	43.4	0.0
C4	32	40	**8**	25	56.2	**31.2**
C5	40	47	**7**	40	39.2	–0.8
M (*SD*)	37.2 (3.7)	43.4 (3.6)	6.2 (3.8)	41.9 (10.9)	50.5 (9.0)	8.6 (13.1)
BOX						
B1	29	37	**8**	44.1	61.5	**17.4**
B2	33	42	**9**	56.7	69.6	**12.9**
B3	30	42	**12**	64.2	85	**20.8**
B4	26	30	4	89.4	—	—
M (*SD*)	29.5 (2.9)	37.8 (5.7)	**8.3 (3.3)**	55 (10.2)	72 (12.0)	**17 (4.0)**

Note. ANELT = Amsterdam Nijmegen Everyday Language Test; CETI = Communicative Effectiveness Index; I = improvement; CIAT = Constraint-Induced Aphasia Therapy; C = CIAT, BOX = lexical semantic therapy; B = BOX. Bold numbers indicate a critical change in raw score of an individual as defined by ANELT (≥ 7 points) or by CETI (≥ 10 points). Dashes indicate "data not available."

Table 5. Individual case data: Aachen Aphasia Test (Token Test, Comprehension, Repetition, Naming, Written Language) and BNT raw scores pre- and posttherapy.

	CIAT group												BOX group									
	C1		C2		C3		C4		C5		*M* (*SD*)		B1		B2		B3		B4		*M* (*SD*)	
Test	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Token Test (max 50)	**29**	**20**	**28**	**18**	**38**	**28**	**39**	**24**	**32**	**17**	**33.2 (5.1)**	**21.4 (4.6)**	**29**	**20**	**24**	**13**	39	34	27	26	29.8 (6.5)	23.3 (8.9)
Comprehension (max 120)	81	92	79	87	88	86	87	96	104	100	87.8 (9.8)	92.2 (5.9)	103	110	100	113	66	83	104	113	93.3 (18.2)	104.8 (14.6)
Repetition (max 150)	144	148	119	124	132	136	116	130	105	108	121.2(16.4)	129.2 (14.8)	117	120	136	143	145	143	95	94	123.3 (22.2)	125.0 (23.3)
Compounds (max 30)	29	29	22	22	**18**	**23**	**20**	**26**	17	10	21.2 (4.8)	22.0 (7.2)	18	16	26	29	29	29	9	12	20.5 (9.0)	21.5 (8.8)
Sentences (max 30)	27	29	14	16	24	23	**12**	**18**	9	12	17.2 (7.8)	19.6 (6.6)	13	16	25	25	28	26	9	11	18.8 (9.2)	19.5 (7.2)
Naming (max 120)	93	96	96	102	66	75	90	99	99	111	88.8 (13.2)	96.6 (13.3)	**86**	**105**	96	87	48	57	**77**	**104**	76.8 (20.7)	88.3 (22.4)
Color (max 30)	27	27	28	28	**16**	**25**	28	27	30	30	25.8 (5.6)	27.4 (1.8)	30	30	23	18	14	15	30	30	24.3 (7.6)	23.3 (7.9)
Compounds (max 30)	25	22	20	22	12	12	23	24	**19**	**28**	19.8 (5.0)	21.6 (5.9)	17	26	25	22	10	12	**16**	**28**	17.0 (6.2)	22.0 (7.1)
Sentences (max 30)	**16**	**21**	21	23	18	18	**13**	**25**	20	23	17.6 (3.2)	22.0 (2.6)	14	20	24	20	**7**	**13**	**10**	**16**	13.8 (7.4)	17.3 (3.4)
Written Language (max 90)	84	87	82	84	67	72	81	82	66	70	76.0 (8.7)	79.0 (7.5)	82	85	76	73	79	85	65	74	75.5 (7.4)	79.3 (6.6)
To dictation (max 30)	26	27	28	27	**23**	**29**	26	25	**11**	**17**	22.8 (6.8)	25.0 (4.7)	27	27	23	20	26	27	**15**	**21**	22.8 (5.4)	23.8 (3.8)
BNT (max 60)	**30**	**45**	**33**	**39**	**7**	**17**	**37**	**44**	**44**	**54**	**30.2 (14.0)**	**39.8 (13.8)**	**37**	**46**	46	45	**0**	**19**	**33**	**49**	29.0 (20.1)	39.8 (13.9)

Note. Bold numbers indicate on an individual basis either (a) a critical change in raw score as defined by the AAT (Token Test = 8, Comprehension = 22, Repetition = 15 [compounds = 7, sentences = 7], Naming = 17 [colors = 10], Compounds = 10 [sentences = 7], Written Language = 12 [writing to dictation = 8]) or (b) a change in score of ≥ 2 *SD*s from the gender-, age-, and education-adjusted mean normal performance on the BNT. Token Test is an error score.

Table 6. Individual case data: Raw scores and mean scores pre- and posttherapy on semantic and phonological measures (n = 9).

