

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Outcome Measure | Psycholinguistic Assessments of Language Processing in Aphasia (PALPA) |
| Sensitivity to Change | Unknown |
| Population | Adult |
| Domain | Neuropsychological Impairment |
| Type of Measure | Objective tests |
| ICF-Code/s | |
| Description | <p>Manual: Kay, Lesser and Coltheart (1992) or short introduction in Kay et al. (1996)</p> <p>Designed as a psycholinguistic assessment of language processing. It is a set of resource materials where the user selects language tasks suited to the individuals hypothesis.</p> <p>PALPA has 60 subtests divided into four sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Auditory processing (17 subtests) • Reading and Spelling (29 subtests) • Picture and Word Semantics (8 subtests) • Sentence Completion (6 Subtests) <p>It aims to identify functional and dysfunctional modules in adults with aphasic brain injuries. This includes areas such as orthography and phonology, word and picture semantics, and morphology and syntax. Together they assess spoken and written input and output processes.</p> <p>Based on the assumption that the minds language system is organized in separate modules of language-processing abilities and the connections within and between modules can be selectively impaired in brain damage.</p> |
| Properties | <p>May be more in Kay, Coltheart, & Lesser (1992) Manual</p> <p><u>Convergent Validity</u>: found that differences in sentence-picture naming on PALPA were differentiated by a parietally distributed P300 ERP activity with 91.3% accuracy.</p> <p>Could not find any studies assessing the psychometric properties</p> |
| Advantages | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widely used measure for research and clinical practice (however this is different according to certain subtests). • Clinicians and researchers regard it as the most useful and comprehensive language-testing battery. • For TBI it is a popular clinical resource. • Has many subtests that may be selected for use. • Most tests generally efficient in terms of administration time. |

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Disadvantages | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barely any independent studies on psychometric properties of the PALPA tests. • Tests are not fully standardised • Unable to provide normative data for some of the subtests • Poorly written instructions and poorly presented materials such as pictures • Some of the tests seem quite arbitrary such as reading single words aloud. • Most of the use of PALPA has been in single case study. • Few studies on TBI populations and rated poorly by researchers (2.67/5) and clinicians (3.60/5; Bate, Kay, Code, Haslam, & Hallowell, 2010). • Reasonably expensive for just a manual (\$525.00) |
| Additional Information | No revised version has been published since the 1992 edition. |
| Reviewers | Leanne Togher |

References

Bate, S., Kay, J., Code, C., Haslam, C., & Hallowell, B. (2010). Eighteen years on: What next for the PALPA?. *International journal of speech-language pathology, 12*(3), 190-202.

Kay, J., Coltheart, M., & Lesser, R. (1992). *Psycholinguistic Assessments of Language Processing in Aphasia,(PALPA): Auditory Processing*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kay, J., Lesser, R., & Coltheart, M. (1996). Psycholinguistic assessments of language processing in aphasia (PALPA): An introduction. *Aphasiology, 10*(2), 159-180.