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Background

- Developed in 1994 by Dave Hewett and Melanie Nind.
- Client-led
- ‘Entering their world’
- Process-focused not task-focused
- Assumes communicative intent
- Primarily uses NVC to establish contact
Aims (Firth & Barber, 2011)

- Genuine and participatory social inclusion
- Communicative skills acquisition or development
- Therapeutic support

“A way of finding a connection with someone who is difficult to reach, then building a more equitable and inclusive relationship with them”
Intensive Interaction in Dementia (Ellis & Astell, 2008)

- Single Case Study – termed ‘Adaptive Interaction’
- Observation – explore current communication context, identify key features.
- Standard Interaction (baseline) – 10 minutes, closed questions followed by 20 sec. pause.
- I.I. – 10 minutes, attended to and responded to verbal and non-verbal behaviours, either direct reflection, or reproducing rhythm in some way.
My Study

- 3 Participants
- Information gathering – life history, baseline observation, rating of communication skills
- 4 sessions over the course of a week
- 5 minutes Standard Interaction followed by 10 minutes Intensive Interaction
- 2 sessions were ‘Augmented’ with biographically relevant joint-focus items.
Data Collection

- Holden Communication Scale
  D = 46/48, F = 26/48, K = 43/48

- Positive Response Schedule (Perrin, 1997)

- Passive Observer recording events and thoughts

- Reflective Diary after each session
# Holden Communication Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest in past events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to join in games etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts at communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and response to objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success in communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Response Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate Body Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate Head Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks at Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks at Carer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 1 - David Total Scores
Results – D

Chart 2 - David Social Interaction Scores
Results - F

Chart 3 - Fred Total Scores
Results - F

Chart 4 - Fred Social Interaction Scores
Results - K

Chart 5 - Karen Total Scores
Results - K

Chart 6 - Karen Social Interaction Scores
Reflections & Conclusions

- Increasing rapport over time, but not strong enough effect to show in quantitative results
- Physically and emotionally demanding
- Differences between conditions are enhanced when social interaction items are extracted.
Reflections & Conclusions

- Joint-focus items work for some people – 1-2 items per session?
- Best for those scoring over about 38/48 on HCS
- Post-study – further developments for D & K
- Some issues with staff understanding
- Reflexivity and peer support is vital
What Next?

- Further investigation of benefits over time – longitudinal study
- Determine appropriate cut-off point on HCS (or similar)
- Encouraging all staff to engage
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