	Semantic measures						Phonological measures			
	Verbal semantic word association (SAT; max 30)		Semantic word association low imageability (PALPA; max 15)		Auditory synonym judgment (PALPA; max 60)		Nonword repetition (PALPA; max 30)		Auditory lexical decision (PALPA; max 160)	
Case	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
C1	24	22	6	7	47	49	28	27	149	148
C2	21	24	14	13	51	51	**18**	**21**	**131**	**140**
C3	**18**	**28**	6	7	54	52	27	29	156	156
C4	22	25	**8**	**10**	52	53	**18**	**27**	**129**	**152**
C5	30	27	13	12	57	57	21	22	157	160
M (*SD*)	23.0 (4.5)	25.2 (2.4)	9.4 (3.8)	9.8 (2.8)	52.2 (3.7)	52.4 (3.0)	22.4 (4.8)	23.4 (6.9)	144.4 (13.5)	151.2 (7.7)
B1	27	28	**12**	**14**	**52**	**59**	28	26	159	154
B2	23	27	**8**	**10**	**49**	**55**	24	25	141	140
B3	13	12	**3**	**6**	46	46	26	28	**139**	**144**
B4	27	30	**12**	**14**	**54**	**58**	3	4	**124**	**136**
M (*SD*)	22.5 (6.6)	24.2 (8.3)	**8.7 (4.3)**	**11 (3.9)**	**50.2 (3.5)**	**54.5 (5.9)**	20.2 (11.6)	20.7 (11.2)	140.75 (14.3)	143.5 (7.7)

Note. Bold numbers indicate on an individual basis a change in raw score of ≥ 6 points on the Semantic Association Test (SAT), ≥ 2 points on the semantic word association for low imageability words, ≥ 3 points on the auditory synonym judgment, ≥ 3 points on the repetition of nonwords, or ≥ 5 points on auditory lexical decision. PALPA = Psycholinguistic Assessment of Language Processing in Aphasia.

score on the ANELT than the patients of the CIAT group, which could have influenced the level of improvement.

Verbal communication in everyday life was also measured by means of the CETI (Lomas et al., 1989), which showed a critical change in raw score for four out of nine (C4, B1, B2, and B3) participants (see Table 4). The relatives of the participants indicated that the effectiveness of the patients' communication had significantly improved after treatment, mean improvement = 11.8, $t(7) = 3.02$, $p = .019$, for both treatment groups combined. No statistically significant difference in improvement after treatment was found between CIAT and BOX therapy, $t(6) = 1.01$, $p = .332$. When comparing pre- and postscores for both groups separately, however, no statistically significant difference was found in the CIAT group, $t(4) = 1.47$, $p = .216$, $d = 0.66$, whereas in the BOX group, the improvement was significant, $t(2) = 7.40$, $p = .019$, $d = 4.27$. In addition, the pre- and postscores of the BOX group were higher than the pre- and postscores of the CIAT group on the CETI. Although the difference between the prescores of both groups did not reach statistical significance, $t(6) = 1.69$, $p = .142$, the difference between the postscores did, $t(6) = -2.93$, $p = .026$.

Regarding the impairment-focused assessments, all participants (N = 9) achieved a critical change in raw score as defined by the AAT (Graetz et al., 1992) on at least one of the AAT subtests or subscales (see Table 5). Both groups improved on four AAT language subtests—that is, Comprehension, Repetition, Naming, and Written Language. Only the amount of progress differed. Thus, although none of the BOX patients showed a critical improvement in raw score, the improvement in the BOX group was significant on the comprehension task, $t(3) = 5.19$, $p = .014$, $d = 2.59$, but the progress of language production was not—that is, Repetition, $t(3) = 0.85$, $p = .457$; Naming, $t(3) = 1.48$, $p = .235$; and Written Language, $t(3) = 1.46$, $p = .239$ (see Table 7). For the CIAT group, the opposite was observed: the improvement on the comprehension task did not reach significance, $t(4) = 1.43$, $p = .226$, but these participants scored well on language production—that is, Repetition, $t(4) = 3.00$, $p = .04$, $d = 1.34$; Naming, $t(4) = 5.10$, $p = .007$, $d = 2.28$; and Written Language, $t(4) = 4.24$, $p = .013$, $d = 1.90$ (see Table 7). Only one CIAT participant (C5) showed a critical loss of score on the Repetition Compounds task (see Table 5). The CIAT group did very well on the TT, $t(4) = 8.95$, $p = .001$, $d = 4.00$, and the BNT (Mariën et al., 1998), $t(4) = 6.12$, $p = .004$, $d = 2.74$ (see Table 7). The improvement of the BOX group did not reach significance on either the TT, $t(3) = 2.93$, $p = .061$, or the BNT, $t(3) = 2.42$, $p = .094$. This, however, could be due to the small sample size (n = 4), which would require a very large effect size in order to reach significance. In the CIAT group, this effect size was large enough to overcome the small sample size (n = 5), whereas in the BOX group, this was not the case. No

Table 7. Statistics of the comparison (paired t tests) between the pre- and postscores on the subtests of the Aachen Aphasia Test (Comprehension, Token Test, Repetition, Naming, Written Language) and on the BNT of the CIAT and BOX groups.

