

University of Louisville

## ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

---

5-2020

### Hearing loss: investigating the comfort, confidence, knowledge, and preparedness of Kentucky school-based speech-language pathologists.

Amanda Matsumoto  
*University of Louisville*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>



Part of the [Speech and Hearing Science Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Matsumoto, Amanda, "Hearing loss: investigating the comfort, confidence, knowledge, and preparedness of Kentucky school-based speech-language pathologists." (2020). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 3464.

Retrieved from <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd/3464>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact [thinkir@louisville.edu](mailto:thinkir@louisville.edu).

HEARING LOSS: INVESTIGATING THE COMFORT, CONFIDENCE,  
KNOWLEDGE, AND PREPAREDNESS OF KENTUCKY SCHOOL-BASED  
SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGISTS

By

Amanda Matsumoto

B.A.- Charleston Southern University, Charleston, South Carolina, May 2017

A Thesis  
Submitted to the Faculty of the  
School of Medicine of the University of Louisville  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of

Master of Science  
in Communicative Disorders

Department of Otolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery  
and Communicative Disorders

University of Louisville

Louisville, Kentucky

May 2020

© 2020  
Amanda Matsumoto  
All rights reserved



HEARING LOSS: INVESTIGATING THE COMFORT, CONFIDENCE,  
KNOWLEDGE, AND PREPAREDNESS OF KENTUCKY SCHOOL-BASED  
SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGISTS

By

Amanda Matsumoto

B.A.- Charleston Southern University, Charleston, South Carolina, May 2017

A Thesis Approved on

April 10, 2020

by the following Thesis Committee:

---

Alan Smith, Ed.D., Thesis Advisor

---

Teresa Pitts, Ph.D.

---

Rhonda Mattingly, Ed.D.

## DEDICATION

To cochlear implant users everywhere, thank you for the inspiration to complete this project and enriching the world we live in.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis advisor Dr. Smith for his guidance, patience, and encouragement throughout this process. I would also like to express my gratitude to my thesis committee, Dr. Pitts and Dr. Mattingly, for their counsel and support during my graduate school career. I would like to thank the entire faculty and staff in the University of Louisville speech-language pathology department for sharing their expertise and knowledge with their students. Finally, I would like to extend my sincerest appreciation for the staff at Heuser Hearing Institute for preparing me for my post-graduate career and fueling my passion for the hearing impaired.

## ABSTRACT

### HEARING LOSS: INVESTIGATING THE COMFORT, CONFIDENCE, KNOWLEDGE, AND PREPAREDNESS OF KENTUCKY SCHOOL-BASED SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGISTS

Amanda Matsumoto

April 10, 2020

Due to advances in technology, the number of users with hearing devices have increased. These users are often mainstreamed into classrooms with typical hearing peers. However, even with these devices, speech and language impairments may still persist. This study was conducted to analyze school-based speech-language pathologists' (SLP) comfort, confidence, knowledge, and preparedness in treating students with hearing loss in Kentucky schools. 48 SLPs practicing in all levels of school including elementary, middle, and high, completed an anonymous online survey through the Qualtrics® platform. Responses were received from SLPs representing 11 out of the 15 regions throughout Kentucky. Spearman's rank order correlation was  $r$  to assess the association between the comfort, confidence, knowledge, and preparedness of SLPs to manage selected hearing devices and providing treatment. Previous research conducted throughout the United States demonstrated that there is an overall lack of comfort, confidence, knowledge, and preparedness of SLPs in treating patients with hearing loss. Previous research has also demonstrated the need for more knowledge and training for treating those who use hearing devices. This study was conducted to compare the results of Kentucky school-based speech-language pathologists to other studies previously conducted in other states. The findings were consistent with previous results demonstrating that overall there is a lack of training in managing students with hearing

loss, the need for more collaborations with other professionals, instruction at both the undergraduate and graduate level, and the need for various forms of continuing education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	IV
ABSTRACT.....	V
LIST OF TABLES .....	IX
INTRODUCTION .....	1
METHODS .....	11
Participants.....	11
Setting and Instrumentation .....	12
Data Analysis .....	13
RESULTS .....	15
Descriptive Statistics and Within-Group Item Correlations .....	17
Comfort Level.....	17
Confidence Level.....	20
Knowledge of Roles and Responsibilities .....	23
Preparedness/Training .....	25
Between-Group Item Correlations .....	27
Comfort and Confidence Levels .....	27
Comfort Level and Knowledge of Roles and Responsibilities.....	28
Comfort Level and Preparedness/Training .....	28
Confidence Level and Knowledge of the Roles and Responsibilities .....	29
Confidence Level and Preparedness/Training .....	30
Knowledge of Roles and Responsibilities and Preparedness/Training .....	31
DISCUSSION .....	32
Comfort .....	32
Confidence .....	36
Knowledge .....	39
Preparedness .....	41
Further Research .....	42
Summary .....	43
REFERENCES .....	46
APPENDIX: ABBREVIATIONS .....	51

APPENDIX: SURVEY INSTRUMENT .....	52
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	62

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Participant Age Ranges ( $N = 48$ ) .....	15
2. Years at Current School .....	16
3. Students with Hearing Aids, FM Systems, and/or Cochlear Implants .....	16
4. Comfort Levels .....	18
5. Spearman’s Rho Correlation Matrix (Comfort Levels) .....	20
6. Confidence Levels .....	21
7. Spearman’s Rho Correlation Matrix (Confidence Levels) .....	23
8. Knowledge of Roles and Responsibilities .....	23
9. Spearman’s Rho Correlation Matrix (Knowledge of Roles/Responsibilities).....	25
10. Preparedness/Training.....	26
11. Spearman’s Rho Correlation Matrix (Preparedness/Training) .....	26
12. Spearman’s Rho Correlation Matrix (Comfort and Confidence Levels).....	27
13. Spearman’s Rho Correlation Matrix (Comfort Level and Knowledge of Roles and Responsibilities).....	28
14. Spearman’s Rho Correlation Matrix (Comfort Level and Preparedness/Training)....	29
15. Spearman’s Rho Correlation Matrix Confidence Level and Knowledge of Roles and Responsibilities).....	30
16. Spearman’s Rho Correlation Matrix (Confidence Level and Preparedness/Training)	30
17. Spearman’s Rho Correlation Matrix Knowledge of Roles/Responsibilities and Preparedness/Training) .....	31
18. Summary of Tested Null Hypotheses .....	45

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

A child's brain development is largely influenced by experiences and information that the five senses of taste, touch, smell, sight, and hearing receive and send to the brain (Brotherson, 2005). When one of these senses is impaired, a child's brain and cognition may be impacted. (Graven & Browne, 2008). For many children born in the United States, their brain development and cognition are directly impacted by hearing loss. According to the National Institute on Deafness and other Communication Disorders, (NIDCD), in the United States, two to three out of every 1,000 children are estimated to have been born with hearing loss in one or both of their ears (NIDCD, 2016). Additionally, 16,000-18,000 babies and toddlers are diagnosed with hearing loss per year, making it one of the most common birth defects (Madell, Flexer, Wolfe, & Schafer, 2019).

Without the ability to hear, a child will miss out on accessibility to environmental acoustics and intelligible spoken language which are both vital for brain growth (Madell, et al., 2019). Children with normal hearing thresholds acquire language by listening to the 'spoken language that surrounds them daily and interacting with their environment (Bobsin & Houston, 2015). The brain needs exposure to a variety of sounds to process information and allow responses (Brotherson, 2005). Auditory experience changes the way the brain processes future input whether beneficial during developmental shaping

of the speech processing circuits or detrimental due to neuro degeneration (Moore 2002). Auditory information assists speech production as it allows a child to learn to manage breath support, differentiate speech events, acquire the phonemes specific to their language community, and monitor mistakes (Tye-Murray, 2015). Auditory information also assists in keeping the suprasegmental features of voice under control, including F0, intensity, and quality (Tejeda-Franco et al., 2020)

While auditory perception is associated with the ears, the ears are just the pathway as the sensation actually occurs in the brain (Madell et al., 2019). Auditory signals are transmitted to the brain via the outer, middle, and inner ear. Sound travels down the ear canal as the pinna detects the direction of where the sound is coming from. At the middle ear, vibration of the tympanic membrane occurs, triggering movement of the malleus, incus, and stapes. The bones in the middle ear cause movement of the fluid in the cochlea, stimulating the hair cells and converting the movement into an action potential (Grindle, 2014). The signals are transmitted through the auditory nerve into the auditory cortex of the brain for higher processing (Grindle, 2014). The brain then concludes what the sounds represent and how to respond. According to the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) when problems arise in any of these parts along the pathway, it can lead to a hearing loss (ASHA, 2019).

Hearing loss is categorized by type, degree, and configuration displayed on the child's audiogram. Conductive, sensorineural and mixed are the 3 types of hearing loss that indicate which part of the hearing mechanism is damaged whether the outer, middle, inner or a combination (Grindle, 2014). The configuration of the hearing loss demonstrates the degree and pattern across frequencies as described as

bilateral, unilateral, symmetrical, asymmetrical, fluctuating, or stable (Tye-Murray 2015). Erler (2002), states that understanding a child with hearing loss's audiogram is critical in helping develop care. While audiologists diagnose hearing loss, the coexistence of hearing disorders and speech and language problems allow for hearing-screenings and basic checks of hearing aid performance to be completed by speech-language pathologist as within their scope of practice (Martin & Clark, 2015).

The coexistence of hearing disorders and speech/language deficits cause concerns directly affects academic, emotional, and psychosocial development of young children (Madell et.al., 2019). Academically, hearing loss affects a child's reading comprehension, theory of mind, problem solving, reading, and decoding (Kyle & Cain, 2015). Hearing loss directly impacts a child's overall intelligibility, suprasegmental, language, pragmatics and literacy errors (Tye-Murray, 2015). Research has shown that children with hearing loss exhibit persistent phonological errors that extend beyond the normal age of suppression including cluster reduction, cluster simplification, gliding, stopping, devoicing, velar fronting, assimilation, voicing, deaffrication, final consonant deletion, and weak syllable deletion (Asad, Purdy, Ballard, Fairgray, & Bowen, 2018). Stopping is especially prevalent in this population due to limited access to high-frequency sounds (Asad et al., 2018).

Social functioning and behavioral problems are also prevalent in the deaf and hard of hearing population secondary to the lack of acquisition of social/emotional competencies (Theunissen et al., 2014). A study conducted by Stevenson, McCann, Watkin, Worsfold, and Kennedy (2010), found an increased prevalence for behavior difficulties in children with hearing loss that manifest as emotional symptoms, conduct

problems, hyperactivity, and peer problems. Poor speech and language skills may exacerbate the aforementioned behaviors because a child may experience difficulty expressing themselves as well as managing peer interactions (Stevenson et al., 2010). Moreover, those with hearing loss have difficulty with pragmatics due to lack of practice with communication partners, difficulty hearing with background noise, different modes of communication, and lack of formal instruction (Tye-Murray, 2015).

