

[263]

Ohio Functional Assessment Battery: Standardized Tests for Leisure and Living Skills.

Purpose: Designed to determine the functional level of a client's abilities in order to develop measurable treatment objectives.

Population: Adults experiencing slight to profound impairment in cognitive ability.

Publication Date: 1994.

Scores: 3 test options: the Functional Living Skills Assessment (FLSA), the Quick Functional Screening Test (QFST), and the Recreation and Leisure Profile (RLP).

Administration: Individual.

Price Data, 1999: \$299 per complete battery including 25 recordkeeping forms, dominos, beads, and manual (83 pages); \$49 per 25 recordkeeping forms.

Time: (15–65) minutes.

Comments: Ratings by therapist; test options utilize some or all of six activities: Recreation and Leisure Profile, Domino Patterns, Draw a Box, Beads, Sporting Goods Shopping Trip, and A Rainy Day.

Author: Roy H. Olsson, Jr.

Publisher: Therapy Skill Builders—A Division of The Psychological Corporation.

Review of the Ohio Functional Assessment Battery: Standardized Tests for Leisure and Living Skills by GARY L. CANIVEZ, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, IL:

The Ohio Functional Assessment Battery: Standardized Tests for Leisure and Living Skills (OFAB) was constructed as a "therapy tool designed to obtain the functional level of a client in order to develop measurable treatment objectives" (manual, p. 1). It was reportedly based on a leisurability model (Peterson & Gunn, 1984) that provides for interventions in (a) treatment, (b) leisure education, and (c) recreation. Cognitive and behavioral functioning is assessed based on the assumption that substantial limitations in these areas need to be remediated in order for an individual to participate in leisure activities or leisure education.

The activities and verbatim instructions seem adequate, although the activities seem to be quite complicated for clients in the severe range of cognitive impairment. As the verbatim instructions are printed in the same print style, size, and color, it seemed a bit difficult to read the instructions to the client in a smooth manner. Providing the instructions in a larger font and in a

different color would be a helpful addition to future editions.

The Functional Living Skills Assessment (FLSA) is used with clients with cognitive impairments in the lower-moderate to severe range to assess three options, but upon closer inspection, it appears that there are actually two options as one activity, Recreation and Leisure Profile (RLP), is common to both the Quick Functional Screening Test (QFST) and the FLSA.

Information on the rationale for these tests was lacking. Also lacking was a description of the target population(s) including age, developmental, and disability considerations. Scoring examples and research studies reported in the manual suggest that it would be used with adults (and perhaps older adolescents) who were disabled in some manner. This, however, should be explicitly stated by the author so test users know exactly the populations with which this test could and should be used. A more elaborate description of the theoretical basis of this test and its development is also sorely needed.

Descriptions of parameter meanings are provided to assist in the interpretation of the results; however, there are no criteria presented to assist the user in determining whether a score or result is high, low, or otherwise. This is a limiting factor for criterion-referenced interpretations. Stating acceptable performance levels or levels of mastery and establishing external criteria for these levels would help in interpretation. There is also a lack of normative data to provide meaning to the obtained scores.

Technical data in the manual are presented in a somewhat awkward way by presenting validity data before reliability data. Reliability estimates were provided through the use of test-retest and interrater methods; however, there are no estimates of internal consistency for the functional parameters or other scores. Although the stability and interrater correlations are reported to be high, none of the reliability or validity studies are described in sufficient detail and include very small sample sizes of individuals from unknown geographic, ethnic, or socioeconomic status characteristics. It seems quite unlikely that these samples were demographically representative of the U.S. population. There are no descriptions of how the interrater reliability data were collected nor were there indications of the test-retest interval. This limits conclusions that

might be made of the high correlations obtained in these studies.

Also lacking were factor analytic studies to determine the number of underlying traits or characteristics being assessed. The moderate to high intercorrelations among many parameters suggests that many of the cognitive parameters seem to be measuring a similar trait (general intelligence). With no indexes of parameter or subtest specificity, it is not possible to determine whether or not there is sufficient unique variability to interpret the separate parameters as meaningful above the likely general cognitive factor. Given the extremely small samples on which these correlations are based, it would not be possible to conduct such factor analyses.

On a more serious note, no validity studies have compared the OFAB cognitive parameters with other more psychometrically sound, objective instruments of cognitive or neuropsychological functioning such as the Wechsler scales (WISC-III [T5:2862], WAIS-R [9:1348], WAIS-III [415]), Stanford-Binet (SB:FE; T5:2485), or Halstead-Reitan (HRNPB; T5:1164). Such studies are necessary to validate the method used in the OFAB to assess these important characteristics.

SUMMARY. Although the OFAB is presented as a "therapy tool" (manual, p. 1) serious limitations discussed above suggest that this instrument should be used as a research instrument until further reliability and validity studies are conducted with better descriptions of the sample's cognitive, communication, and behavioral skills through a series of six activities requiring them to attend, retain information in short term memory, learn, retrieve information from long-term memory, problem solve, and perform motorically.

The OFAB reportedly provides three testing options and methods of investigation. Furthermore, if these are to be criterion-referenced tests, better guidelines need to be developed (and investigated) in order to guide interpretations. If these tests are to provide normative comparisons, then a nationally representative standardization sample for various disabilities is needed to provide appropriate comparisons that guide interpretations and provide meaning to the scores. The \$299 cost of this instrument places it near the range of costs for intelligence, neuropsychological, and achievement tests that have much more reliability and validity research support and

well-developed criteria and normative samples to guide interpretations. The OFAB may assist in helping understand an individual's limitations and leisure interests but it does not appear to be particularly cost effective.

REVIEWER'S REFERENCE

Peterson, C. A., & Gunn, S. L. (1984). *Therapeutic recreation program design: Principles and procedures* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Review of the Ohio Functional Assessment Battery: Standardized Tests for Leisure and Living Skills by KATHARINE SNYDER, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Shepherd College, Shepherdstown, WV:

The Ohio Functional Assessment Battery (OFAB) was designed to assist occupational and recreational therapists in evaluating the adaptive skills of previously diagnosed cognitively impaired individuals. Those with severe impairments either take the Functional Living Skills Assessment (FLSA) or a shorter Quick Functional Screening Test. Individuals with mild impairments are given the Recreation and Leisure Profile (RLP), a structured interview/questionnaire assessing interests, resources, participation, motivation, and barriers to therapy.

Validity and reliability data for the FLSA are impressive. In support of criterion-related validity, the FLSA strongly predicts performance on the Comprehensive Occupational Therapy Evaluation Scale, with coefficients ranging from .87 to .98. Interrater and interitem reliability coefficients are also strong for all three components. Results are encouraging and support the utility of the OFAB in the design and assessment of recreation/occupational therapy programs.

Using six activities, the FLSA provides a standardized rating format for 19 critical parameters in designing and evaluating therapy programs. The six activities include placing chips in order of most to least preferred on top of activities on leisure charts, copying domino patterns, drawing/coloring a box, stringing beads (same size, color, and shape), shopping for sporting goods, and picking out activities for a rainy day. Before any activities, reality orientation is rated by asking individuals to verify their name, address, phone number, date, and time. The abilities to organize time/materials and to follow directions are also rated throughout the FLSA.

An excellent feature of the FLSA is in rating emotional/behavioral variables that could impact test performance. For instance, attention span and nonproductive behaviors are recorded during time

THE FOURTEENTH MENTAL MEASUREMENTS YEARBOOK

BARBARA S. PLAKE and JAMES C. IMPARA

Editors

LINDA L. MURPHY

Managing Editor

The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements
The University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska

2001

Distributed by The University of Nebraska Press