	CIAT group		BOX group	
Subtest	$t(4)$	p	$t(3)$	p
Comprehension	1.43	.226	5.19	**.014**
Token Test	8.95	**.001**	2.93	.061
Repetition	3.00	**.040**	0.85	.457
Naming	5.10	**.007**	1.48	.235
Written Language	4.24	**.013**	1.46	.239
BNT	6.12	**.004**	2.42	.094

Note. Bold numbers indicate a significant difference in pre- and postscores according to the paired t test ($p \leq .05$).

differences were found between the two groups in the prescores on the TT, $t(7) = 0.90$, $p = .399$, and the BNT, $t(7) = 0.11$, $p = .919$.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of BOX and CIAT in patients with fluent aphasia, semantic and phonological measures were analyzed in more detail by means of various subtests of SAT and PALPA. Table 6 summarizes mean progress on these measures after the two treatments. After BOX treatment, all four participants demonstrated critical gains on the subtest Semantic Word Association low imageability. Three out of four (B1, B2, and B4) as well demonstrated critical gains on the Auditory Synonym Judgment subtest of the PALPA. However, none of the four patients showed significant improvement on the SAT verbal. By contrast, only two out of five (C3, C4) CIAT participants showed a change of 2 *SD*s on semantic measures (C3 on SAT verbal and C4 on PALPA semantic word association).

Considering the phonological measures, two out of five CIAT participants (C2, C4) demonstrated critical changes on both phonological tests (see Table 6)—that is, Auditory Lexical Decision and Nonword Repetition. Two out of four BOX participants (B3, B4) showed critical gains on the Auditory Lexical Decision task (see Table 6).

All participants expressed their satisfaction with the therapy and indicated that they would like to participate a second time. Patients unanimously agreed that intensive treatment was tolerable. All participants preferred a short period of intensive treatment over a prolonged treatment period. The BOX participants strongly agreed that their communication skills had improved after treatment, whereas there was less agreement among CIAT participants.

Discussion

Although only preliminary conclusions can be drawn from the relatively small sample size, this study demonstrates that chronic patients with a diagnosis of a moderate fluent aphasia after a left vascular lesion may significantly benefit from an intensive CIAT or BOX treatment in the chronic stage of recovery. Nine participants with a diagnosis of Wernicke aphasia or transcortical sensory aphasia with an underlying semantic and phonological deficit received intensive semantic treatment (i.e., BOX) or constraint-induced communicative treatment (i.e., CIAT). The two types of intervention differed in the theoretical perspective of the therapy (i.e., impairment-focused vs. focus on constraint-induced principles), the content (i.e., focus on semantics vs. focus on verbal communication), and the nature of the interaction (i.e., one-to-one vs. group therapy). The therapy regime (duration, frequency, and intensity) was identical in both groups, and both groups received an intensive treatment of 30 hr over nine to 10 weekdays. Meinzer et al. (2005), Maher et al. (2006), Barthel et al. (2008), and Berthier and Pulvermüller (2011) have demonstrated that treatment intensity has a positive effect on the language and communication skills in a heterogeneous group of patients with chronic vascular aphasia. The findings of the present study are in line with these results and support the general behavioral effectiveness of a short-term intensive treatment approach in the chronic stage of aphasia.

In a homogeneous group—that is, a chronic moderate fluent aphasia population—verbal communication (ANELT) showed a significant improvement for both groups, but improvement was smaller in the CIAT group than in the BOX group; nevertheless, the CIAT group scored better on language production (AAT-Repetition, AAT-Naming, and BNT) than the BOX group. The more limited improvement on verbal communication (ANELT and CETI) might be in contradiction with the findings of Kirmess and Lind (2011) who found more improvement in everyday communication after CIAT, possibly because turn-taking and interactional behavior are trained more intensively compared with purely carrying out written instructions after semantic treatment. It is important to notice that two factors could have influenced the improvement: (a) the significant difference in the prescores on the ANELT (e.g., scores of BOX group < scores of CIAT group) and (b) the way verbal effectiveness is measured. First, the smaller potential for improvement in the CIAT group possibly have resulted in a lesser mean improvement, making a comparison between the two groups difficult. Second, the ANELT is a qualitative measure, looking at the verbal response as a whole, whereas a linguistic analysis, a quantitative detailed description of parameters such as the type token ratio and mean length of utterance of the ANELT responses, might have been more sensitive to detect changes in verbal effectiveness over time (Doesborgh et al., 2004; Grande et al., 2008; Ruiter, Kolk, Rietveld, Dijkstra, & Lotgering, 2011). With the CETI, however, no statistically significant improvement was found for the CIAT group. In contrast, the BOX group did improve significantly on the CETI even though the prescores of the BOX group on the CETI were higher than those of the CIAT group, resulting in significant higher postscores in the BOX group than in the CIAT group.

