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The contribution of risk factors to the effect of early otitis media with effusion on later language, reading, and spelling
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A cohort of 940 children who were screened for otitis media with effusion (OME) from the ages of 2 to 4 were studied for language, reading, and spelling at 7 years of age. The effects of OME in combination with single risk factors and with increasing numbers of risk factors were investigated. An interaction with an additional risk factor was found only for gender and OME, with boys’ spelling influenced negatively by a history of OME. OME in combination with preterm birth and low birthweight also appears to put children at risk for later language and educational problems. Although a negative linear relation between the number of risk factors and later functioning was found, it is suggested that OME, even when combined with a number of other risk factors, produces only minor effects on later language, reading, and spelling.

Otitis media with effusion (OME) is one of the most common diseases in early childhood. It is also considered a risk factor for later speech, language, and associated learning problems, because it is accompanied by a loss of conductive hearing (Silva et al. 1986, Friel-Patti and Finitzo 1990, Schüller et al. 1993a). The results of the many studies into the relation of OME to later language and educational problems are nevertheless conflicting. In recent prospective studies, the association of OME with later language and educational problems has been found to be fairly weak (Hubbard et al. 1985, Louis et al. 1988, Friel-Patti 1990, Roberts et al. 1991, 1994; Gravel and Wallace 1992; Grieveink et al. 1993; Schüller et al. 1993a; Peters et al. 1994; Paradise et al. 1995). Whenever there are detrimental effects of early OME at school age, they appear to be of little practical importance (Roberts et al. 1991, 1994; Grieveink et al. 1993; Peters et al. 1994; Louis 1995). Most children with OME appear to overcome the short-term effects of OME as soon as the disease disappears, even when the OME has been long-lasting. These results also do not change when the frequency of the OME and the pattern of its recurrence are taken into account (Grieveink et al. 1993, Peters et al. 1994, Roberts et al. 1994). In other studies, however, a major effect of OME on later language and learning has been found (Silva et al. 1986, Tecle et al. 1990). In search of an explanation for these differences, it has been suggested that the effect of OME on later language and learning may be the cumulative effect of a number of risk factors (Rapin 1979, Menyuk 1980, Bishop and Edmundson 1980, Louis et al. 1988, Penrice et al. 1988, Roberts and Schuele 1990, Roberts et al. 1991). Some authors (Roberts and Schuele 1990, Roberts et al. 1991) suggest that it is important to consider those variables that may potentially contribute to the effects of OME as well. In this study, it is assumed that most children can cope with OME and that difficulties may most often arise in the presence of other risk factors. If the negative effects of OME arise from its coincidence with other risk factors, one can expect to find only small effects of OME in a population where the incidence of such risk factors is low. Conversely, one can expect to find a relatively large effect of OME in a population with a high incidence of the risk factors and a history of OME. The data from a specific group of children in the Nijmegen Otitis Media Study (Grieveink et al. 1993, Peters et al. 1994) were then analysed to test this hypothesis.

Several factors have been suggested to produce a lower level of language ability and educational attainment in general and in relation to OME in particular. Such variables are socio-economic status, sex, the intelligence level of the children, gestational age and birthweight, and a first language other than Dutch. In a number of studies, the role of a low socio-economic status in placing a child at risk is emphasized (Rapin 1979; Menyuk 1980, 1986; Hopman-Rock et al. 1988; Roberts et al. 1986, 1991, 1994; Louis 1993). Tecle et al. (1984) compared a high and low social group and found only a relation between OME and lower language scores for the higher social group. With regard to sex as a risk factor, boys have generally been found to score lower on language development tests than girls in general and in association with the occurrence of OME in particular (Silva 1980, Hopman-Rock et al. 1988, Allred 1990, Louis 1993). Low intelligence is associated with poor language scores and reading difficulties (Silva et al. 1983). Preterm birth and a low birthweight (LBW) have also been found to be risk factors for later functioning (Largo et al. 1980, Heregard...
et al. 1993, Ross et al. 1992, Levy-Shiff et al. 1994). Bishop and Edmundson (1986) have suggested that OME might interact with a number of perinatal risk factors in the etiology of language disorders. Children born prematurely with chronic OME were found to have relatively poorer verbal–cognitive abilities than children with a preterm delivery and no OME in at least one study (Pearce et al. 1988). Veen et al. (1993) also assessed a population of very preterm and very-low-birth-weight infants and found those children with a history of OME to have a significantly increased risk of language and speech developmental disorders at the age of 5. Children with a first language other than Dutch, the language of the community at large, are assumed to form a specific risk group. Verhoeven (1990) and Verhoeven and Gillijns (1994), for example, found the acquisition of reading and spelling in a second, non-native language to be less efficient than the acquisition of these abilities in a first language.

