Language is caught not taught

Supporting parents in monitoring and understanding their child’s functional listening skills to guide implantation decisions, maximise listening and learning opportunities and its effect on outcomes
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 WHY FUNCTIONAL LISTENING?

- Children’s worlds are noisy places
- Communication needs much more than ‘detection’ and ‘discrimination’
- Cognitive components of listening involving the brain, are key to communication development
- Audiograms and speech perception testing cannot tell us how a child listens in daily life
- Understanding how children are using sounds in their everyday environments provides valuable information to guide the candidacy process

 WHY PARENTAL INPUT?

- Learning happens best in a child’s natural environment
- Parents and caregivers are the best ones to support this
- Shaping & influencing every day interactions provides the platform for constant learning and integration
- Tools such as the FLI-P can support parents to:
  - identify and seize listening opportunities in everyday life,
  - provide motivation, and
  - reinforce focus on listening skill development

The Functional Listening Index
FLI-P™
The current study set out to redevelop the FLI-P to support parental use and reliability of use by clinicians.

**AIMS:**

- Provide a parent friendly tool to:
  - Improve knowledge of listening development
  - Increase awareness of listening skills in everyday life
  - Provide ideas to maximise listening and learning opportunities in everyday life
  - Increase reliability by removing ambiguity of items

**EXAMPLE:**

- "To identify a familiar concrete object from several related descriptors (open set)" (1.1)  
  **VS**  
  "Guesses what I'm describing from clues when I describe an object or an animal they know" (2.0)

---

**Phase 5: Listening through discourse and narratives**

1. **Recognise a familiar person on the phone**
   - **What can this look like**
     - They can recognise the phone someone that they know.
   - **How to check**
     - Ask someone they know (family member, close friend, teacher) to talk to them on the phone.
     - Can they tell you who it is?

2. **Say things that surprise me because I don’t know where they heard it**
   - **What can this look like**
     - They can say words or phrases that you haven’t said or taught them directly. When they say something that you haven’t heard, you might think, “Where did they get that from?”
   - **How to check**
     - Children learn new words by their exposure to different words and different people talking. Listen closely to what they say and watch when they are talking to you or their friends at a child care/ preschool or in the playground.
     - Are they saying things that surprise you? Do they say things you’ve never heard before or that they don’t normally say?
1.1 vs 2.0

- %age of total items acquired were calculated and compared.
- Statistical analysis indicated high levels of correlation using R-squared values.
- A number of clinicians scored very similarly across the 1.1 and 2.0.
- Results did vary for newer/less experienced clinicians. Discussing individual results identified that 2.0 seemed to be easier for newer/less experienced clinicians to accurately represent current listening skills.
- Given the aim of simplifying the FLI-P to increase understanding and reliability in scoring, this shows results in line with project aims.

2.0 Clinician vs 2.0 Parent/carer

- n=20; (10 clinicians, 10 parents (1 x parent unable to complete due to IT error)
- Interrater agreement showed variance of parent score between 6 below and 10 above
- Equal numbers indicated more listening skills (n=4), and less listening skills acquired (n=4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLI 2.0 Score Clinician</th>
<th>FLI 2.0 Score Parent</th>
<th>Variance of parent score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child 1 50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 2 50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 3 12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 4 14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 5 55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 6 17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 7 39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 8 23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 9 55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunity to
a) Indicate level of **auditory acquisition** at any point in time
b) Contribute knowledge from **natural settings**, every day interactions, observations and context
c) **Educate, empower and engage** parents/carers in their own child’s listening development
d) Support newer/less experienced clinicians with goals and intervention

**NEXT STEPS**

Despite preliminary stage, and small (n), initial results indicate:

1. Strong correlations between 1.1 and 2.0 scores by clinicians on the FLI-P;
2. A range of scores by parents using the tool (some higher, some lower);
3. In line with research in similar fields, the use of the FLI-P by both parents and clinicians could provide
   a) valuable information in accurately determining a child's current level of auditory acquisition, contributing knowledge from different observations and context,
   b) serve to educate parents/carers, and newer/less experienced clinicians in developing a child's listening skills.