Regarding the impairment-focused assessments, all participants ($N = 9$) improved on at least one of the AAT subtests or subscales—that is, Comprehension, Repetition, Naming, and Written Language. Only the amount of progress differed: The improvement in the BOX group was significant on the comprehension task, but the change in language production was not. For the CIAT group, the opposite was true: There was no significant improvement on comprehension, although a significant improvement on language production was noted. A significant improvement was noted for the CIAT group both on the TT (an aphasia severity scale) and BNT (a confrontation naming test), but not for the BOX group. This, however, could be due to the small sample size. Small sample sizes require a very large effect size in order to reach significance. More in-depth linguistic analysis (PALPA and SAT) showed that intensive task-oriented cognitive linguistic treatment of a specifically impaired linguistic level—BOX, a purely semantic treatment—in a chronic fluent aphasia population led to a significant improvement on two semantic measures (Semantic Word Association low imageability and Auditory Synonym Judgment) for almost all

BOX participants (B1, B2, and B4, see Table 7). By contrast, only two out of five CIAT participants critically improved on semantics (C3 and C4). For phonology, two out of five CIAT participants (C2 and C4) showed significant improvement on both phonological tests, whereas in the BOX group, improvement was seen on only one phonological subtest (Auditory Lexical Decision) in two out of four participants (B3 and B4). These linguistic results are in line with the results of Barthel et al. (2008), who emphasized that treatment effects were best achieved by specific and intensive treatment. The results are also in agreement with the findings of previous cognitive linguistic studies (Doesborgh et al., 2004; Visch-Brink et al., 1997) that reported a significant influence on semantics but not on phonology after pure semantic treatment. The results also meet neurobiological principles of use-dependent learning, wherein intensity as well as specificity of treatment affects improvement (Maher et al., 2006). Intensity has been reported in the literature to be an important factor in the outcomes of aphasia rehabilitation (e.g., Bhogal et al., 2003). However, intensity alone cannot explain the positive differences between the two groups' performance because intensity was controlled. These results demonstrate that intensity of treatment as well as specificity of treatment could influence therapy outcome. In the BOX group, lexical semantic skills—that is, the underlying linguistic skill of comprehension—were trained. In the CIAT group, however, treatment focused on forced use of spoken language so that phonology—that is, the underlying linguistic skill of language production—was trained. Kleim and Jones (2008) reported that treatment driven by a specific brain function can lead to an enhancement of that function.

In general, it was demonstrated that both types of therapy, CIAT and BOX, have a positive effect on verbal communication in chronic fluent aphasia. However, three out of nine (C1, C3, and B4) patients failed to improve on verbal communication (ANELT results). These three patients did improve significantly on impairment-focused language tasks—that is, naming (AAT-naming and BNT). This might be due to the fact that a naming test is less complicated than a communicative test in terms of the load on the language system and other cognitive functions. A naming test requires a straightforward word-level response, whereas a communicative test requires a coherent discourse-level response. A naming test might be less challenging for the cognitive system (the visual stimulus is the starting point of the clearly defined response), whereas a communicative test is influenced by auditory working memory (the patient has to memorize the instruction as well as the scenario) and by executive functioning (the patient has to consistently structure an answer and has to delineate a response).

Besides the small sample size and the chosen outcome measures, some other limitations to the study should be taken into account: (a) previous treatment experience by the participants, (b) relevance of materials, (c) clinician's experience, and (d) group versus single-patient setting. First, it is not known which therapy regimen (content or quantity) the participants have received before participating in this study. It is known that none of the nine participants had prior exposure to an intensive therapy program. As Holland, Greenhouse, Fromm, and Swindell (1989) noted, previous treatment might be an influential factor on treatment outcome because the treatment might facilitate or speed up neural recovery processes. Second, Murray and Clark (2006) found that the degree of relevance of materials to the participant contributes to generalization. This factor was not examined in this study. Third, the CIAT and BOX treatments were given by seven different students, and although these students received the same training and coaching, their experience, personality, and way of shaping might have influenced the participants' outcome. The fact that students instead of professionals supervised the interventions should have no impact because several studies (Davis, Enderby, & Bainton, 1982; Lesser, Bryan, Anderson, & Hilton, 1986; Marshall et al., 1989; Meikle et al., 1979; Shewan & Kertesz, 1984; Wertz et al., 1986; Worrall & Yiu, 2000) found no differences in language improvement of patients with aphasia when treatments were applied by trained laypersons or by professional therapists (Meinzer at al., 2007). Fourth, therapy in a single-patient setting is more intensive than in a group setting, where practice time is divided among the group members (Berthier & Pulvermüller, 2011). In this study, CIAT participants received as much individualized cueing as necessary for a successful expression (no detailed records were kept to count the exact minutes), whereas BOX participants alternated between working by themselves and with the therapist. This might have caused a more intensive experience for the BOX group.

