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Parkinson’s

- Affects 4 in 1000 Australians (Chan, et.al., 2001)
- Challenges in all areas of function (Lees, et. al., 2009; Foster, 2014)
- OTs assess upper limb function (Homann, et. al., 2000; Proud, et. al., 2013)
- Ax’s not standardised or quantifiable
- No common guidelines specific to OT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Item</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unscrew jar Lids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Phone dialling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Page turning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Writing name/Sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Money handling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tablet handling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Doing up buttons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pouring liquids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Buttering bread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cutting bread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timed Upper Limb Assessment

- Uses
- 10 items
- Standardised instructions
- Standardised layout
Method

QUESTIONS:
1. Inter-rater reliability?
2. Norms?
3. Clinical value in PD?
4. Differentiate?

METHOD:
Cross-sectional research design (Whitall, et. al., 2009)

ANALYSIS:
• Inter-rater correlation
• Independent groups t-test.
Results

**RESULTS:**

- agreement between assessors
- Correlation coefficients between $r=.96$ to $r=.998$.

**Surveys:**

- all items relevant

**Mean scores:**

Between Parkinson’s ($n=15$) and control group ($n=77$) → **significant differences** with $t=2.65$ to $t=7.46$; $p<.00$
Implications:

• Potential updates
• Accurate Ax of upper limb function
• Application
• Further research → Normative data
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