Advances in hearing technology such as hearing aids, bone conduction devices, and cochlear implants, have aided in the reduction of the aforementioned maladaptive behaviors associated with hearing loss (Madell et al., 2019). Hearing aids, bone conduction devices, and cochlear implants all vary in the type of hearing loss they assist, with cochlear implants providing assistance to the greatest hearing deficits (Tye-Murray, 2015). The purpose of these devices is to “access, activate, stimulate, and grow auditory neural connections throughout the brain as the foundation for spoken language, reading, and academics” (Madell et al., 2019, p. 1). The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) identifies the two types of hearing aids as analog and digital which both amplify sound. Bone conduction devices assist those with conductive/mixed hearing loss or unilateral hearing loss (Eggermont, 2017). Cochlear implants provide sound to those with severe to profound hearing loss by bypassing the damaged portions of the ear to stimulate the auditory nerve (NIDCD, 2017). The external part of the cochlear implant utilizes a microphone and converts it into electrical stimulation code with a digital signal processing unit (Macherey & Carlyon, 2014) This is then transmitted to the internal part via a radio frequency link where electricity conveys the timing, intensity, and frequency characteristics of sound directly to the auditory nerve (Macherey & Carlyon, 2014). For

some students, or when they are in environments with varying levels of background noise, sometimes a hearing aid, bone conduction device, or even cochlear implants are not enough.

According to ASHA (n.d.), hearing assistive technology (HATS) are devices that assist a person hear in loud or busy places and can be used with or without hearing aids and cochlear implants. Individual frequency modulated (FM systems) are a type of HAT frequently used in the classroom to decrease the negative effects of hearing loss by transmitting a signal via FM radio waves through a microphone from the speaker's mouth to a receiver on the listener (Lewis, 2010). ASHA lists other HATS as infrared systems, induction loop systems, one to one communicators, and other devices used on technology such as cellphones or doorbells (ASHA, n.d.).

Since first introduced in 1972, cochlear implants have helped change the prognosis and academic success for the deaf and hard of hearing (ASHA, 2003). According to the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD), as of 2012, 324,200 registered devices have been implanted worldwide and this number is rapidly increasing with an estimated 58,000 adults and 38,000 children implanted (NIDCD, 2017). In 2000, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) deemed children as young as 12 months eligible for implantations after research determined that children implanted before three had better speech and language outcomes (Discolo & Hirose, 2002). However, receiving a cochlear implant does not automatically guarantee success. It is a lengthy process that extends past the preoperative care and surgery. "Although the technology itself is awe inspiring, improvements in oral communication are not ensured simply by using the device alone.

Intensive intervention is critical (Ertmer, 2002, p. 149). While the devices improve access to auditory information otherwise not received, they are not singly responsible for speech and language development. As implantations increase, it is vital that professionals who work with patients that have assistive hearing devices be familiar with the pre- and post-operative processes, current research findings, how to troubleshoot issues when they occur and making referrals to other professionals when necessary (Ertmer, 2002).

The pre-operative and actual implantation are primarily handled by the surgeon, (e.g., otologist), and audiologist, while speech-language pathologists play a critical role in post-implantation care. Speech-language pathologists are responsible for evaluating spoken or signed communication abilities and to make recommendations for intervention (Watson & Martin, 1999). After implantation, the therapist is responsible for direct speech/language therapy, auditory training, and troubleshooting/maintaining devices (Teagle & Moore, 2002). If a child's device is not working properly, their speech and the auditory input received in may be unintelligible, thus altering the way information is stored in their brains (Madell et al., 2019). Professionals involved with the child's care should be familiar with and able to carry out basic troubleshooting and maintenance procedures including changing cords or batteries as well as conducting functional listening checks (Teagle & Moore, 2002). It is recommended that school-based professionals who work and interact with those who use hearing devices work have a copy of the guides and manuals specific to the child's device as they are readily available for free (Hohla & Switzer, 2014). ASHA (2011), lists the knowledge and skills required for the practice of audiologic/aural rehabilitation which includes performing routine visual inspection and listening checks of client's hearing devices to troubleshoot causes

of malfunction such as dead or corroded battery obstruction or damage to visible parts of the system within the SLP's scope of practice. Speech-language pathologists need to acquaint themselves to the individual's device and its functionality as well as conduct listening checks using the Ling Six-Sound test to regulate the consistency of a child's access across the range of frequencies used in speech (Erler, 2002). This is necessary as auditory learning only occurs if the function of the implant is consistently maintained (Erler, 2002). Their speech is directly impacted by what they hear and will often reciprocate the word and intonation pattern. If they are unable to hear the differences in intonation and other suprasegmental aspects of speech than they will not be able to produce them correctly (Tye-Murray, 2015).

Cochlear implants have improved the adverse effects of hearing loss on speech and language, however there are still areas in need of improvement. Cochlear implants have increased accuracy with articulation however, fricatives and affricates continue to prove difficult due to their high-frequency nature (Tye-Murray, 2015). Cochlear implant users have difficulty with suprasegmentals as the devices do not support pitch perception thus affecting their development of prosody (Tye-Murray, 2015). Language development varies depending on age of implantation and experience (Tye-Murray, 2015). Those with hearing loss have difficulty with pragmatics due to lack of practice with communication partners, difficulty hearing with background noise, different modes of communication, and lack of formal instruction (Tye-Murray, 2015). Continued difficulty is seen with cochlear implant users as research has shown struggles with repairing communication breakdowns (Most, Shina-August, & Meilijison, 2010). With a background in articulation

training and language development, speech-language pathologists possess the skills to work with hearing impaired children in these areas (Teagle & Moore, 2002)

While speech-language pathologists receive training in articulation and language development, previous research has shown a lack of training specific to those suffering from hearing loss (Watson & Martin 1999; Babeu 2016; Ward, Grubbs & Biswas 2018). Speech-language pathologists are often unaware of the auditory hierarchy and the effect that the lack of mastering the various levels has on language, articulation, and auditory development (Hohla & Switzer, 2014). This includes the progression of the child's awareness of sound, suprasegmental discrimination/association, segmental association/identification, identification, and processing/comprehension (Hohla & Switzer, 2014).

According to the ASHA (2018) survey, in the United States, 51% of speech-language pathologists work in the public-school sector. Moreover, the percentage of SLPs that regularly serve children with hearing loss was reported as 45% with an average of 2.3 children served per SLP (ASHA, 2018). As speech-language pathologists play a vital role in the habilitation/rehabilitation processes for individuals with cochlear implants and hearing loss, it is important to address their level of comfort, confidence, knowledge of professionals' roles, and perception of preparedness to work with this population group. These areas have previously been investigated in studies in different parts of the United States including states in the upper midwest, the northeast, and the south (Watson & Martin 1999; Babeu 2016; Ward, Grubbs & Biswas 2018).

ASHA's membership and affiliation profile for state-level data, year-end 2018, revealed that 45% of the speech-language pathologists working in Kentucky listed

their primary employment facility as school-based (ASHA, 2018). While data is not available regarding the percentage of children served with hearing loss, it is probable that the numbers are consistent with ASHA's 2018 schools survey. The purpose of this study was to investigate the comfort, confidence, knowledge of professionals' roles, and perception of preparedness of Kentucky's school-based speech-language pathologists working with children with hearing loss, specifically those with cochlear implants.

### Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses are as follows:

H<sub>1</sub>: There will be a statistically significant association between school-based SLPs' comfort level and their management of selected hearing devices and procedures.

H<sub>2</sub>: There will be a statistically significant association between school-based SLPs' confidence level and their ability to carry out aural habilitative or rehabilitative treatment plans.

H<sub>3</sub>: There will be a statistically significant association between school-based SLPs' knowledge of cochlear implants and the roles and responsibilities of professionals associated with management of hearing loss.

H<sub>4</sub>: There will be a statistically significant association between school-based SLPs' educational training and their perception of preparedness to work with children with cochlear implants.

### Null Hypotheses

The null hypotheses are as follows:

H<sub>1</sub>: There will not be a statistically significant association between school-based SLPs' comfort level and their management of selected hearing devices and procedures.

H<sub>2</sub>: There will not be a statistically significant association between school-based SLPs' confidence level and their ability to carry out aural habilitative or rehabilitative treatment plans.

H<sub>3</sub>: There will not be a statistically significant association between school-based SLPs' knowledge of cochlear implants and the roles and responsibilities of professionals associated with management of hearing loss.

H<sub>4</sub>: There will not be a statistically significant association between school-based SLPs' educational training and their perception of preparedness to work with children with cochlear implants.

## CHAPTER 2

### METHODS

#### Participants

This non-experimental study utilized a convenience sample (N = 48) to investigate associations between the comfort, confidence, knowledge of professionals' roles, and perception of preparedness levels of Kentucky's school-based speech-language pathologists working with children with hearing loss, specifically those with cochlear implants. Respondents were asked to complete an online survey (Core<sup>XM</sup> Qualtrics<sup>®</sup>; SAP<sup>®</sup> SE; Walldorf, Germany) querying their comfort (8 questions), confidence (6 questions), knowledge of roles and responsibilities (5 questions), and perception of preparedness (3 questions) levels. The survey used a seven-point Likert scale for comfort and confidence targets and a five-point Likert scale for knowledge and preparedness items. The researchers used both within and between group designs to analyze responses. Approval was granted by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Louisville.

The researchers recruited participants through their district Director of Special Education (DoSE) via email blast. Each DoSE received an explanation of the current study and a link to the survey instrument. DoSE's were requested to forward an explanatory email to their speech-language pathologists. The email included possible risks or benefits of the study, informed consent, and the aforementioned link to the survey. A total of 49 responses were received between August 20, 2019 and September

20, 2019. Inclusionary criteria included licensure as an SLP in a Kentucky public school system and a minimum of a Master's degree. There were no gender, age-related, ethnic background, or health status requirements per this study. This study excluded all other non-therapy disciplines, teachers, and school-based audiologists. After data screening, one response was excluded, with 48 eligible responses remaining.

#### Setting and Instrumentation

School-based speech-language pathologists completed the online survey. The survey was accessible by tablet, laptop, smartphone, or desktop computer, and was designed to take 15 minutes or less. The survey was open for approximately one month; respondents were asked to complete the survey once. Prior to accessing the survey, participants were informed of the possible risks and benefits of the study, and that the opening, completion, or submission of the survey implied consent for inclusion. Participants were advised that there were no foreseeable risks. The survey requested no personal identifying information. Responses were stored on a password protected computer behind a locked door.

The survey was comprised of demographic probes and previously used questionnaires regarding respondents' comfort, confidence, knowledge of roles and responsibilities, and perception of preparedness levels to work with children with hearing loss, specifically those with cochlear implants. The survey included several demographic related questions. Demographic questions included those related to gender, age, ethnicity, highest degree, Kentucky licensure, year of graduation with the Master's degree, teacher certification, school-district location (i.e., region), grades served, years at current school,

number of students on caseload, number of students with hearing aids, FM systems, and cochlear implants.