The question remains whether a specific treatment—BOX or CIAT—delivered under different conditions (i.e., varying the intensity schedule, quantity of treatment, aphasia population/linguistic impairments, involving relatives) would still yield positive outcomes. Some suggestions for further study can be summarized as follows:

1. How can the delivery of therapy be restructured to enhance the learning effect (e.g., is an intensive treatment schedule beneficial in the subacute phase)?
2. Which type of aphasia responds best to intensive treatment? For example, is an intensive phonological treatment in an individual with conduction aphasia more useful than CIAT therapy (Goral & Kempler, 2009; Szaflarski et al., 2008)?
3. Which linguistic process should be intensively trained (e.g., will an intensive, phonologically based therapy in fluent aphasia also significantly improve verbal communication)?
4. What are the most appropriate outcome measures to assess treatment gains? For example, is more attention to conversation screening and analysis as useful as in-depth assessment of the affect on verbal communication (Difrancesco et al., 2012)?

We can conclude based on this explorative study that intensive treatment has a significant effect on language and communication skills and that an intensive semantic treatment—that is, BOX—results in selective treatment effects and a more pronounced improvement of verbal communication when compared with CIAT.

Acknowledgment

This study was performed at the Department of Clinical and Experimental Neurolinguistics, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium.

The first two authors contributed equally to the article.

References

Altschuler, E. L., Multari, A., Hirstein, W., & Ramachandran, V. S. (2006). Situational therapy for Wernicke's aphasia. *Medical Hypotheses, 67,* 713–176.

Baayen, R. H., Piepenbrock, R., & van Rijn, H. (1993). *The CELEX lexical database* (CD-ROM). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Linguistic Data Consortium.

Barthel, G., Meinzer, M., Djundja, D., & Rockstroh, B. (2008). Intensive language therapy in chronic aphasia: Which aspects contribute most? *Aphasiology, 22,* 408–421.

Basso, A. (2005). How intensive/prolonged should an intensive/prolonged treatment be? *Aphasiology, 19,* 975–984.

Bastiaanse, R., Bosje, M., & Visch-Brink, E. (1995). *Psycholinguistic assessments of language processing in aphasia* (Dutch ed.). East Sussex, United Kingdom: Erlbaum.

Berthier, M. L. (2005). Poststroke aphasia, epidemiology, pathophysiology and treatment. *Drugs & Aging, 22,* 163–182.

Berthier, M. L., & Pulvermüller, F. (2011). Neuroscience insights improve neurorehabilitation of poststroke aphasia. *Neurology, 7,* 86–97.

Bhogal, S. K., Teasell, R. W., Foley, N. C., & Speechley, M. R. (2003). Rehabilitation of aphasia: More is better. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation, 10,* 66–76.

Blomert, L., Koster, Ch., & Kean, M. L. (1995). *Amsterdam-Nijmegen test voor alledaagse taalvaardigheid* [Amsterdam-Nijmegen Everyday Language Test]. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Boyle, M. (2004). Semantic feature analysis treatment for anomia in two fluent aphasia syndromes. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 13,* 236–249.

Brady, M. C., Kelly, H., Godwin, J., & Enderby, P. (2012). Speech and language therapy for aphasia following stroke. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2012*(5), 1–228. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD000425.pub3

Breier, J. L., Juranek, J., Maher, L. M., Schmadeke, S., Med, D., & Papanicolaou, A. C. (2009). Behavioral and neurophysiologic response to therapy for chronic aphasia. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 90,* 2026–2033.

Butterworth, B. (1992). Disorders of phonological encoding. *Cognition, 42,* 261–286.

Carragher, M., Conroy, P., Sage, K., & Wilkinson, R. (2012). Can impairment-focused therapy change the everyday conversations of people with aphasia? A review of the literature and future directions. *Aphasiology, 26,* 895–916.

Cherney, L. R., Patterson, J. P., Raymer, A., Frymark, T., & Schooling, T. (2008). Evidence-based systematic review: Effects of intensity of treatment and constraint-induced language therapy for individuals with stroke-induced aphasia. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 51,* 1282–1299.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Conley, A., & Coelho, C. (2003). Treatment of word retrieval impairment in chronic Broca's aphasia. *Aphasiology, 17,* 203–211.

Croteau, A., & Le Dorze, G. (2006). Overprotection, "speaking for," and conversational participation: A study of couples with aphasia. *Aphasiology, 20,* 327–336.

Davis, G., Enderby, P., & Bainton, D. (1982). Treatment of acquired aphasia: Speech therapists and volunteers compared. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry, 45,* 957–961.

Davis, G., & Wilcox, M. (1985). *Adult aphasia rehabilitation: Applied pragmatics*. San Diego, CA: College-Hill Press.

De Jong-Hagelstein, M., Kros, L., Lingsma, H. F., Dippel, D. W. J., Koudstaal, P. J., & Visch-Brink, E. G. (2012). Expert versus proxy rating of verbal communicative ability in people with aphasia after stroke. *Journal of International Neuropsychological Society, 18,* 1064–1070.