The purpose of the present study was to investigate whether or not the effects of longstanding, bilateral OME between the ages of 2 and 4 years are accompanied by one or more of the above-mentioned risk factors for later language, reading, and spelling delay at the age of 7. The Nijmegen Otitis Media Study is a large cohort study in which three groups were formed on the basis of the history of OME between the second and fourth birthdays: one group with bilateral OME and no surgical treatment, one group with bilateral OME and treatment with ventilation tubes, and a control group with no OME. The children were then tested at the age of 7 for various aspects of their language, reading, and spelling ability (Grievink et al. 1993, Peters et al. 1994).

In the present study, two specific questions were investigated. The first question is whether or not the OME subjects with an additional risk for later language, reading, and spelling problems produce lower scores at the age of 7 than the OME subjects with no additional risk. Four groups of children were formed: those with and those without a history of OME, and those with and those without an additional risk factor. The second question is whether or not an increased number of risk factors appears to increase the detrimental effects of OME on later language, reading, and spelling ability. In this study, a low educational level for both of the parents, male sex, low non-Verbal intelligence, preterm birth and LBW, and Dutch as a second language were considered risk factors.

Method

SUBJECTS

A birth cohort of 1439 children born between September 1 1982 and August 31 1983 in Nijmegen, a town of 145,000 inhabitants in the Netherlands, formed the basis of this study. Of these children, 1328 were screened for OME by tympanometry on nine occasions at 3-month intervals between the ages of 2 and 4 years (Zielhuis et al. 1989). The reliability and validity of the tympanometer had been tested in pilot studies (Zielhuis et al. 1989). The tympanograms were classified as Type A, C1, C2 or B, according to a modification of Jerger's (1970) method. Type A indicates normal compliance of the tympanic membrane, Type C1 and C2 indicate various degrees of negative middle ear pressure and reduced compliance of the tympanic membrane. A type B tympanogram (i.e. a flat one) was considered indicative of OME. On follow-up when the children were 7 to 8 years old, 131 of the 1328 children had moved to another region, and the parents of 37 children declined to participate after the preschool screening. The remaining 1160 children were invited to participate in this follow-up study between September 1990 and February 1991; 946 attended. All 946 children were examined by otomicroscopy, tympanometry, and audiometry. An ear, nose, and throat history was taken of the period between the last preschool screening and the present study. Audiological and otological characteristics of the whole group are described elsewhere (Schulder et al. 1993b, 1995). Children who had had bilateral B tympanograms on at least two consecutive occasions between the ages of 2 and 4 years (here called OME subjects) and children who had never had a bilateral type B or C tympanogram (control subjects) were invited to have their language, reading, and spelling achievement measured. 305 (78%) of the 395 children invited were studied in this way. Three groups of subjects were then formed: untreated OME subjects (N=151), treated OME subjects (N=37) and control subjects without OME (N=82). In addition, 35 children whose first language was other than Dutch ('1.2 children') were studied: 20 non-treated OME children, 1 treated child, and 14 control children.