Comfort level questions (eight questions) were modeled after instruments used by Watson and Martin (1999), Ward, Grubbs, and Biswas (2018), Compton, Tucker, and Flynn (2009), and Babeu (2016). Confidence level questions (six questions) were modeled after instruments used by Watson and Martin (1999) and Babeu (2016). Knowledge of roles and responsibilities of professionals' working with children with hearing loss were modeled after questionnaires used by Watson and Martin (1999). Perception of preparation to work with children with hearing loss questions were modeled after questionnaires used by Babeu (2016) and Compton, Tucker, and Flynn (2009). As previously indicated, the instrument for this study used a seven-point Likert scale for comfort and confidence targets. Elections ranged from *extremely uncomfortable* to *extremely comfortable* and *extremely inadequate* (confidence) to *extremely adequate* (confidence). Questions involving knowledge of roles and responsibilities of professional's working with children with hearing loss, including cochlear implants and perception of preparedness used a five-point Likert scale. The scale ranged from *not knowledgeable at all* to *extremely knowledgeable* and *not well at all* (preparedness) to *extremely well* (preparedness), respectively. The survey instrument is included as Appendix A.

### Data Analysis

All completed surveys were exported to Microsoft Excel and numerically coded in preparation for analysis. The data were then exported to SPSS Version 25 for statistical analyses. Descriptive and summary statistics characterized the aforementioned

demographic items. The overall sample size was small and evidenced a monotonic relationship during assumption testing. As such, non-parametric analyses consistent with Spearman's rank-order correlations were completed for both within and between group items. Interpretation of the correlation coefficients was based on Mukaka (2012) with only statistically significant positive and negative correlations  $\geq .5$  included.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESULTS

This study used a convenience sample of school-based speech-language pathologists (SLP) working in Kentucky's public-school system, inclusive of preschool, elementary, middle school, and high school settings. Respondents completed an online anonymous that queried their comfort, confidence, knowledge of roles and responsibilities, and perception of preparedness for working with children with hearing loss, specifically those with cochlear implants. Forty-eight (48) participants completed the survey in its entirety; 2% ( $n = 1$ ) were male and 98% ( $n = 47$ ) were female. Years practicing as an SLP ranged from one year to 34 years ( $M = 14.2$ ,  $SD = 9.3$ ). Total caseload size ranged from 24 students to 68 students ( $M = 52.8$ ,  $SD = 11.6$ ). Respondent age ranges and years at their current school (i.e., range) are presented in Tables 1 and 2 respectively.

**Table 1**

Participant Age Ranges ( $N = 48$ )

Range	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
<24 Years	3	6.3%	6.3
25-34 Years	16	33.3	39.6
35-44 Years	14	29.2	68.8
45-54 Years	10	20.8	89.6
>55 Years	5	10.4	100.0

**Table 2**Years at Current School

Range	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
<1 Year	10	20.8	20.8
1-5 Years	13	27.1	47.9
6-10 Years	7	14.6	62.5
11-15 Years	8	16.7	79.2
>16 Years	10	20.8	100.0

Table 3 presents frequency counts of those students served with hearing aids, FM systems, and/or cochlear implants. This study was not limited to school districts or regions with known high numbers of children with hearing loss. The survey was distributed across the 15 regions of Kentucky (e.g., Purchase, Pennyrite, Green River, Barren River, Bluegrass, Cumberland Valley, Northern Kentucky, Kentucky River, Gateway, Buffalo Trace, Fivco, Big Sandy, KIPDA, Lincoln Trail, Lake Cumberland) with representation from 11 regions (73%).

**Table 3**Students with Hearing Aids, FM Systems, and/or Cochlear Implants

# of Students	Hearing Aids	FM Systems	Cochlear Implants
0	26	30	38
1-5	22	17	10
6-10	0	0	0
11-15	0	0	0
>16	0	1	0
Totals	48	48	48

Tables 4, 6, 8, and 10 present descriptive statistics regarding respondents' comfort (8 questions), confidence (6 questions), knowledge of roles and responsibilities (5 questions), and perception of preparedness (3 questions) levels. The survey used a seven-

point Likert scale for comfort and confidence targets and a five-point Likert scale for knowledge and preparedness items. Tables 5,7,9, and 11 present within-group item correlations while tables 12-17 present between-group item correlations. Spearman's rank-order correlation was used for analysis as the data set overall was relatively small ( $N = 48$ ) and largely monotonic. Interpretation of correlation coefficients is based on Mukaka (2012) with only statistically significant positive and negative correlations  $\geq .500$  included.

### Descriptive Statistics and Within-Group Item Correlations

#### Comfort Level

Descriptive statistics for this study and this sample ( $N = 48$ ) found that school-based SLPs are moderately or extremely uncomfortable with CI procedures (68.7%,  $n = 33$ ); moderately or extremely uncomfortable with CI brands (88.5%,  $n = 42$ ); moderately or extremely uncomfortable regarding different types of hearing aids (50%,  $n = 24$ ); moderately or extremely uncomfortable with bone conductor hearing aids (60.4%,  $n = 29$ ); moderately or extremely uncomfortable troubleshooting devices (66.7%,  $n = 32$ ); and moderately or extremely uncomfortable with mapping a CI (87.6%,  $n = 42$ ). School-based SLPs appear somewhat more comfortable regarding "how a CI works" and their skills "interpreting audiograms". Respondents rated their comfort level regarding "how a CI works" as extremely, moderately, or slightly comfortable (43.7%,  $n = 21$ ) versus moderately or extremely uncomfortable (39.6%,  $n = 19$ ). Respondents rated their comfort level interpreting audiograms as extremely, moderately, or slightly comfortable (52.1%,  $n = 25$ ) versus moderately or extremely uncomfortable (27.1%,  $n = 13$ ).

**Table 4**Comfort Levels

		<i>n</i>	%
CI Procedures	Extremely Comfortable	0	0.0%
	Moderately Comfortable	2	4.2%
	Slightly Comfortable	4	8.3%
	Neutral	3	6.3%
	Slightly Uncomfortable	6	12.5%
	Moderately Uncomfortable	10	20.8%
	Extremely Uncomfortable	23	47.9%
CI Brands	Extremely Comfortable	0	0.0%
	Moderately Comfortable	0	0.0%
	Slightly Comfortable	2	4.2%
	Neutral	2	4.2%
	Slightly Uncomfortable	2	4.2%
	Moderately Uncomfortable	10	20.8%
	Extremely Uncomfortable	32	66.7%
Different HA	Extremely Comfortable	0	0.0%
	Moderately Comfortable	4	8.3%
	Slightly Comfortable	5	10.4%
	Neutral	5	10.4%
	Slightly Uncomfortable	10	20.8%
	Moderately Uncomfortable	13	27.1%
	Extremely Uncomfortable	11	22.9%
Bone Conductor HA	Extremely Comfortable	1	2.1%
	Moderately Comfortable	1	2.1%
	Slightly Comfortable	3	6.3%
	Neutral	4	8.3%
	Slightly Uncomfortable	10	20.8%
	Moderately Uncomfortable	12	25.0%
	Extremely Uncomfortable	17	35.4%
Troubleshooting Devices	Extremely Comfortable	1	2.1%
	Moderately Comfortable	1	2.1%
	Slightly Comfortable	4	8.3%
	Neutral	0	0.0%
	Slightly Uncomfortable	10	20.8%
	Moderately Uncomfortable	11	22.9%
	Extremely Uncomfortable	21	43.8%

		<i>N</i>	%
How CI Works	Extremely Comfortable	0	0.0%
	Moderately Comfortable	5	10.4%
	Slightly Comfortable	16	33.3%
	Neutral	6	12.5%
	Slightly Uncomfortable	2	4.2%
	Moderately Uncomfortable	8	16.7%
	Extremely Uncomfortable	11	22.9%
Interpreting Audiograms	Extremely Comfortable	7	14.6%
	Moderately Comfortable	7	14.6%
	Slightly Comfortable	11	22.9%
	Neutral	4	8.3%
	Slightly Uncomfortable	6	12.5%
	Moderately Uncomfortable	5	10.4%
	Extremely Uncomfortable	8	16.7%
Mapping CI	Extremely Comfortable	0	0.0%
	Moderately Comfortable	0	0.0%
	Slightly Comfortable	1	2.1%
	Neutral	0	0.0%
	Slightly Uncomfortable	5	10.4%
	Moderately Uncomfortable	9	18.8%
	Extremely Uncomfortable	33	68.8%

A Spearman's rank-order correlation was run to assess the association between school-based SLPs' comfort level and their management of selected hearing devices and procedures. There were statistically significant, moderate positive correlations between CI procedures and CI brands,  $r_s(48) = .54, p < .001$ ; CI procedures and "how a CI works",  $r_s(48) = .51, p < .001$ ; CI procedures and mapping a CI,  $r_s(48) = .57, p < .001$ ; CI brands and mapping a CI,  $r_s(48) = .58, p < .001$ ; bone conduction hearing aids and different types of hearing aids,  $r_s(48) = .53, p < .001$ ; troubleshooting devices and different types of hearing aids,  $r_s(48) = .59, p < .001$ ; interpreting audiograms and different types of hearing aids,  $r_s(48) = .53, p < .001$ ; bone conduction hearing aids and troubleshooting devices,  $r_s(48) = .52, p < .001$ ; interpreting audiograms and bone

conduction hearing aids,  $r_s(48) = .52, p < .001$ ; and troubleshooting devices and mapping a CI,  $r_s(48) = .57, p < .001$ . A statistically significant, high positive correlation was noted between bone conduction hearing aids and CI procedures,  $r_s(48) = .74, p < .001$ .

**Table 5**

Spearman's Rho Correlation Matrix (Comfort Levels)

	CI Procedures	Brands	Different HA	Bone Conduct.	Troubleshoot	How CI Works	CI Audiogram	Mapping CI
CI Procedures	-							
CI Brands	<i>.54</i>	-						
Different HA	<i>.38</i>	<i>.39</i>	-					
Bone Conduct.	<b>.74</b>	<i>.43</i>	<i>.53</i>	-				
Troubleshoot	<i>.38</i>	<i>.50</i>	<i>.59</i>	<i>.52</i>	-			
How CI Works	<i>.51</i>	<i>.32</i>	<i>.38</i>	<i>.45</i>	<i>.47</i>	-		
Audiogram	<i>.29</i>	<i>.32</i>	<i>.53</i>	<i>.52</i>	<i>.40</i>	<i>.38</i>	-	
Mapping CI	<i>.57</i>	<i>.58</i>	<i>.41</i>	<i>.47</i>	<i>.57</i>	<i>.49</i>	<i>.36</i>	-

Moderate Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r = .50-.70|$  in *italics*

High Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r > .70|$  in **bold**

Confidence Level

Descriptive statistics for this study and this sample (N = 48) found that school-based SLPs feel moderately or extremely inadequate with auditory training for individuals with CI (50%,  $n = 24$ ); moderately or extremely inadequate with speech reading tasks for individuals with CI (58.4%,  $n = 28$ ); and moderately or extremely inadequate with theory of mind tasks for individuals with CI (50%,  $n = 24$ ). Respondents rated their confidence level as slightly, moderately, or extremely adequate with respect to articulation therapy for individuals with CI (70.8%,  $n = 27$ ) versus moderately or extremely inadequate (20.8%,  $n = 10$ ). Respondents rated their confidence levels as slightly, moderately, or extremely adequate with respect to treatment of executive functions individuals with CI (47.9%,  $n = 18$ ) versus moderately or extremely inadequate (37.5%,  $n = 18$ ). Respondents also reported feeling slightly, moderately, or extremely

adequate with respect to treatment of phonological awareness in individuals with CI: (52.9%,  $n = 25$ ) versus those that felt moderately or extremely inadequate (22.9%,  $n = 11$ ).

