

Stakeholders' Perspectives on Speech-Language Pathology Tele-Practice for Pediatric Populations: A Systematic Review

Megan Ray and Audrey McMillion

Division of Speech and Hearing Sciences, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

Tele-medicine or tele-practice has been in use for almost a century as a way to connect clients and patients with the necessary professionals (Strehle & Shabde, 2006). The use of tele-practice has been identified as a way for allied health professionals, including speech-language pathologists, to provide equitable services to individuals residing in rural communities or those who may be unable to attend appointments due to other barriers (Dew et al., 2013). In speech-language pathology, a wide variety of both positive and negative opinions from clinicians and caregivers have been identified on the acceptability of tele-practice for delivering SLP services (Lincoln et al., 2014; May & Erickson, 2014). The perceptions of these stakeholders (parents, clinicians, teachers, administrators) is especially important to understand, as their acceptance of this practice is essential to its successful implementation. Further, during the COVID-19 pandemic, SLPs internationally have been unable to meet with clients face-to-face, requiring tele-practice to provide services. As such, studying the use of tele-practice has become more relevant than ever before. Due to the likely dramatic increase in tele-practice and the need to better understand stakeholders' perceptions of tele-practice, this study sought to explore parents', clinicians', and other stakeholders' opinions on the feasibility and implementation of speech-language pathology tele-practice for pediatric populations via a systematic review of the published literature.

Research Question:

• Regarding speech-language pathology for pediatric populations, what are parents and clinicians' opinions on the feasibility of tele-practice service delivery?

METHODS

Databases searched:

• PubMed, CINAHL, PsycINFO, ERIC

Search Terms

- Speech*
- Tele-practice, tele-therapy, tele-health
- Pediatric, child, toddler, infant, school-age, adolescent
- Opinion, perspective, satisfaction, feedback, social validity

Inclusion Criteria

- English
- Peer-reviewed
- Involved caregivers' and clinicians' opinions
- Tele-practice services provided to a person aged 0 to 18 with a speech or language need.
- Non-experimental, experimental, controlled, uncontrolled studies, and systematic reviews about clinicians' and parents' opinions on speech-language pathology tele-practice service delivery (screening, evaluation, treatment)

Exclusion Criteria

Articles that did not include opinions on tele-practice

Procedures

- Researchers completed title-abstract screening, full text screening, quality appraisal, and data extraction and were blind to each others' responses (Center for Evidence Based Management, 2019; LEGEND, 2020).
- Due to the range of study designs, a variety of quality appraisal forms were used (e.g. survey, interview, case study).

RESULTS Figure 1. PRISMA diagram. Articles Articles **Articles** Articles identified identified through through PubMed CINAHL through PsycInfo database (n=20) database (n=16) database (n=5) database (n=13) Articles after duplicates removed (n=29) Articles excluded due Titles/abstracts to title/abstract reviewed (n=29) unrelated to PICO 83% Reliability question systematic review (n=7) Full-text articles Articles excluded due assessed for eligibility to study unrelated to (n=22)the PICO question (n=4)77% Reliability Studies included in data analysis for systematic review (n=18)

Figure 3. Positive and Negative Themes

Positive Themes

Technology motivates children

• Easier to build rapport with

(Akamoglu et al., 2018)

(Lincoln et al., 2014)

creative and flexible ways

(Akamoglu et al., 2018)

**SLP perspectives only

students and parents

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Convenient- "a million times	(Anderson et al., 2015)
easier." (Thomas et al., 2018)	 Time constraints
More inclusive for parents	(McCullough, 2001) &
during sessions (Anderson et	Scheduling Conflicts
al., 2015)	(Duncan, 2008)
Just as efficient, if not more,	 Children's fear of the camera
than face-to-face therapy	(McCullough, 2001)
(Hughes et al., 2018)	• Lack of availability of a quiet,
Access to bilingual services	private space for sessions
(Pham, 2012)	(Lincoln et al., 2014)
More professional	 Lack of proximity can be a
opportunities outside of the	barrier to building
geographic area** (Pham,	relationships (Akamoglu et al.,
2012)	2018)
Elimination of potential costs	 Difficulties establishing
of travel, additional childcare,	strategies to involve all parties
and more (Goehring et al.,	in the session** (Hines et al.,
2017)	2016)
Engaging with clients in	• Less controlled environment;

Negative Themes

difficulties (Anderson et al.,

overwhelming families**

Technical

2015)

Greater chance of

 Less controlled environment; behavior management (Baharav et al., 2016)

Figure 2. Included Studies.