Difrancesco, S., Pulvermüller, F., & Mohr, B. (2012). Intensive language-actions therapy (ILAT): The methods. *Aphasiology, 26,* 1317–1351.

Doesborgh, S. J. C., van de Sandt-Koenderman, M. W. E., Dippel, D. W. J., van Harskamp, F., Koudstaal, P. J., & Visch-Brink, E. G. (2004). Effects of semantic treatment on verbal communication and linguistic processing in aphasia after stroke: A randomized controlled trial. *Stroke, 35,* 141–146.

Edwards, S., & Tucker, K. (2006). Verb retrieval in fluent aphasia: A clinical study. *Aphasiology, 20,* 644–675.

Ellis, A. W., & Young, A. W. (1996). *Human cognitive neuropsychology*. Hove, United Kingdom: Psychology Press.

Faroqi-Shah, Y., & Virion, C. R. (2009). Constraint-induced language therapy for agrammatism: Role of grammaticality constraints. *Aphasiology, 23,* 977–988.

Fridriksson, J., Hubbard, H., Hudspeth, S. G., Holland, A. L., Bonilha, L., Fromm, D., & Rorden, C. (2012). Speech entrainment enables patients with Broca's aphasia to produce fluent speech. *Brain, 135,* 3815–3829.

Goral, M., & Kempler, D. (2009). Training verb production in communicative context: Evidence from a person with chronic non-fluent aphasia. *Aphasiology, 23,* 1383–1397.

Graetz, P., de Bleser, R., & Willmes, K. (1992). *Akense Afasie Test: Nederlandstalige versie* [Aachen Aphasia Test: Dutch version]. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Grande, M., Hussmann, K., Bay, E., Christoph, S., Piefke, M., Willmes, K., & Huber, W. (2008). Basic parameters of spontaneous speech as a sensitive method for measuring change during the course of aphasia. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders, 43,* 408–426.

Hengst, J. A., Duff, M. C., & Dettmer, A. (2010). Rethinking repetition in therapy: Repeated engagement as the social ground of learning. *Aphasiology, 24,* 887–901.

Hillis, A. E., Boatman, D., Hart, J., & Gordon, B. (1999). Making sense out of jargon. *Neurology, 53,* 1813–1820.

Hinckley, J. J., & Carr, T. H. (2005). Comparing the outcomes of intensive and non-intensive context based aphasia treatment. *Aphasiology, 19,* 965–974.

Holland, A. L. (1991). Pragmatic aspects of intervention in aphasia. *Journal of Neurolinguistics, 6,* 197–211.

Holland, A. L., Greenhouse, J. B., Fromm, D., & Swindell, C. S. (1989). Predictors of language restitution following stroke: A multivariate analysis. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 32,* 232–238.

Kaplan, E. H., Goodglass, H., & Weintraub, S. (1983). *Boston Naming Test*. Philadelphia, PA: Lea & Febiger.

Kay, J., Lesser, R., & Coltheart, M. (1992). *Psycholinguistic assessment of language processing in aphasia*. Hove, United Kingdom: Psychology Press.

Kirmess, M., & Lind, M. (2011). Spoken language production as outcome measurement following constraint induced language therapy. *Aphasiology, 25,* 1207–1238.

Kleim, J. A., & Jones, T. A. (2008). Principles of experience-dependent neural plasticity: Implications for rehabilitation after brain damage. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 51*(Suppl.), S225–S239.

Lesser, R., Bryan, K., Anderson, J., & Hilton, R. (1986). Involving relatives in aphasia therapy: An application of language enrichment therapy. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research, 9,* 259–267.

Links, P., Hurkmans, J., & Bastiaanse, R. (2010). Training verb and sentence production in agrammatic Broca's aphasia. *Aphasiology, 24*, 1303–1325.

Lomas, J., Pickard, L., Bester, S., Elbard, H., Finlayson, A., & Zoghaid, C. (1989). The Communication Effectiveness Index: Development and psychometric evaluation of a functional communication measure for adult aphasia. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 54,* 113–124.

Maher, L., Kendall, D., Swearengin, J., Rodriguez, A., Leon, S., Pingel, K., . . . Rothi, L. (2006). A pilot study of use-dependent learning in the context of constraint induced language therapy. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society, 12,* 843–852.

Mariën, P., Mampaey, E., Vervaet, A., Saerens, J., & De Deyn, P. P. (1998). Normative data for the Boston Naming Test in native Dutch-speaking Belgian elderly. *Brain and Language, 65,* 447–467.

Marshall, R. C., Wertz, R. T., Weiss, D. G., Aten, J. L., Brookshire, R. H., Garcia-Bunuel, L., . . . Goodman, R. (1989). Home treatment for aphasic patients by trained nonprofessionals. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 54,* 462–470.

Meikle, M., Wechsler, E., Tupper, A., Benenson, M., Butler, J., Mulhall, D., & Stern, D. (1979). Comparative trial of volunteer and professional treatments of dysphasia after stroke. *British Medical Journal, 2,* 87–89.