**Table 6**

Confidence Levels

		<i>n</i>	%
CI Auditory Training	Extremely Adequate	1	2.1%
	Moderately Adequate	5	10.4%
	Slightly Adequate	8	16.7%
	Neutral	5	10.4%
	Slightly Inadequate	5	10.4%
	Moderately Inadequate	12	25.0%
	Extremely Inadequate	12	25.0%
CI Speech Reading	Extremely Adequate	0	0.0%
	Moderately Adequate	5	10.4%
	Slightly Adequate	7	14.6%
	Neutral	5	10.4%
	Slightly Inadequate	3	6.3%
	Moderately Inadequate	13	27.1%
	Extremely Inadequate	15	31.3%
CI Articulation	Extremely Adequate	11	22.9%
	Moderately Adequate	16	33.3%
	Slightly Adequate	7	14.6%
	Neutral	1	2.1%
	Slightly Inadequate	3	6.3%
	Moderately Inadequate	5	10.4%
	Extremely Inadequate	5	10.4%
CI Theory of Mind	Extremely Adequate	4	8.3%
	Moderately Adequate	5	10.4%
	Slightly Adequate	2	4.2%
	Neutral	8	16.7%
	Slightly Inadequate	5	10.4%
	Moderately Inadequate	11	22.9%
	Extremely Inadequate	13	27.1%
CI Executive Functions	Extremely Adequate	4	8.3%
	Moderately Adequate	14	29.2%

	Slightly Adequate	5	10.4%
	Neutral	3	6.3%
	Slightly Inadequate	4	8.3%
	Moderately Inadequate	7	14.6%
	Extremely Inadequate	11	22.9%
CI Phonological Awareness	Extremely Adequate	7	14.6%
	Moderately Adequate	18	37.5%
	Slightly Adequate	5	10.4%
	Neutral	2	4.2%
	Slightly Inadequate	5	10.4%
	Moderately Inadequate	5	10.4%
	Extremely Inadequate	6	12.5%

A Spearman's rank-order correlation was run to assess the association between school-based SLPs' confidence level and their ability to carry out aural habilitative and rehabilitative treatment plans. There were statistically significant, moderate positive correlations between auditory training and articulation,  $r_s(48) = .52, p < .001$ ; auditory training and phonological awareness,  $r_s(48) = .63, p < .001$ ; speech reading and theory of mind,  $r_s(48) = .61, p < .001$ ; speech reading and executive functions,  $r_s(48) = .50, p < .001$ ; theory of mind and articulation,  $r_s(48) = .65, p < .001$ ; theory of mind and executive functions,  $r_s(48) = .66, p < .001$ ; and theory of mind and phonological awareness,  $r_s(48) = .69, p < .001$ . There were statistically significant, high positive correlations between auditory training and speech reading,  $r_s(48) = .81, p < .001$ ; auditory training and theory of mind,  $r_s(48) = .71, p < .001$ ; auditory training and executive functions,  $r_s(48) = .71, p < .001$ ; articulation and executive functions,  $r_s(48) = .75, p < .001$ ; articulation and phonological awareness,  $r_s(48) = .83, p < .001$ ; and executive functions and phonological awareness,  $r_s(48) = .76, p < .001$ .

**Table 7**Spearman's Rho Correlation Matrix (Confidence Levels)

	Aud. Train.	Sp. Read.	Artic.	Th. of Mind	Ex. Func.	Phono Awar.
Aud. Train.	-					
Sp. Read.	<b>.81</b>	-				
Artic.	.52	.43	-			
Th. of Mind	<b>.71</b>	.61	.65	-		
Ex. Func.	<b>.71</b>	.50	<b>.75</b>	.66	-	
Phono Awar.	.63	.47	<b>.83</b>	.69	<b>.76</b>	-

Moderate Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r = .50-.70|$  in *italics*

High Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r > .70|$  in **bold**

### Knowledge of Roles and Responsibilities

Descriptive statistics for this study and this sample (N = 48) found that school-based SLPs feel moderately, very, or extremely knowledgeable regarding the roles and responsibilities of audiologists (87.5%,  $n = 42$ ), teachers (68.7%,  $n = 33$ ), speech-language pathologists (75.1%,  $n = 36$ ), and parents (79.2%,  $n = 38$ ) in the management of individuals with hearing loss. Approximately 48% ( $n = 23$ ) of respondents reported feeling slightly knowledgeable or having no knowledge regarding the role of otologists in the management of individuals with hearing loss.

**Table 8**Knowledge of Roles and Responsibilities

		<i>n</i>	%
Otologist	Extremely Knowledgeable	3	6.3%
	Very Knowledgeable	6	12.5%
	Moderately Knowledgeable	16	33.3%
	Slightly Knowledgeable	13	27.1%
	Not Knowledgeable	10	20.8%
Audiologist	Extremely Knowledgeable	5	10.4%
	Very Knowledgeable	18	37.5%
	Moderately Knowledgeable	19	39.6%
	Slightly Knowledgeable	4	8.3%

	Not Knowledgeable	2	4.2%
Teacher	Extremely Knowledgeable	5	10.4%
	Very Knowledgeable	12	25.0%
	Moderately Knowledgeable	16	33.3%
	Slightly Knowledgeable	11	22.9%
	Not Knowledgeable	4	8.3%
SLP	Extremely Knowledgeable	8	16.7%
	Very Knowledgeable	13	27.1%
	Moderately Knowledgeable	15	31.3%
	Slightly Knowledgeable	10	20.8%
	Not Knowledgeable	2	4.2%
Parent	Extremely Knowledgeable	4	8.3%
	Very Knowledgeable	15	31.3%
	Moderately Knowledgeable	19	39.6%
	Slightly Knowledgeable	8	16.7%
	Not Knowledgeable	2	4.2%

A Spearman's rank-order correlation was run to assess the association between school-based SLPs' knowledge of cochlear implants and the roles and responsibilities of individuals associated with the management of hearing loss. There were statistically significant, moderate positive correlations between otologists and audiologists,  $r_s(48) = .55, p < .001$ ; otologists and teachers,  $r_s(48) = .55, p < .001$ ; otologists and speech-language pathologists,  $r_s(48) = .53, p < .001$ ; and otologists and parents,  $r_s(48) = .62, p < .001$ . There were statistically significant, high positive correlations between audiologists and teachers,  $r_s(48) = .80, p < .001$ ; audiologists and speech-language pathologists,  $r_s(48) = .72, p < .001$ ; audiologists and parents,  $r_s(48) = .82, p < .001$ ; teachers and speech-language pathologists,  $r_s(48) = .78, p < .001$ ; teachers and parents,  $r_s(48) = .79, p < .001$ ; and speech-language pathologists and parents,  $r_s(48) = .73, p < .001$ .

**Table 9**Spearman’s Rho Correlation Matrix (Knowledge of Roles/Responsibilities)

	Otologist	Audiologist	Teacher	SLP	Parent
Otologist	-				
Audiologist	.55	-			
Teacher	.55	<b>.80</b>	-		
SLP	.53	<b>.72</b>	<b>.78</b>	-	
Parent	.62	<b>.82</b>	<b>.79</b>	<b>.73</b>	-

Moderate Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r = .50-.70|$  in *italics*

High Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r > .70|$  in **bold**

## Preparedness/Training

Descriptive statistics for this study and this sample ( $N = 48$ ) found that the majority of school-based SLPs felt that neither their undergraduate education, graduate education, nor their practicum experiences sufficiently prepared them to work with children with cochlear implants. In response to the prompt, “how well do you feel your undergraduate education prepared you to work with children with cochlear implants?”, 68.8% ( $n = 33$ ) reported “not well at all”, 27.1% ( $n = 13$ ) reported “slightly well”, and 4.2% ( $n = 2$ ) reported “moderately well”. The same prompt was provided for “graduate education”. Approximately 52% of respondents suggested that their graduate education did “not” prepare them “well at all” to work with cochlear implants while 35.4% described their training as “slightly well”. Six respondents (12.5%) reported their graduate training to be “moderately well” prepared. In terms of practicum placements, the majority (70.8%,  $n = 34$ ) reported “not well at all” to the provided prompt followed by 16.7% ( $n = 8$ ) as “slightly well”, 6.3% ( $n = 3$ ) as “moderately well”, and 6.3% ( $n = 3$ ) as very well.

**Table 10**

Preparedness/Training

Education		N	%
Undergraduate Degree	Extremely Well	0	0.0%
	Very Well	0	0.0%
	Moderately Well	2	4.2%
	Slightly Well	13	27.1%
	Not Well At All	33	68.8%
Graduate Degree	Extremely Well	0	0.0%
	Very Well	0	0.0%
	Moderately Well	6	12.5%
	Slightly Well	17	35.4%
	Not Well At All	25	52.1%
Practicum Placements	Extremely Well	0	0.0%
	Very Well	3	6.3%
	Moderately Well	3	6.3%
	Slightly Well	8	16.7%
	Not Well At All	34	70.8%

A Spearman's rank-order correlation was run to assess the association between school-based SLPs' educational training and their perception of preparedness to work with children with cochlear implants. A statistically significant, moderate positive correlation was identified between graduate education and practicum placements,  $r_s(48) = .68, p < .001$ .

