

**This assessment review was compiled by our students and is intended to be used as a guide in assisting clinicians. We encourage you to review the evaluations and assessments for yourself to guarantee the most accurate and updated information.*

I. General Information

Title of the test: Executive Function Route-Finding Test (EFRT)

Author: Thomas M. Boyd and Scott W. Sautter, created in 1985

Publisher: N/A

Time required to administer: Time varies on the selected destination and client's executive functioning skills. I was unable to find a suggested time frame recommended by Boyd and Sautter, but I would imagine that 30 minutes would be reasonable amount of time to find an unfamiliar office within the building complex in which the examination is given.

Cost of the Test: Free test available in an article (Boyd & Sutter, 1992)

II. Description of Test

Type/Purpose of Test:

- Ecological test of evaluation of adaptation in head-injured adults
- Occupation-based assessment that combines features of naturalistic observation and standardized assessment to evaluate possible dysexecutive functions.

Population: Adults with head injuries

Focus of measurement:

Organic systems Abilities Participation/life habits Environmental Factors

III. Practical Administration

Ease of Administration: Very Easy

- Subjects must find their way from a starting point to a predetermined destination within the building complex in which the examination is given.
- While accompanying the client, the examiner records the path taken and how the client gets there. The examiner also answers questions and give encouragement and advice as needed, noting these too.
- After reaching the destination, the examiner may need to question the client further to clarify whether moves were made by chance, what cues the client used to find the way, etc.

Clarity of Directions: Clear and simple, but vague

Although the instructions are easy to understand, the format is intended to be open-ended to allow the client to make decisions on their own including the route and finding strategies.

"I am going to give you an exercise which involves your finding an unfamiliar office. How you do this is up to you."

Scoring Procedures:

Performances are rated on a 4-point scale to measure the degree to which the client was dependent on the examiner for:

A. Task Understanding

1. Failure to grasp nature of task despite several elaborations
2. Faulty understanding of important elements requiring specific or explanatory cueing and elaboration (i.e., 'How am I suppose to know where it is?')

3. Distorts peripheral detail requiring slight clarification or a non-specific cue, (e.g., "Can you tell me where this is?")
 4. Shows a clear grasp or asks for clarification appropriately (e.g., "Can I get someone to take me there.")
- B. Incorporation of Information Seeking
1. Aimless wandering
 2. Follows a hunch without gathering information first (unless shows prior knowledge of destination) or exhaustive door-to-door search
 3. Gathers information before commencing search, but without appraisal information source
 4. Shows judgment in use of information sources
- C. Retaining Directions (functional memory)
1. Continual forgetting of directions or name of destination and failure to use suggested means of compensating unless cued repeatedly
 2. Needs repeated non-specific cueing or provision of concrete strategy to compensate for memory deficits.
 3. Forgets details but compensates after non-specific cue
 4. Paraphrasing or clarification sufficient for remembering, or spontaneous compensation (e.g. note taking)
- D. Error Detection (self-monitoring)
1. Continued errors without self-detection even after repeated examiner cues.
 2. Some spontaneous awareness of errors but more instances of cueing required.
 3. Some cueing required, but more instances of spontaneous error detection shown.
 4. Verifies correctness independently when appropriate, may exploit incidental information (e.g. signs) to prevent errors.
- E. Error Correction (trouble-shooting)
1. Helpless or preservative behavior
 2. Inefficient strategy
 3. Seeks help immediately once aware of error
 4. Reasons efficiently
- F. On task Behavior
1. Helpless or preservative behavior
 2. Inefficient strategy
 3. Seeks help immediately once aware of error
 4. Reasons efficiently (e.g., looks for signs, considers where may have erred in following directions to self-correct).

Both the examiner and client evaluate the overall independence ranging from 1 to 4.

1. Extensive cueing required
2. Appreciable cueing needed
3. Occasional non-cueing required
4. Independent of cueing

Examiner is given cueing rules on the examination form. The types of cueing that were required need to be documenting and provide helpful documentation information about the level of support required to carry out an executive task

- Nonspecific Cues: alerts the client to monitor progress
- Specific Cues: provides information about how to execute task.

Examiner Qualification & Training: I was unable to find the qualification and training required to perform the EFRT. However, I believe that having formal training on activity analysis would be helpful in determining which areas of executive functioning are required for the task and what areas are problematic for the clients.

IV. Technical Considerations

Standardization: ___ Norms ___x___ Criterion Referenced ___ Other _____

Reliability: High inter-rater reliability ($r > .90$)

Validity: Acceptable Congruent Validity

Manual: ____ Excellent ____ Adequate ____ Poor x No Manual

What is (are) the setting/s that you would anticipate using this assessment?

- Inpatient and outpatient rehab to assess executive functioning in an unfamiliar setting

Summary of strengths and weaknesses

Weakness:

- Unstructured format
 - Instructions and difficulty level are dependent on examiner's observation skills, activity analysis skills, and choice of destination and instruction
- Hard to find details and additional information about the EFRT
 - There is not a publisher website
 - Unable to find current contact info for the creators of the EFRT

Strength:

- Occupation-based assessment that evaluates function
- Unstructured format that allows you to customize test to client's abilities and preferences
- Measures multiple dimensions of executive functioning
- Ecologically-valid
- Easy to administer and score
- High inter-rater reliability

Resources:

- Boyd, T.M., & Sautter, S.W. (1993). Route Finding: A measure of everyday executive functioning in the head-injured adult. *Applied Cognitive Psychology* 7 92), 171-181
- http://www.learnpsychology.com/courses/neuroassmt/Unit%203%20Sensory%20&%20Motor/Lezak_Motor.pdf