Meinzer, M., Djundja, D., Barthel, G., Elbert, T., & Rockstroh, B. (2005). Long-term stability of improved language functions in chronic aphasia after constraint induced aphasia therapy. *Stroke, 36,* 1462–1466.

Meinzer, M., Rodriguez, A. D., & Gonzalez Rothi, L. J. (2012). First decade of research on constrained-induced treatment approaches for aphasia rehabilitation. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 93*(Suppl.), S35–S45.

Meinzer, M., Streiftau, S., & Rockstroh, B. (2007). Intensive language training in rehabilitation of chronic aphasia: Efficient training by laypersons. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society, 13,* 846–853.

Moses, M. E., Nickels, L. A., & Sheard, C. (2004). I'm sitting here feeling aphasic: A study of recurrent perseverative errors elicited in unimpaired speakers. *Brain and Language, 89,* 157–173.

Murray, L. L., & Clark, H. M. (2005). *Neurogenic disorders of language: Theory driven clinical practice*. Clifton Park, NY: Thomson Delmar Learning.

Oldfield, R. C. (1971). The assessment and analysis of handedness: The Edinburgh Handedness Inventory. *Neuropsychologia, 9,* 97–113.

Patterson, K. E., & Shewell, C. (1987). Speak and spell: Dissociations and word-class effects. In M. Coltheart, R. Job, & G. Sartori (Eds.), *The cognitive neuropsychology of language* (pp. 273–296). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pulvermüller, F., & Berthier, M. L. (2008). Aphasia therapy on a neuroscience basis. *Aphasiology, 22,* 563–599.

Pulvermüller, F., Neininger, B., Elbert, T., Mohr, B., Rockstroh, B., Koebbel, P., & Taub, E. (2001). Constraint-induced therapy of chronic aphasia after stroke. *Stroke, 32,* 1621–1626.

Raven, J. C. (1976). *Coloured Progressive Matrices*. London, United Kingdom: H. K. Lewis.

Raymer, A. M., Beeson, P., Holland, A., Kendall, D., Maher, L. M., Martin, N., . . . Gonzalez Rothi, L. J. (2008). Translational research in aphasia: From neuroscience to neurorehabilitation. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 51*(Suppl.), S259–S275.

Robey, R. R. (1998). A meta-analysis of clinical outcomes in the treatment of aphasia. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 41,* 172–187.

Robson, H., Sage, K., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2012). Revealing and quantifying the impaired phonological analysis underpinning impaired comprehension in Wernicke's aphasia. *Neuropsychologia, 50,* 276–288.

Ruiter, M. B., Kolk, H. H. J., Rietveld, T. C. M., Dijkstra, N., & Lotgering, E. (2011). Towards a quantitative measure of verbal effectiveness and efficiency in the Amsterdam-Nijmegen Everyday Language Test (ANELT). *Aphasiology, 25,* 961–975.

Sampson, M., & Faroqi-Shah, Y. (2011). Investigation of self-monitoring in fluent aphasia with jargon. *Aphasiology, 25,* 505–528.

Shewan, C. M., & Kertesz, A. (1984). Effects of speech and language treatment on recovery from aphasia. *Brain and Language, 23,* 272–299.

Simmons-Mackie, N. N., Kearns, K. P., & Potechin, G. (2005). Treatment of aphasia through family member training. *Aphasiology, 19,* 583–593.

Strauss, E., Sherman, E. M. S., & Spreen, O. (2006). *A compendium of neuropsychological tests: Administration, norms and commentary* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Szaflarski, J. P., Ball, A., Grether, S., Al-Fwaress, F., Griffith, N. M., Neils-Strunias, J., . . . Reichhardt, R. (2008). Constraint-induced aphasia therapy stimulates language recovery in patients with chronic aphasia after ischemic stroke. *Medical Science Monitor, 14,* CR243–CR250.

Szekely, A., Jacobsen, T., d'Amico, S., Devescovi, A., Andonova, E., Herron, D., . . . Bates, E. (2004). A new online resource for psycholinguistic studies. *Journal of Memory and Language, 51,* 247–250.

Taub, E., Uswatte, G., & Elbert, T. (2002). New treatments in neurorehabilitation founded on basic research. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 3,* 228–236.

Taub, E., Uswatte, G., & Pidikiti, R. (1999). Constraint induced movement therapy: A new family of techniques with broad application to physical rehabilitation—A clinical review. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development, 36,* 237–251.

Verhoeven, J. (2005). Illustrations of the IPA: Belgian Standard Dutch. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association, 35,* 243–247.

Visch-Brink, E. G., & Bajema, I. M. (2001). *BOX: Een semantisch therapie programma* [BOX: A semantic therapy program]. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Visch-Brink, E. G., Bajema, I. M., & van de Sandt-Koenderman, M. E. (1997). Lexical semantic therapy: BOX. *Aphasiology, 11,* 1057–1078.