**Table 11**

Spearman's Rho Correlation Matrix (Preparedness/Training)

	Undergrad	Graduate	Practicum
Undergrad	-		
Graduate	.48	-	
Practicum	.39	.68	-

Moderate Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r = .50-.70|$  in *italics*

High Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r > .70|$  in **bold**

## Between-Group Item Correlations

### Comfort and Confidence Levels

A Spearman's rank-order correlation was run to assess the association between school-based SLPs' comfort level and their management of selected hearing devices and procedures and their degree of confidence regarding their ability to carry out aural habilitative and rehabilitative treatment plans. There were statistically significant, moderate positive correlations between CI procedures and auditory training,  $r_s(48) = .53, p < .001$ ; different types of hearing aids and auditory training,  $r_s(48) = .60, p < .001$ ; bone conduction hearing aids and auditory training,  $r_s(48) = .54, p < .001$ ; different types of hearing aids and speech reading,  $r_s(48) = .56, p < .001$ ; troubleshooting devices and speech reading,  $r_s(48) = .59, p < .001$ ; "how a CI works" and theory of mind,  $r_s(48) = .53, p < .001$ ; CI procedures and overall confidence,  $r_s(48) = .66, p < .001$ ; CI brands and overall confidence,  $r_s(48) = .51, p < .001$ ; different types of hearing aids and overall confidence,  $r_s(48) = .57, p < .001$ ; bone conduction hearing aids and overall confidence,  $r_s(48) = .66, p < .001$ ; troubleshooting devices and overall confidence,  $r_s(48) = .57, p < .001$ ; "how a CI works" and overall confidence,  $r_s(48) = .61, p < .001$ ; and mapping a CI and overall confidence,  $r_s(48) = .52, p < .001$ .

**Table 12**

#### Spearman's Rho Correlation Matrix (Comfort and Confidence Levels)

	Aud. Train.	Sp. Read.	Artic.	Th. of Mind.	Ex. Func.	Phono. Awar.	Overall Conf.
CI Procedures	.53	.34	.20	.30	.29	.25	.66
CI Brands	.27	.32	.03	.15	.01	.08	.51
Different HA	.60	.56	.34	.45	.41	.35	.57
Bone Conduct.	.54	.38	.10	.32	.22	.18	.66
Troubleshoot	.43	.59	.18	.32	.16	.18	.57
How CI Works	.46	.37	.33	.53	.30	.33	.61
Audiogram	.46	.40	.20	.38	.27	.38	.48

Mapping CI	.44	.44	.20	.30	.19	.15	.52
------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Moderate Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r = .50-.70|$  in *italics*  
High Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r > .70|$  in **bold**

### Comfort Level and Knowledge of Roles and Responsibilities

A Spearman's rank-order correlation was run to assess the association between school-based SLPs' comfort level managing selected hearing devices and procedures and their knowledge of cochlear implants and the roles and responsibilities of individuals associated with the management of hearing loss. There were statistically significant, moderate positive correlations between “how a CI works” and parents,  $r_s(48) = .52, p < .001$  and mapping a CI and parents,  $r_s(48) = .54, p < .001$ .

**Table 13**

Spearman's Rho Correlation Matrix (Comfort Level and Knowledge of Roles and Responsibilities)

	Otologist	Audiologist	Teacher	SLP	Parent
CI Procedures	.33	.24	.27	.23	.40
CI Brands	.02	.09	.06	.09	.21
Different HA	.05	.28	.26	.40	.35
Bone Conduct.	.26	.21	.26	.16	.29
Troubleshoot	-.09	.20	.26	.20	.27
How CI Works	.27	.41	.49	.29	.52
Audiogram	.24	.44	.47	.44	.42
Mapping CI	.17	.40	.40	.28	.54

Moderate Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r = .50-.70|$  in *italics*  
High Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r > .70|$  in **bold**

### Comfort Level and Preparedness/Training

A Spearman's rank-order correlation was run to assess the association between school-based SLPs' educational training and their perception of preparedness to work with children with cochlear implants and their comfort level managing selected hearing devices and procedures. There were statistically significant, moderate positive

correlations between interpreting audiograms and graduate education,  $r_s(48) = .51, p < .001$  and mapping a CI and graduate education,  $r_s(48) = .59, p < .001$ .

**Table 14**

Spearman's Rho Correlation Matrix (Comfort Level and Preparedness/Training)

	Undergrad	Graduate	Practicum
CI Procedures	.03	.29	.28
CI Brands	.15	.29	.30
Different HA	.23	.40	.39
Bone Conduct.	.14	.36	.37
Troubleshoot	.16	.33	.18
How CI Works	.00	.42	.24
Audiogram	.29	.51	.37
Mapping CI	.20	.59	.39

Moderate Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r = .50-.70|$  in *italics*

High Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r > .70|$  in **bold**

Confidence Level and Knowledge of the Roles and Responsibilities

A Spearman's rank-order correlation was run to assess the association between school-based SLPs' confidence level regarding their ability to carry out aural habilitative and rehabilitative treatment plans and their knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of individuals associated with the management of hearing loss. There were statistically significant, moderate positive correlations between theory of mind and teachers,  $r_s(48) = .52, p < .001$ ; theory of mind and speech-language pathologists,  $r_s(48) = .50, p < .001$ ; theory of mind and parents,  $r_s(48) = .54, p < .001$ ; phonological awareness and speech-language pathologists,  $r_s(48) = .51, p < .001$ ; auditory training and parents,  $r_s(48) = .54, p < .001$ ; and overall confidence and parents,  $r_s(48) = .52, p < .001$ .

**Table 15**

Spearman's Rho Correlation Matrix Confidence Level and Knowledge of Roles and Responsibilities)

	Otologist	Audiologist	Teacher	SLP	Parent
Aud. Train.	.33	.44	.45	.44	.54
Sp. Read.	.24	.42	.43	.42	.50
Artic.	.31	.37	.36	.40	.31
Th. of Mind	.34	.47	.52	.50	.54
Ex. Func.	.22	.30	.33	.32	.29
Phono Awar.	.34	.42	.45	.51	.40
Overall Conf.	.25	.37	.39	.31	.52

Moderate Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r = .50-.70|$  in *italics*

High Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r > .70|$  in **bold**

Confidence Level and Preparedness/Training

A Spearman's rank-order correlation was run to assess the association between school-based SLPs' confidence level regarding their ability to carry out aural habilitative and rehabilitative treatment plans and their educational training and perception of preparedness to work with children with cochlear implants. While statistical significance was achieved for many items, none of the Spearman's rank-order correlations were  $\geq .500$ .

**Table 16**

Spearman's Rho Correlation Matrix (Confidence Level and Preparedness/Training)

	Undergrad	Graduate	Practicum
Aud. Train.	.34	.44	.43
Sp. Read.	.45	.50	.45
Artic.	.21	.18	.22
Th. of Mind	.19	.38	.43
Ex. Func.	.21	.20	.26
Phono Awar.	.26	.17	.17
Overall Conf.	.14	.34	.30

Moderate Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r = .50-.70|$  in *italics*

High Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r > .70|$  in **bold**

Knowledge of Roles and Responsibilities and Preparedness/Training

A Spearman's rank-order correlation was run to assess the association between school-based SLPs' educational training and perception of preparedness to work with children with cochlear implants and their knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of individuals associated with the management of hearing loss. A statistically significant, moderate positive correlation was identified between teachers and graduate education,  $r_s(48) = .56, p < .001$ .

**Table 17**

Spearman's Rho Correlation Matrix Knowledge of Roles/Responsibilities and Preparedness/Training)

	Undergrad	Graduate	Practicum
Otologist	.13	.32	.25
Audiologist	.16	.44	.33
Teacher	.32	.56	.38
SLP	.26	.47	.31
Parent	.20	.49	.35

Moderate Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r = .50-.70|$  in *italics*

High Positive (Negative) Correlation  $|r > .70|$  in **bold**

## CHAPTER 4

### DISCUSSION

Early hearing detection and intervention (EDHI) laws have increased opportunities for children with hearing loss by requiring newborn hearing screenings and early intervention services by six months of age (ASHA, 2020). As the number of children diagnosed continues to increase, school based SLPs will likely have hearing-impaired students on their caseloads as 90% of children with hearing loss are educated in the public school system with 61% served in a mainstream classroom (Ertmer 2002; U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics). The goal is for direct speech, language, and auditory training services to decrease during the elementary and middle school years after quality intervention (Teagle & Moore, 2002). It is vital that SLPs who work with this population are proficient in their ability to provide treatment as student's progress with speech perception, speech production, and oral language requires quality and collaborative intervention (Ertmer 2002; Munoz & Blaiser 2011). In this study, forty-eight Kentucky school based SLPs were surveyed on their comfort, confidence, knowledge, and preparation in providing appropriate intervention services for hearing impaired students.

#### Comfort

From a comfort perspective, the majority of this sample size rated their comfort levels with cochlear implant (CI) procedures, brands, troubleshooting and mapping as extremely uncomfortable. In a similar study conducted in New Hampshire, results

demonstrated a lack of knowledge about cochlear implant candidacy as 100% of respondents answered they felt minimally competent (Babeu, 2016). Per this sample context, 81.2% of SLPs surveyed ranked themselves as uncomfortable with CI procedures from candidacy to activation. The ASHA (2001) Knowledge and Skills for the Practice of Audiologic/Aural Rehabilitation outlines that SLPs who provide aural rehabilitation demonstrate the ability to describe candidacy criteria for amplification and sensory prosthetic devices. Understanding the candidacy criteria and preimplant factors that affect outcomes, will assist SLPs in their decisions, make the correct referrals, and provide support to families (Teagle & Moore, 2002). SLPs also assist in the candidacy process by providing the CI team with the child's expressive and receptive language skills, speech production, auditory behaviors, speech perception ability, attention, and other cognitive abilities to determine eligibility (Erler, 2002). SLPs also contribute to the CI process before activation by conditioning the child to be aware of the presence of a stimulus using various cues (Erler, 2002). A strong positive correlation was found in this sample between the comfort levels with CI procedures and their overall confidence levels in creating treatment goals with a .662 correlation. Understanding the CI process in combination with the child's pre-implantation speech and language skills will aid SLPs in developing appropriate expectations of the child (Erler, 2002).

Previous research has shown that SLPs demonstrated lower confidence scores when it came to determine the functional status of a hearing aid and even lower confidence troubleshooting (Muncy, Yoho, & McClain, 2019). Results from a Mississippi study indicated that 73% percent of the SLPs surveyed felt uncomfortable with troubleshooting procedures (Ward, Grubbs, & Biswas, 2018). A similar study

conducted in the Midwest also yielded similar results with SLPs indicating they had minimal to no knowledge on troubleshooting a malfunctioning implant (Watson & Martin, 1999). Richburg and Knickelbein (2011) yielded results of a two hundred and nine SLP sample throughout the United States that 60.6% rated their ability to assist students with malfunctioning hearing aids or FM systems as low and 57.6% rated their ability to assist students with malfunctioning cochlear implants as low. Results from Richburg & Knickelbein (2011) study also suggested that although monitoring hearing aids is listed in the ASHA Guidelines, SLPs are not conducting listening checks to determine device function level adequately or appropriately. Per this sample of Kentucky school based SLPs, 87% felt slightly-extremely uncomfortable with troubleshooting devices. Consistent use of a well-functioning hearing device is critical to a child's success as auditory learning only occurs when integrity is maintained (Erler 2002; Munoz & Blaiser 2011). While malfunctioning devices subject an audiology referral, many school systems do not have educational audiologists readily available (Brackett, 1997). ASHA's Knowledge and Skills for the Practice of Audiologic/Aural Rehabilitation (2001) outlines that SLPs are able to "perform routine visual inspection and listening checks of clients' hearing devices and sensory aids to troubleshoot common causes of malfunctioning (para. 7). Common causes include cord dysfunction or battery status (Erler, 2002). In addition to monitoring changes in a student's abilities that may indicate device malfunction, SLPs should also coach parents in checking the integrity of devices at home to ensure accurate access to sound (Brackett 1997; Munoz & Blaiser 2011). For the cases where an audiologist is not readily available, most companies offer manuals to assist SLPs in troubleshooting (Hohla & Switzer, 2014).

