

Background

- Participation or “involvement in a life situation” (WHO, 2001) is an important outcome for children with and without disabilities⁷
- Environmental factors including school & physical environments, temporal organization & assistance can support or hinder participation^{2,3,4}
- Hence, it is vital to assess environment together with participation¹
- Currently very few observational tools available which combine the 2 elements⁶

SPOT

- Observation measure developed based on the terminology from the study by Pereira et al⁵
- Evaluating social participation and environmental supportiveness
- Participation rating categories: Equal (E), Equal with modifications (EM), Onlooker (O), Non-participation (N)
- Qualifiers of + and – were used for E, EM & O
- Likert environmental scores of 1 (very limiting) to 5 (very supportive)

Research Aims

- To examine inter-rater agreement of participation & environmental scores for the SPOT
- To identify the common rationale & descriptors for each of the ratings on the participation & environmental scale
- To examine the clinical usefulness of the SPOT and identify areas for improvement.

Methods

Data Collection

- Convenience sample of 1st & 2nd grade students from one classroom
- 6 Occupational Therapy Graduate students divided into 3 pairs conducted 4 observations each, at morning meeting, meal time or outside time

Data Analysis

- Inter-rater percent agreement was evaluated using $(\# \text{ of matches}) / (12 \text{ observations}) * 100$
- Qualitative data were coded and analyzed for frequency; codes were grouped into themes
- Equal participation qualifiers (E+/E-) were analyzed to see how each rating fit into themes
- Environmental ratings were analyzed for positive and negative words/phrases
- Percentage of positive words per rating was identified
- Feedback/comments were analysed to evaluate utility and suggestions for improvement of the tool


Quantitative Results

Inter-rater Percent Agreement

Participation without Qualifiers	91.67%
Participation with Qualifiers	58.33%
Environmental Scores	91.67%


Frequency of Environmental Scores

Score	Frequency
5	8.33%
4	54.17%
3	37.5%




Qualitative Results

*Note: Insufficient responses for EM, N & O categories may be due to research being conducted in one setting.



Relationship between Themes & Participation Ratings



Analysis of Participation Rating

- E+ rating is more highly associated with “high level of engagement” and “peer interactions.”
- E and E- are more highly associated with “active rule following.”
- E and E- rationale also include disqualifier themes for why an E+ was not given or why an E – was given

Analysis of Environmental Rating

Percentage of Positive words/phrases:
 5: 75%
 4: 66%
 3: 57%

As ratings decreased, the percentage of positive words/phrases used in rationale also decreased

Practical Utility

- Rationale for ratings provides self check for raters; makes tool user friendly
- Observer’s reaction column on SPOT keeps the rater objective
- Use of observable behaviors column on SPOT helps to arrive at an overall participation score
- Barriers/supports helped with developing rationale for environmental ratings
- Environmental rating helped to apply qualifiers to the participation rating

Suggestions for Improvement

- Clear explanation about use of qualifiers may increase inter-rater agreement
- Consultation with classroom teacher to understand expectations of the activity and to clarify questions, may improve accuracy of rating
- Future research could include a larger sample and a variety of settings which may increase range of responses
- Future research could also evaluate sensitivity of tool over time and discriminative validity

Conclusion

- The high inter-rater percent agreement without qualifiers suggests that categories are clear
- By definition, the group determines what E participation is; this could explain the high frequency of E ratings
- High frequency of 4 ratings may be due to same classroom being used for all observations.
- The findings from qualitative analysis suggest that there are differences among the three ratings within the E category
- Further definition and distinction between ratings will also aid in use of the tool for evaluating student goals & outcomes
- Preliminary observations show that the tool has promise for future use, but still needs development

References

- Bedell, G., Khetani, M., Cousins, M., Coster, W., & Law, M. (2011). Parent perspectives to inform development of measures of children's participation and environment. *Archives of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*, 92, 765-773
- Hemmingson, H., & Borell, L. (2002). Environmental barriers in mainstream schools. *Child: Care, Health & Development*, 28, 57-63
- Hemmingson, H., Borell, L., & Gustavsson, A. (2003). Participation in school: School assistants creating opportunities and obstacles for pupils with disabilities. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health*, 23(3), 88-98.
- Law, M., Petrenchik, T., King, G., & Hurley, P. (2007). Perceived environmental barriers to recreational, community and school participation for children and youth with physical disabilities. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 88, 1636-1642.
- Pereira, E., la Cour, K., Jonsson, H., & Hemmingson, H. (2010). The participation experience of children with disabilities in Portuguese mainstream schools. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 73, 598-606.
- Sakzewski, L., Boyd, R., & Ziviani, J. (2007). Clinimetric properties of participation measures for 5 to 13 year old children with cerebral palsy: A systematic review. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 49, 232-240.
- Simeonsson, R., Carlson, D., Huntington, G., Sturtz McMillen, J., & Brendt, J. (2001). Students with disabilities: A national survey of participation in school activities. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 23, 49-63.