Factors Impacting Language Outcomes of Children with Unilateral Hearing Loss: A Multi-State Perspective

EHDI Conference March 7, 2023

Disclaimer

The findings and conclusions in this presentation are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

Acknowledgement

This project was funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

Specifically, via cooperative agreement CDC-RFA-DD20-2005, NCBDDD Outcomes and Developmental Data Assistance Center for EHDI Programs (ODDACE)





Presenters/Authors

Allison Sedey, Ph.D.

University of Colorado-Boulder Colorado School for the Deaf and the Blind Allison.Sedey@colorado.edu

Christine Yoshinaga-Itano, Ph.D. University of Colorado-Boulder Christie.Yoshi@colorado.edu

Today's Topics

- Compare language outcomes based on laterality and hearing levels
- Summarize characteristics of children with unilateral hearing differences
- Identify characteristics associated with better language outcomes in children with unilateral hearing differences

Description of Database

- Data obtained from 17 different programs participating in ODDACE
 - www.colorado.edu/center/oddace
- ODDACE: CDC-supported project collecting language outcome data on deaf and hard-ofhearing children birth to 3 across the United States



ODDACE Project Objectives

- Partners have accurate and standardized data on outcomes of children who are D/HH
 - Database created for each participating program
 - Annual report provided summarizing program data
- Increased understanding of factors that impact developmental outcomes at the state and national level
 - Combine program databases to obtain a large, diverse, representative sample

Participating States

- Arizona
- Colorado
- Florida
- Idaho
- Illinois
- Indiana
- Maine

- Massachusetts
- North Dakota
- South Dakota
- Tennessee
- Texas
- Vermont
- Wisconsin
- Wyoming

Assessment Components

- Demographic form
- Audiologic information
- Developmental Assessment of Young Children (DAYC-2)
- MacArthur-Bates Communicative
 Development Inventories

Question 1

Is there a difference in language scores for children with hearing differences that are:

- Unilateral vs.
- Bilateral mild/mod vs.
- Bilateral mod-sev to profound



30 40 50

60

70

90

100



Number of Participants

- 683 children (DAYC-2 outcomes)
 - Bilateral = 440
 - Unilateral = 243

- 607 children (MacArthur outcomes)
 - Bilateral = 387
 - Unilateral = 220

Participant Criteria for Language Outcomes Analysis

- No disabilities thought to affect speech or language development
- Most recent assessment

Language Outcomes Analysis: Participant Characteristics

- Chronological age
 - Range = 2 to 36 months
 - Mean = 22 months
- Gender
 - Boys = 53%
 - Girls = 47%

Developmental Assessment of Young Children - DAYC-2

- Based on observation and parent report
- Examined Receptive and Expressive Language subscales



• Adapted to reflect abilities in both spoken and sign language

MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventories

- Assesses diversity of vocabulary
- Parent-report instrument
- Includes both spoken and signed expressive vocabulary



Comparison by Laterality and Degree

- Three groups
 - Unilateral
 - Bilateral: Mild/Moderate



- Bilateral: Mod-Sev through Profound
- Statistical analysis to compare groups:
 - One-Way ANOVA

Results: Comparison by Laterality and Degree

DAYC-2: Receptive and Expressive subscales

- No significant diff between UHL and mild-mod
- Significant diff (p < .001) between UHL and mod-sev through profound
- Significant diff (p < .001) between mild/moderate and mod-sev through profound

MacArthur: Expressive Vocabulary

• Significant diff (p < .05) between all three groups

Mean Language Percentiles: Unilateral and Bilateral



Mean percentile for hearing children in the normative sample = 50

Question 2

What factors are associated with better language outcomes in children with unilateral hearing differences?





Number of Participants

DAYC-2 = 206

MacArthur CDI = 197





Language Outcomes Analysis: Participant Characteristics

- Chronological age
 - Range = 1 to 36 months
 - Mean = 21 months
- Gender
 - Boys = 52%
 - Girls = 48%
- Affected ear
 - Right = 56%
 - Left = 44%

Participant Characteristics

- English is spoken and/or written language of the home = 87%
- Hispanic ethnicity = 44%
- White race = 84%
- Hearing parents = 95%



Hearing Level in Affected Ear





Amplification Use







EHDI guideline category	Percentage
Identification by 3 months	76%
Intervention by 6 months	61%
Meets 1-3-6	54%



Amount of Intervention

- 62% of families receive EI services once or twice a month
- Mean = 2.9 sessions per month
- Children with bilateral loss in ODDACE: Mean = 5.1 sessions per month

Determining Predictors of Language Outcomes

- Model selection approach
 - Forward-backward stepwise
 - Determines which predictors contribute significantly to the model, balancing model fit with complexity
- Statistical Analysis:
 - Linear regression

Factors NOT Associated with Language Outcomes

- Affected ear (right vs. left)
- Degree of loss in affected ear
- Presence of auditory neuropathy
- Home language (English vs. Spanish)
- Parents' hearing status (deaf vs. hearing)
- Use of amplification (something vs. none)

Significant Predictors of DAYC-2 Language Outcomes

- Sex
- Age of intervention
- Primary caregiver years of education
- Percent of variance in DAYC-2 percentiles accounted for by the model = 11%

Significant Predictors of DAYC-2 Receptive Language Percentile Scores



Mean percentile for hearing children in the normative sample = 50

Significant Predictors of MacArthur Vocabulary Outcomes

- Chronologic age
 - 8- to 22-month-olds had higher percentiles than 23- to 36-month-olds
- Meeting EHDI 1-3-6 guidelines
- Primary caregiver years of education
- Percent of variance in MacArthur percentiles accounted for by the model = 27%

Significant Predictors of MacArthur Percentile Scores



Mean percentile for hearing children in the normative sample = 50

Conclusions

- Language scores on a general language test (the DAYC-2) were in the average range for children with UHL who did not have risk factors
- The MacArthur CDI was sensitive to gaps in vocabulary diversity in children with UHL
 - 31% of children were delayed (scoring at or below the 10th %ile)

Conclusions

 Children with UHL scored similarly to children with mild/mod bilateral hearing differences on a test of general language

 Children with UHL obtained higher scores than children with mild/mod bilateral hearing differences on a measure of expressive vocabulary diversity

Conclusions

Factors placing children with UHL at higher risk for language delay:

- Sex (boys)
- Later ages of intervention
- Not meeting EHDI 1-3-6 guidelines
- Lower levels of primary caregiver education
- Older chronologic ages (> 22 months)

Clinical Implications

Minimally, children with UHL should be evaluated at approximately 2 years old and again at transition to preschool

Rigorous and specific language tests (e.g., the MacArthur CDI) should be used as opposed to general language measures



With Appreciation

- to the families who shared their children's information with ODDACE
- to the interventionists who took the time to complete and send in the assessments
- to the ODDACE Assessment Coordinators
- to the ODDACE Project Assistants