A moderate positive (negative) correlation was evident in this survey between comfort level of troubleshooting and comfort level of both brands and hearing aids. The different hearing aid choices available and different brands directly impacts troubleshooting as each device works differently. SLPs should be familiar with each child's specific device and how it functions (Erler, 2002). Proficiency in device function and how a CI works assists in mapping procedures. When the SLP knows how the hearing device is set, they can observe the child's reactions to various sounds and environments to provide feedback to the audiologist to adjust settings for performance (Munoz & Blaiser, 2011). Previous research into SLPs proficiency with CI function noted a variance amongst SLPs however a majority responded that they did not feel confident in their abilities (Babeau 2016; Compton, Tucker & Flynn 2009; Ward, Grubbs, & Biswas; Watson & Martin 1999). SLPs in this survey also varied in their responses to their comfort level with how a CI works. It is important that SLPs understand the CI components to complete troubleshooting, connecting to FM systems, and completing daily listening checks (Ward, Grubbs, & Biswas 2018). In order to ensure quality intervention services and allow students to reach their full potential with their speech and language skills, SLPs must be knowledgeable about the mechanism of the device and effective management techniques (Watson & Martin, 1999). SLPs should also understand and recognize signs that the device needs troubleshooting or adjustment to the mapping including changes in responses, vocal quality, speech production, or discomfort (Erler, 2002). Unfamiliarity with the mapping procedures may be due to the fact that audiologists handle this rather than the SLP, however there is benefit to understanding mapping. Speech mapping is beneficial to SLP as it ensures that the patient

can hear the necessary frequencies of the speech spectrum (Tye-Murray, 2015). Being comfortable with the location of speech sounds plotted on an audiogram aids in determining whether the student is receiving appropriate benefit from their device and reveals deficits that prompt an adjustment to the mapping of the device (Tye-Murray, 2015).

### Confidence

The SLP's primary responsibility is to develop and deliver an appropriate program with speech, language and listening goals to improve both social interactive and instructional communication (Brackett 1997; Watson & Martin 1999). ASHA (2001) guidelines for aural rehabilitation state that SLPs should provide intervention that includes voice quality, resonance, phonologic processes, oral motor skills, articulation, prosody, semantics, and pragmatics. In this study, SLPs ranked their confidence levels in creating goals in auditory training, speech reading, articulation, theory of mind, executive function, and phonological awareness. SLPs' confidence levels were increased in establishing goals for articulation, executive function, and phonological awareness when compared to auditory training, speech reading, and theory of mind. Excluding theory of mind, the categories with decreased confidence levels were specific to hearing loss whereas the other categories are prevalent among other diagnoses. SLPs need to assess a student's speech and language skills in comparison to age matched peers and understand typical delays related to hearing loss (Munoz & Blaiser, 2011). Low confidence levels may be associated with lack of exposure and experience with this population. Watson and Martin's (1999) data indicated that direct experience was associated with increased confidence levels to treat this population. Per this sample, the majority of SLPs had 0-5

kids on their caseload with hearing aids or cochlear implants. As implantations increase, school based SLPs will begin to see more students with hearing loss on their caseloads and it is vital that they possess the confidence to provide quality care.

Auditory training was a category found in previous research that SLPs had decreased confidence levels and minimal preparation in (Compton, Tucker, & Flynn, 2011; Watson & Martin, 1999). Babeu (2016) however, found SLPs in the sample to be moderately competent in developing listening skills. In comparison to these studies, 60% of this sample of Kentucky school based SLPs, rated their confidence levels in developing auditory training goals as slightly-extremely inadequate. Additionally, Watson and Martin (1999) found that SLPs did not feel that auditory training was their responsibility. Section VII. of the Knowledge and Skills Required for the Practice of Aural Rehabilitation states that SLPs should possess the skill to identify how hearing loss affects listening skills (ASHA, 2001). Auditory training is the process of teaching a child to interpret speech signals with four levels including sound awareness, sound discrimination identification, and eventual comprehension of auditory information (Erler 2002; Tye-Murray 2015). SLPs who work with hearing impaired students must be aware of this auditory hierarchy and the effect it has on language, articulation and auditory development (Hohla & Switzer, 2014). Integration of speech production with auditory training will allow for translation of both skills into daily activities and opportunity to acquire spoken language (Erler, 2002). Understanding the candidacy criteria of CI procedures, directly impacts auditory training outcomes as knowledge of the child's preexposure to sound assists in determining the goals and needs of auditory skill development per each child (Erler, 2002).

Speech reading was another category where the majority of this sample, (64.7%) indicated their confidence levels in creating speech reading goals were inadequate. Due to advances in hearing technology, speech reading popularity has decreased (Tye-Murray, 2015) which may have contributed to the low confidence levels. It is important to note that in Watson and Martin's study (1999) that 74% of survey respondents indicated that speech reading was the responsibility of the SLP, however they reported their knowledge in improving speech reading skills as minimal to slightly knowledgeable. While popularity of speech reading has decreased, it is still beneficial to receive training as it maximizes auditory learning by providing visual cues (Teagle & Moore, 2002). SLPs should possess the ability to use speechreading in their session to accurately follow the guidelines listed by ASHA in the practice of aural rehabilitation. (ASHA 2001).

Theory of mind (ToM) has become a topic of interest with the hearing-impaired population as there has previously been a historical delay in development of it by deaf children (Peterson & Siegal 2000). Studies conducted about ToM development have yielded mixed results. A study conducted in the Netherlands, suggested that CI children were able to master initial theory of mind concepts but struggled with more advanced concepts (Ketelaar, Rieffe, Wiefferink, & Frijns, 2012). In contrast, Rimmel and Peters (2009) found that CI children were not delayed when compared to their normal hearing peers however there was an atypical sequence in understanding ToM concepts. Other research conducted suggested that the age of implantation affected ToM development concluding that earlier implantation reflects normal acquisition of ToM concepts (Sundqvist, Lyxell, Jönsson, & Heimann, 2014). The studies previously referenced surrounding SLPs preparation and knowledge in treating students with hearing loss, did

not specifically investigate ToM concepts. When addressing ToM concepts, 60% of respondents' confidence levels were slightly-extremely inadequate. As the primary goal for students with hearing loss is oral language, a child may be discharged from treatment before deficits in ToM occur or their ToM skills may be overlooked. Post implant rehabilitation should encourage use of mental state language and focus on social cognition to supplement speech and language outcomes (Remmel & Peters, 2009). Support during classroom activities can assist children with deficits in ToM or other psychosocial outcomes as the classroom is where interactions expose the child to appropriate social, academic and communication behaviors that occur during daily routines and the consequences of inappropriate behavior (Brackett, 1997).

### Knowledge

From a knowledge perspective, Kentucky school based SLPs were surveyed on their knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of the otologist, audiologist, teacher, SLP, and parents. SLPs per this sample, felt knowledgeable with the roles and responsibilities of the audiologist, but decreased knowledge with the otologist, SLP, teacher, and parent. Erler (2002) attributes this decreased knowledge to the transdisciplinary team on the student's case, stating that service provision roles often overlap. There are also various degrees of accessibility to an educational audiologist, making the SLP the easiest access for teachers or parents (Muncy, Yoho, & McClain, 2019). Lack of communication and access between different members will also cause blurred lines between roles (Compton, Tucker & Flynn 2009; Watson & Martin 1999). Previous research investigated the access SLPs had to an audiologist. Watson and Martin (1999) discovered that 13% of their respondents had an educational audiologist on staff

and only 51% had access to an audiologist. Similar results were produced by Ward, Grubbs, and Biswas (2018) reporting that 40% of participants reported that they were never in contact with an audiologist. In the North Carolina survey, 33.3% respondents stated that they had no contact (Compton, Tucker, & Flynn, 2009). However, the study completed by Allen and Mayo (2020) in North Carolina demonstrated that 87.5% of SLPs that participated had access to an educational audiologist. Watson and Martin (1999) also investigated respondent's knowledge of the responsibilities of each role and the results varied. While access to an audiologist or other professional team members was not specifically researched in this study, respondents were asked about their knowledge of each role. Respondents from this sample size also indicated variation as the results were widespread between extremely knowledgeable to not knowledgeable. Respondents demonstrated a lack of knowledge of the roles and the responsibilities of the otologist which may be due to decrease in need for collaboration with one after implantation (Lal, Simek, Still & Weber, 2009). Although there was some variation, the majority of respondents moderately-extremely knowledgeable in the roles and responsibilities of the audiologist, SLP, teacher, and parent. Interprofessional collaboration between members of the CI team allows members to have complete information on the child, effectively maximize their potential, and eliminate conflicting info (Munoz & Blaiser, 2011). Understanding each part of the multi-disciplinary team is crucial to ensure that SLPs are not practicing outside their scope of practice. Due to the lack of audiologists in schools, SLPs are often called upon to handle some of these responsibilities, however, SLPs must understand and perform only what is outlined in their scope of practice to eliminate ethical issues (Richburg & Knickelbein, 2011). Positive outcomes for the

student are achieved by the members of the interdisciplinary team working together on the goals and objectives to ensure generalization across all disciplines (Lal et.al. 2009). Better education aimed at improving awareness and knowledge of each disciplines roles and responsibilities would increase collaborative effort (Richburg & Knickelbein, 2011).

### Preparedness

Consistent with previous studies conducted, (Babeu 2016; Compton, Tucker, & Flynn 2009; Watson & Martin 1999), this survey supported previous research indicating that there is a need for more expertise and training with hearing impaired children. More specifically, this sample of Kentucky school based SLPs did not feel as if their undergraduate, graduate, or practicum placements adequately prepared them to treat and manage patients with hearing loss. Increasing education and preparation will raise SLPs comfort, confidence, and knowledge by providing more experience with this increasing population. While undergraduate, graduate, and practicum placements vary by state, school, and SLP, results suggest that universities can improve on their training and class curriculum to address the needs to this population. 66.8% of respondents felt their undergraduate preparation did not prepare them, 52% felt their graduate coursework did not prepare them, and 70.8% felt their practicum experience was not sufficient in preparing them to treat those with hearing loss. Specifics to the amount of lectures or hands on experience was not questioned in this survey however, previous surveys have investigated this. Babeu (2016) discovered that only 19% of respondents in the study had received formal education on CIs through a graduate course. The UNCG survey results showed that only 3.9% of SLPs surveyed had practicum experience with CIs (Compton

et.al 2009). Certification for knowledge and skills needed for hearing loss can be met with few supervised hearing screening hours and one academic course (Page, Harrison, Moeller, Oleson, Arenas, & Spratford 2018). With many other existing areas of speech language pathology, it is difficult to learn every disorder in the SLP scope of practice in two years, however this skill gap in hearing loss may be compensated through in-service training and multidisciplinary support (Brackett, 1997). Participants in another study completed, indicated that their level of competency came from workshops or professional development (Babeau, 2016). As the caseloads of SLPs expands to include a higher incidence of auditory impairment, SLPs knowledge and skills need to expand as well (Richburg & Knickelbein, 2011). Both undergraduate and graduate schools should address this skill gap, evaluate the curriculum, and provide clinical experience to better prepare SLPs to treat this population.