Visch-Brink, E. G., Stronks, D., & Denes, G. (2005). *De Semantische Associatie Test* [Semantic Association Test]. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Wertz, R. T., Weiss, D. G., Aten, J. L., Brookshire, R. H., Garcia-Bunuel, L., Holland, A. L., . . . Goodman, R. (1986). Comparison

of clinic, home and deferred language treatment for aphasia. A Veterans Administration Cooperative Study. *Archives of Neurology, 43,* 653–658.

Whitworth, A., Webster, J., & Howard, D. (2005). *A cognitive neuropsychological approach to assessment and intervention in aphasia: A clinician's guide*. Hove, United Kingdom: Psychology Press.

Worrall, L., & Yiu, E. (2000). Effectiveness of functional communication therapy by volunteers for people with aphasia following stroke. *Aphasiology, 14,* 911–924.

Appendix (p. 1 of 2)

Detailed Description of Therapy Programs

Detailed Description of the Constraints Used in CIAT Training

Material Constraints

All words represented by pictures of objects and actions (N = 450) were classified for lexical frequency (high, middle, and low frequency words) according to the database CELEX (Baayen, Piepenbrock, & Van Rijn, 1993). Because of the moderate severity of language impairment in both CIAT groups, the participants almost exclusively practiced with low-frequency picture cards (N = 287). In the first sessions, only simple black-and-white line drawings of objects (n = 249) were used. These drawings were taken from an Internet database (Szekely et al., 2004). Later on, colored pictures of objects from different semantic categories or themes, action cards, and sentence cards (n = 173; Internet database, i.e., Imagine Symbols, 2004 [http://www.imaginesymbols.com]) and pictures with minimal pairs (n = 28) were introduced. Thus, the therapist triggered a more advanced communication by means of (a) decreasing word frequency, (b) introducing colored pictures from the same semantic category or theme, (c) using action or sentence cards, and (d) requesting the exact pronunciation by using cards of phonetically minimal pairs.

Shaping and Rules Constraints

In the first session, participants were allowed to use any relevant verbal expression to obtain a particular card. The therapist provided as much cueing as necessary for a successful expression. Cueing strategies that were used consisted of semantic cueing, phonological cueing, selecting, repeating, or a reminder/visual cueing. These verbal expressions and cueing strategies were gradually constrained by the introduction of explicit rules and shaping and modeling (i.e., to encourage increasing complexity of verbal responses). The rule of constraining allows the players to use the names of the coplayers, to use politeness rules, and to use more complex verbal expressions. To encourage the self-cueing capacities of the patients in a communication setting and to introduce the use of more complex verbal expressions, the questioner was sometimes asked to give only a description of the object. The receiver was expected to name the object. Following the shaping principle, the cueing strategies were gradually reduced. Finally, the participants were encouraged to communicate without any help.

Reinforcement Contingencies

Because we composed groups based on similar degrees of linguistic impairment, the rules and shaping principles could be performed on a group basis. Everyone could practice with the same rules and constraints.

Detailed Description of the Exercises Used in BOX Training

There are eight different types of exercises: (a) semantic categories, (b) syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationship, (c) semantic gradation, (d) adjectives and exclamations, (e) part–whole relationship, (f) anomalous sentences, (g) semantic definition, and (h) semantic context. Most of the exercises contain four levels of difficulty:

1. Word choice. Imageability, frequency, word length, and abstractness are considered.
2. Number of distractors. In general, the level of difficulty increases by adding more distractors.
3. Semantic relatedness. There are mostly unrelated distractors at the easy level, and only related distractors at the most difficult level.
4. Ambiguity. Incorporated in the difficulty level are ambiguous words; the task is to survey both word meanings at the same time.

An example of exercises (Visch-Brink et al., 1997) is shown in Table A1.

Table A1. Example of exercises.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Semantic Categories		
Postcard	Comma	Greatness
Cigar	*Number*	Superiority
Bill	Question mark	Importance
	Semicolon	Power
	Parentheses	*Motivation*
		Authority
Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic Relationship		
Crisps: *popcorn* or towel	Theater: *musical* or home movie	Interpreter: actor, *translator*, or courier
Let's have something to go with our drinks.	It appears that the show is sold out.	The Russian ambassador is coming to Holland.
Semantic Gradation		
Spring/Autumn		
Blossom/*cleaning*		
Mushroom/chestnut		
First cuckoo/September		
Adjectives and Exclamations		
The boy from next door is playing in the mud.	That piano makes a terrible noise.	I've got my driver's license!
The boy from next door is dirty.	The piano is white.	Oh dear!
The boy from next door is clean.	The piano is new.	*Congratulations!*
	The piano is out of tune.	Is that so?
Part–Whole Relationship		
The towels are in the linen cupboard.	That painting has a nice list.	A cat's tail.
Dishcloth	*Portrait*	*Frock*
Lawn mower	*Watercolor*	Dress
Handkerchief	Film	Coat

Note. Italics indicate correct answers.