Citation	Study Design	Setting	Participants	Evidence Level
Akamoglu et al., 2018	Questionnaire, Interview	18 states across US; school and home	15 SLPs	High Quality
Anderson et al., 2015	Interview, Focus Groups	metropolitan Australia; services home	13 SLPs; 7 caregivers	High Quality
Baharav et al., 2010	Case Study	Western Washington state; home	2 children; 2 caregivers	High Quality
Cassel et al., 2016	Survey (Likert scale)	Suburban southern New Jersey; university clinic	4 student clinicians	Low Quality
Chen et al., 2017	Retrospective cohort study; questionnaire	Taiwan; home	10 children; 5 caregivers; 4 therapists	High Quality
Duncan, 2008	Case Study; interview	Taiwan, Australia	1 child; 1 caregiver	High Quality
Fairweather et al., 2016	Interview	Rural Australia; school	16 children; 5 caregivers	High Quality
Fitton et al., 2017	Quantitative survey	Northern Florida, Michigan, Illinois; home?	79 parents	High Quality
Freckmann et al., 2017	Online survey	Australia; school, home	32 SLPs	High Quality
Goehring et al., 2017	Case study; Questionnaire	United States	19 children; 19 caregivers	High Quality
Hines et al., 2015	Interviews	Australia; in person, by phone	15 SLPs	High Quality
Hughes et al., 2018	Case study; questionnaire	United States	17 children; 17 caregivers	High Quality
Hodge et al., 2019	Questionnaire (Likert Scale)	Rural Australia; school	37 children; caregivers; teachers	Low Quality
Lincoln et al., 2014	Semi-structured interviews	Rural Australia, school	9 children; 3 principals; 7 facilitators, 6 caregivers	High Quality
McCullough et al., 2001	Questionnaire	Belfast, Northern Ireland; school	4 children; 4 caregivers	Low Quality
Pham, 2012	Case study; interview	Northeastern United States	1 child; 1 caregiver	High Quality
Thomas et al., 2018	Semi-structured interviews	Australia; clinic	10 caregivers	High Quality
Vivian, 2012	Case study; interview	Rural Vermont	1 child; 2 caregivers	High Quality

DISCUSSION

Summary of Evidence

- Overall, this systematic review showed that caregivers appreciated the convenience of tele-practice, were able to build relationships with their child, and recommended telepractice to other caregivers as an alternative to face-to-face therapy.
- SLPs indicated tele-practice was a way to provide consistent therapy and build rapport with clients and caregivers.
- A few caregivers preferred in-person therapy instead of telepractice. While some SLPs showed initial uncertainty about tele-practice, they were open-minded to learning more.
- SLPs and clinicians had similar opinions regarding advantages and disadvantages of tele-practice services.
- One theme encompassed both advantages and disadvantages of tele-practice: SLPs found that tele-practice allowed them to engage with clients in more creative and flexible ways, but they also indicated that tele-practice required more flexibility and creativity for planning and facilitating sessions.

Clinical Implications:

- The overall positive attitudes of both caregivers and clinicians indicate the acceptability of tele-practice as a service delivery method.
- Concerns with tele-practice, including technical difficulties, behavior management, and time restraints should be addressed for the most successful implementation.

Limitations:

- Many of these studies were done in Australia, and, thus, they may not generalize well to other countries.
- Grey literature was not included, so information from unpublished studies was not provided here.
- This review did not include any articles that were not in English.

Future Directions:

- It would be valuable to explore the effectiveness of telepractice by examining quantitative intervention studies in a systematic review or meta-analysis.
- Future research should explore opinions on tele-practice for more specific populations like early intervention or autism.
- Future research should investigate ways to train clinicians, family, and support staff on the use of tele-practice, as well as further investigation of services that can be delivered via telepractice.

REFERENCES

References give upon request. Contact Audrey McMillion (audrey_mcmillion@med.unc.edu) or Megan Ray (megan_ray@med.unc.edu).

DISCLOSURES/ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This systematic review was completed as a project for SPHS 701 Introduction to Research Methods, under the guidance of Dr. Jessica Steinbrenner, Dr. Thomas Page, and Ms. Danielle Nader. The authors have no financial or intellectual conflicts of interest.

- International Locations: Australia, United States, Taiwan, and Ireland.
- Many of the studies involved opinions on how tele-practice compares to traditional, face-to-face therapy.
- Studies that were labelled as low quality were given this ranking because of small sample sizes and more limitations. Because these studies provided valuable information, they were included in the systematic review.
- Quality appraisals were completed with 89% reliability. Data extraction was completed with 90% reliability.