With insufficient training before working independently with this population, SLPs in this study indicated that they would receive the most benefit from continuing education courses, conferences, and online internet-based information. Previous research into the lack of expertise with treating students with hearing loss suggested that there is a need for accessible cochlear implant resources and seminars held by audiologists would be beneficial (Ward et.al 2018).

#### Further Research

As research and technology surrounding pediatric hearing loss improves, it is imperative that professionals who work with this population are prepared to treat this population. The sample size of this study was relatively small and results represented only a portion of school based SLPs in Kentucky. A larger sample size would be

beneficial for future studies to achieve a more accurate representation. Future research investigating the access to other professionals such as audiologists or otologists in different places around the state may assist SLPs in receiving the support they need to effectively treat this population. The amount of preparation may depend on the undergraduate/graduate schools the SLPs have attended, therefore research into specific courses and electives offered in aural rehabilitation may reveal where programs are lacking. Further research may also look into recent graduates vs. longer practicing therapists for a more accurate description of the course work especially as technology for this population improves.

Through this research, the possible the decreased levels comfort, confidence, knowledge, and preparation of Kentucky SLPs when working with students with hearing loss, were revealed. SLPs in this sample size suggested a need for more experience and continuing education resources to improve intervention for the hearing-impaired population. Discovering and acknowledging these shortfalls will assist in creating ways to close the gap and contribute to the success of a child with hearing loss in the classroom.

### Summary

The intent of this study sought to investigate the comfort, confidence, knowledge of professionals' roles, and perception of preparedness of Kentucky's school-based speech-language pathologists working with children with hearing loss, specifically those with cochlear implants. The results in ranked order found that SLPs appear most uncomfortable discussing how CIs are mapped, the different CI brands, CI procedures from surgery to activation, troubleshooting devices (i.e., hearing aids) including bone

conductor hearing aids, and their knowledge of the many different types of hearing aids on the market. SLPs, per this sample, appeared more comfortable interpreting audiograms and explaining the general process of how a CI works. Moreover, the greatest high positive correlation per this sample was noted between an SLP's comfort level with bone conduction hearing aids and CI procedures in general.

Kentucky school-based SLPs (per this sample) appear to lack the greatest amount of confidence in their abilities managing aural habilitative and rehabilitative treatment plans that involve speech reading, auditory training, and theory of mind tasks. They appear much more confident with executive functions, phonological awareness, and articulation. Again, the aforementioned areas are rank-ordered from low confidence to high confidence. The greatest high positive correlation per this sample was noted between SLP's confidence level in carrying out habilitative/rehabilitative treatment plans involving articulation and phonological awareness targets.

With respect to identification of the roles and responsibilities of individuals associated with the management of hearing loss, Kentucky school-based SLPs appear most knowledgeable per the duties of the team's audiologist. This is followed by the roles and responsibilities of the parent, speech-language pathologist, and the classroom teacher. Per this sample, SLPs reported lower knowledge regarding the roles and responsibilities of the otologist. The greatest high positive correlation per this sample was noted with respect to SLP's knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of the audiologist and the parent.

Lastly, school-based SLPs overwhelmingly reported that neither their undergraduate education, graduate education, nor their practicum experiences sufficiently

prepared them to work with children with cochlear implants. Per this sample, respondents rated their graduate education as only slightly improved over their undergraduate education experiences. Practicum placements were rated the lowest overall. The greatest moderate positive correlation per this sample was between graduate education and practicum placements. The tested null hypotheses for the study are presented in Table 18.

**Table 18**

Summary of Tested Null Hypotheses

Hypothesis	Statement	Results
<b>H<sub>1</sub></b>	There will not be a statistically significant association between school-based SLPs' comfort level and their management of selected hearing devices and procedures.	Reject
<b>H<sub>2</sub></b>	There will not be a statistically significant association between school-based SLPs' confidence level and their ability to carry out aural habilitative or rehabilitative treatment plans.	Reject
<b>H<sub>3</sub></b>	There will not be a statistically significant association between school-based SLPs' knowledge of cochlear implants and the roles and responsibilities of professionals associated with management of hearing loss.	Reject
<b>H<sub>4</sub></b>	There will not be a statistically significant association between school-based SLPs' educational training and their perception of preparedness to work with children with cochlear implants.	Reject

## REFERENCES

- Asad, A. N., Purdy, S. C., Ballard, E., Fairgray, L., & Bowen, C. (2018). Phonological processes in the speech of school-age children with hearing loss: Comparisons with children with normal hearing. *J Commun Disord*, 74, 10-22. doi:10.1016/j.jcomdis.2018.04.004
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (n.d.). Hearing Assistive Technology. Retrieved from <https://www.asha.org/public/hearing/Hearing-Assistive-Technology/>
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2001). Knowledge and Skills Required for the Practice of Audiologic/Aural Rehabilitation. Retrieved from <https://www.asha.org/policy/KS2001-00216/#sec1.4>
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2003). Cochlear Implants. Retrieved from <https://www.asha.org/policy/TR2004-00041/#d4e1462>
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2016). Scope of practice in speech-language pathology. Retrieved from <https://www.asha.org/policy/>.
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2018). *Employment Characteristics and Demographics of ASHA Member and Nonmember Certificate Holders, by State and Area of Certification*. Retrieved from: <https://www.asha.org/uploadedFiles/Demographic-Profile-Certificate-Holders-by-State.pdf>
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2018). SLP Caseload and Workload Characteristics. Retrieved from: <https://www.asha.org/uploadedFiles/Schools-2018-SLP-Caseload-and-Workload-Characteristics.pdf>
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2019). How We Hear. Retrieved from <https://www.asha.org/public/hearing/How-We-Hear/>
- American Speech-Language Hearing Association. (2020). Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EDHI). Retrieved from <https://www.asha.org/Advocacy/federal/Early-Hearing-Detection-and-Intervention/>

- Babeu, C. A. (2016). Preparation of speech-language pathologists to provide effective services for children with cochlear implants in New Hampshire public schools.
- Bell, A., & Houston, K. T. (2014). Red Flags: Barriers to Listening and Spoken Language in Children with Hearing Loss. *Division 9 Newsletter*, 24(1), 11-18.
- Bobsin, L. L., & Houston, K. T. (2015). Communication assessment and intervention: implications for pediatric hearing loss. *Otolaryngologic Clinics of North America*, 48(6), 1081-1095.
- Brackett, D. (1997). Intervention for Children With Hearing Impairment in General Education Settings. *Lang Speech Hear Serv Sch*, 28(4), 355-361. doi:10.1044/0161-1461.2804.355
- Brotherson, S. E., & Service, N. E. (2005). *Understanding Brain Development in Young Children*: NDSU Extension Service.
- Chute, P. M., & Nevins, M. E. (2009). Serving students with hearing loss in the schools: Speech and language services for students in the mainstream. *The ASHA Leader*, 14(12), 12-15.
- Compton, M. V., Tucker, D. A., & Flynn, P. F. (2009). Preparation and Perceptions of Speech-Language Pathologists Working with Children with Cochlear Implants. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 30(3).
- Discolo, C. M., & Hirose, K. (2002). Pediatric cochlear implants. (1059-0889 (Print)).
- Eggermont, J. J. (2017). Chapter 9 - Hearing Aids. In J. J. Eggermont (Ed.), *Hearing Loss* (pp. 263-288): Academic Press.
- Erler, S. F. (2002). Working With Children Who Have Cochlear Implants. *Perspectives on Hearing and Hearing Disorders in Childhood*, 12(3), 19-24.
- Ertmer David, J. (2002). Challenges in Optimizing Oral Communication in Children With Cochlear Implants. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 33(3), 149-152. doi:10.1044/0161-1461(2002/012)
- Geers, A. E. (2002). Factors affecting the development of speech, language, and literacy in children with early cochlear implantation. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*.
- Graven, S. N., & Browne, J. V. (2008). Sensory development in the fetus, neonate, and infant: introduction and overview. *Newborn and Infant Nursing Reviews*, 8(4), 169-172.
- Grindle, C. R. (2014). Pediatric hearing loss. *Pediatrics in review*, 35(11), 456-463.

- Hohla, L., & Switzer, C. (2014). Cochlear implants and school speech-language pathologists. *Perspectives on School-Based Issues*, 15(2), 81-93.
- Ketelaar, L., Rieffe, C., Wiefferink, C. H., & Frijns, J. H. M. (2012). Does Hearing Lead to Understanding? Theory of Mind in Toddlers and Preschoolers With Cochlear Implants. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 37(9), 1041-1050. doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jss086
- Kyle, F., & Cain, K. (2015). A Comparison of Deaf and Hearing Children's Reading Comprehension Profiles. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 35, 144-156. doi:10.1097/TLD.0000000000000053
- Lal, A., Simek, S., Still, J., & Weber, L. (2009). Cochlear Implants: How “Team Work” Can Take the “Guess Work” Out of Patient Care. *Perspectives on School-Based Issues*, 10(4), 115-122. doi:10.1044/sbi10.4.115
- Lewis, D. (2010). Individual FM Systems for Children: Where Are We Now? *Perspectives on Hearing and Hearing Disorders in Childhood*, 20(2), 56-62. doi:10.1044/hhdc20.2.56
- Macherey, O., & Carlyon, R. P. (2014). Cochlear implants. *Current Biology*, 24(18), R878-R884.
- Madell, J. R., Flexer, C., Wolfe, J., & Schafer, E. C. (2019). *Pediatric Audiology : Diagnosis, Technology, and Management* (3 ed.). New York: Thieme.
- Martin, F. N., & Clark, J. G. (2015). *Introduction to audiology* (12th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Moore, D. R. (2002). Auditory development and the role of experience. *British Medical Bulletin*, 63(1), 171-181.
- Most, T., Shina-August, E., & Meilijson, S. (2010). Pragmatic Abilities of Children With Hearing Loss Using Cochlear Implants or Hearing Aids Compared to Hearing Children. *The Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 15(4), 422-437. doi:10.1093/deafed/enq032
- Mukaka, M. M. (2012). Statistics corner: A guide to appropriate use of correlation coefficient in medical research. *Malawi Medical Journal: The Journal of Medical Association of Malawi*, 24(3), 69-71.
- Muncy, M. P., Yoho, S. E., & McClain, M. B. (2019). Confidence of school-based speech-language pathologists and school psychologists in assessing students with

hearing loss and other co-occurring disabilities. *Language, speech, and hearing services in schools*, 50(2), 224-236.

- Muñoz, K., & Blaiser, K. (2011). Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists: Making Critical Cross-Disciplinary Connections For Quality Care in Early Hearing Detection and Intervention. *Perspectives on Audiology*, 7(1), 34-42. doi:10.1044/poa7.1.34
- National Institute of Deafness and Other Communication Disorders. (2016). Quick Statistics about Hearing. Retrieved from <https://www.nidcd.nih.gov/health/statistics/quick-statistics-hearing>
- National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders. (2017). Cochlear Implants. Retrieved from <https://www.nidcd.nih.gov/health/cochlear-implants#c>
- Page, T. A., Harrison, M., Moeller, M. P., Oleson, J., Arenas, R. M., & Spratford, M. (2018). Service Provision for Children Who Are Hard of Hearing at Preschool and Elementary School Ages. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 49, 965-981.
- Perigoe, C. B. (2010). Speech-language pathologists: Vital listening and spoken language professionals. *The Volta*, 110(2), 219-230.
- Peterson, C. C., & Siegal, M. (2000). Insights into Theory of Mind from Deafness and Autism. *Mind & Language*, 15(1), 123-145. doi:10.1111/1468-0017.00126
- Punch, R., & Hyde, M. B. (2011). Communication, psychosocial, and educational outcomes of children with cochlear implants and challenges remaining for professionals and parents. *International journal of otolaryngology*, 2011.
- Rommel, E., & Peters, K. (2008). Theory of Mind and Language in Children With Cochlear Implants. *The Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 14(2), 218-236. doi:10.1093/deafed/enn036
- Richburg, C. M., & Knickelbein, B. A. (2011). Educational audiologists: Their access, benefit, and collaborative assistance to speech-language pathologists in schools. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*.
- Sarant, J. Z., Harris, D. C., & Bennet, L. A. (2015). Academic outcomes for school-aged children with severe–profound hearing loss and early unilateral and bilateral cochlear implants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 58(3), 1017-1032.
- Stevenson, J., McCann, D., Watkin, P., Worsfold, S., Kennedy, C., & Hearing Outcomes Study, T. (2010b). The relationship between language development and

behaviour problems in children with hearing loss. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 51(1), 77-83.

- Sundqvist, A., Lyxell, B., Jönsson, R., & Heimann, M. (2014). Understanding minds: Early cochlear implantation and the development of theory of mind in children with profound hearing impairment. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 78(3), 538-544.  
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2013.12.039>
- Teagle, H. F. B., & Moore, J. A. (2002). School-Based services for Children with Cochlear Implants. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 33, 162-171.
- Tejeda-Franco, C. D., Valadez-Jimenez, V. M., Hernandez-Lopez, X., Ysunza, P. A., Mena-Ramirez, M. E., Garcia-Zalapa, R. A., & Miranda-Duarte, A. (2020). Hearing Aid Use and Auditory Verbal Therapy Improve Voice Quality of Deaf Children. *Journal of Voice*, 34(2), 301.e307-301.e311.  
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvoice.2018.08.007>
- Theunissen, S. C. P. M., Rieffe, C., Netten, A. P., Briare, J. J., Soede, W., Kouwenberg, M., & Frijns, J. H. M. (2014). Self-esteem in hearing-impaired children: the influence of communication, education, and audiological characteristics. *PloS one*, 9(4).
- Tye-Murray, N. (2015). *Foundations of aural rehabilitation : children, adults, and their family members* (Fourth ed.). Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2019). *The Digest of Education Statistics, 2017* (NCES 2018-070), [Table 204.60](#).
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2018). Types of Hearing Aids. Retrieved from <https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/hearing-aids/types-hearing-aids>
- Ward, K., Grubbs, K., & Biswas, A. (2018). Awareness and Knowledge of Cochlear Implants among Speech-Language Pathologists. *Health Science Journal*, 12(4).
- Watson, M. M., & Martin, K. (1999). Providing services to children with cochlear implants in the public schools: Results of a survey of speech-language pathologists.
- Wilson, K. (2006). Beyond early intervention: Providing support to public school personnel. *The Volta Review*, 106(3), 419.

## APPENDIX: ABBREVIATIONS

ASHA	American Speech-Language Hearing Association
CI	Cochlear Implant
EHDI	Early Hearing Detection Intervention
DoSE	Director of Special Education
FDA	U.S. Food and Drug Administration
FM	Frequency Modulation
HATS	Hearing Assistive Technology
IRB	Institutional Review Board
KIPDA	Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency
NIDCD	National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders
SLP	Speech-Language Pathologist
ToM	Theory of Mind

## APPENDIX: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

### **Cochlear Implants: Perceptions and Preparedness of School-Based Speech-Language Pathologists in Kentucky**

---

What is your gender?

- Male
  - Female
  - I prefer not to say.
- 

What is your age?

- <24 years old
  - 25-34 years old
  - 35-44 years old
  - 45-54 years old
  - >55 years old
-

Please indicate your ethnicity.

- White American
  - African American
  - American Indian
  - Asian
  - Pacific Islander
  - Hispanic
  - Other \_\_\_\_\_
  - I prefer not to say.
- 

What is your highest degree?

- Associate's Degree
  - Bachelor's Degree
  - Master's Degree
  - Doctoral Degree
- 

What year did you graduate with your Master's Degree (if applicable)?

\_\_\_\_\_

---

Are you licensed in the state of Kentucky to work as a speech-language pathologist?

- Yes
  - No
- 

Are you a certified teacher (i.e., teaching certificate) in the state of Kentucky?

- Yes
  - No
  - I'm not sure.
-

Is your primary place of employment in a public school system in Kentucky?

- Yes
  - No
- 

What region of Kentucky is your school district located?

- Purchase
  - Pennyrile
  - Green River
  - Barren River
  - Lincoln Trail
  - Lake Cumberland
  - KIPDA
  - Bluegrass
  - Cumberland Valley
  - Northern Kentucky
  - Kentucky River
  - Gateway
  - Buffalo Trace
  - Fivco
  - Big Sandy
  - I'm not sure.
-

What grades do you serve? Check all that apply.

- Preschool/Headstart
  - Elementary School
  - Middle/Junior High School
  - High School
- 

How many years have you been at your current school?

- <1 year
  - 1-5 years
  - 6-10 years
  - 11-15 years
  - >16 years
- 

How many students are currently on your caseload?

---

How many students on your current caseload have hearing aids?

- 0
  - 1-5
  - 6-10
  - 11-15
  - >16
-

How many students on your current caseload use an FM system?

- 0
  - 1-5
  - 6-10
  - 11-15
  - >16
- 

How many students on your current caseload have a cochlear implant?

- 0
  - 1-5
  - 6-10
  - 11-15
  - >16
- 

Does your school have a classroom specifically for Deaf/deaf/hard of hearing students?

- Yes
  - No
  - I'm not sure.
- 

Mark Yes or No regarding your training in the area of Cochlear Implants (CI) and/or therapy techniques for children with CIs.

	-----	-----
	Yes	No

Undergraduate Course	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Graduate Course	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Doctoral Course	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Continuing Education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Conference	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Online Resource	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In-Service Training	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
From a Teacher of the Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing (TDHH)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
From Another SLP	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
From an Audiologist	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ASHA SIG	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Journal Article	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Indicate your comfort level with cochlear implants (CI) and other amplification devices

	Extremely comfortable	Moderately comfortable	Slightly comfortable	Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable	Slightly uncomfortable	Moderately uncomfortable	Extremely uncomfortable
CI Procedures (surgery to activation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The different CI brands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The different types of hearing aids	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of a bone conductor hearing aid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How to troubleshoot a device	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How a cochlear implant works	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How to interpret an audiogram	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mapping a cochlear implant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

Indicate your confidence level (adequate to inadequate) in establishing goals and carrying out treatment plans for students with cochlear implants (CIs)?

	Extremely adequate	Moderately adequate	Slightly adequate	Neither adequate nor inadequate	Slightly inadequate	Moderately inadequate	Extremely inadequate
Auditory training	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Speech reading	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Articulation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Theory of mind	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Executive functions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Phonological awareness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I understand the roles and responsibilities of the following professionals in the care/maintenance/training/education of students with cochlear implants.

	Extremely knowledgeable	Very knowledgeable	Moderately knowledgeable	Slightly knowledgeable	Not knowledgeable at all
Otologist	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Audiologist	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teacher	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Speech-Language Pathologist	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How confident do you feel working with children with CIs?

- Completely Confident
  - Fairly Confident
  - Somewhat Confident
  - Slightly Confident
  - Not Confident at all
- 

How well do you feel your UNDERGRADUATE degree prepared you to work with children with CIs?

- Extremely Well
  - Very Well
  - Moderately Well
  - Slightly Well
  - Not Well at all
- 

How well do you feel your GRADUATE degree prepared you to work with children with CIs?

- Extremely Well
  - Very Well
  - Moderately Well
  - Slightly Well
  - Not Well at all
- 

How helpful were your PRACTICUM PLACEMENTS in preparing you prepare to work for children with CIs?

- Extremely Helpful
- Very Helpful
- Moderately Helpful
- Slightly Helpful
- Not Helpful at all

---

I feel there is a need for more training for speech-language pathologists who work with CIs.

- Strongly agree
  - Agree
  - Somewhat agree
  - Neither agree nor disagree
  - Somewhat disagree
  - Disagree
  - Strongly disagree
- 

I would like to receive training and resources on CIs from \_\_\_\_\_. (check all that apply)

- More Coursework in Undergraduate, Graduate School
  - Cochlear Implant Companies
  - In-Service Training
  - Seminars
  - Conferences
  - Online/Internet-Based Options
  - Continuing Education Courses
  - Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
-

## CURRICULUM VITAE

**NAME:** Amanda Matsumoto

**ADDRESS:** Department of Communicative Disorders  
Speech-Language Pathology  
MDA Building School of Medicine  
627 S. Preston St., Suite 620  
University of Louisville  
Louisville, KY 40292

**DOB:** Maywood, IL – July 10, 1995

**EDUCATION  
& TRAINING:**

B.A Communication  
Charleston Southern University  
2013-2017

M. S., Communicative Disorders  
University of Louisville  
2017-2020

**PROFESSIONAL  
SOCIETIES:**

National Student Speech Language Hearing Association  
University of Louisville, Louisville, KY  
August 2017 – present

Kentucky Speech-Language-Hearing Association  
January 2018 – present

**PRESENTATIONS:** Matsumoto, Amanda., Mattingly, R., Pitts, T., & Smith, A. (2020). Hearing Loss: Investigating the Comfort, Confidence, Knowledge, and Preparedness of Kentucky School-Based Speech-Language Pathologists. Poster presentation at the Kentucky Speech-Language-Hearing Association annual meeting, February 20, Lexington, KY.