MATERIALS

Various tests of language ability were used to evaluate various aspects of language ability (Baehman et al. 1988, van Bon 1992). Two subtests from the Taaltests voor Kinderen (Language Tests for Children) (van Bon 1982) were used to establish general language ability. The morphological Word Forms Production test was used because it is a good indicator of a general language factor (van Bon 1992), and because morphological competence has been demonstrated to be sensitive for abnormal language development (Morehead and Ingram 1973, Wiig et al. 1973, Johnston and Sherry 1976, Vogel 1983). The Concealed Meanings test is receptive in nature, and concerns the children's understanding of the non-explicit content of sentences; there is evidence that children with hearing impairments have problems in recognizing such information (Quigley and Paul 1989). These two tests load on different factors (van Bon 1984).

Each of the 35 items on the Word Forms Production test consists of two sentences. A simple form of the relevant word is used in the first sentence, while the experimenter points at a picture. In the second, open-ended, sentence, the inflected form of the same word has to be provided by the subject while the experimenter points at a second picture. The total number of correct answers is counted.

In the Concealed Meanings test, the child has to match one of two pictures to a sentence that presupposes or implies certain information. This test consists of 33 items, and the total number of correct choices is counted.

Three tests of phonological ability were selected, because phonological ability is assumed to be highly susceptible to the effects of the hearing loss associated with OME, and phonological ability appears to play a crucial role in learning to read and write (Stangvich 1986). Tests for phonemic segmentation, sound blending, and auditory discrimination were used.

The children were asked to divide spoken words into their constituent phonemes in the Phonemic Segmentation test, and to blend separate phonemes into a whole word in the Sound Blending test. Both tests consisted of 30 monosyllabic words: 15 real words, and 15 pseudowords created by changing the vowels of the real words. The pseudowords are pronounceable...
but meaningless sequences of speech sounds that obey phonological rules of Dutch word formation. The contrast between real words and pseudowords makes it possible to examine the effect of lexical knowledge on word recognition (Bryant and Bradley 1980). The number of correct answers was counted.

The Auditory Discrimination test was constructed following the procedure of Wepman's test (1973). Children were asked to judge whether or not two monosyllabic spoken words or pseudowords were the same. ‘Like’ pairs consisted of the same word twice; ‘unlike’ pairs consisted of minimally contrasting words such as muis (mouse) and Luis (house). The test had 16 items. 23 pairs of real words and 23 pairs of pseudowords; 10 pairs were like words and 36 pairs were unlike. The items were recorded on tape by a speech language pathologist, and the number of correct judgments was counted.

Because of the limited time available for testing, reading tests were restricted to the word and sentence level. Three reading tests were used to test word decoding ability and comprehension of written sentences: the One-Minute test, the Word Recognition test and the Sentence Verification test.

The standardized One-Minute test (Brus and Voeten 1978) is frequently used to measure decoding ability, and is highly correlated with tests for reading aloud (Mommers 1987). Words ordered according to difficulty are read aloud as fast and as accurately as possible. The number of words read correctly within one minute constitutes the test score.

The Word Recognition test (adopted from van den Bosch 1981) uses real monosyllabic words and monosyllabic pseudowords consisting of four different orthographical structures. All of the words can be read correctly by applying simple grapheme phoneme correspondence rules. An Apple II GS computer with 2 monitors (one for the subjects and one for the experimenter), a voice-key and a microphone were used to present the words and register the response. The real words were all ones frequently used in children’s literature according to Siaphorsius et al. (1988). Pseudowords were created by replacing the vowel graphemes of the real words with others of the same grapheme class. Words were selected that could be written correctly by applying simple phoneme grapheme correspondence rules. The child was requested to repeat each word correctly and then to write the word.

The Coloured Progressive Matrices test (Raven 1965, van Bon 1981) was administered as a non-verbal test of intelligence.

Parents were asked to complete questionnaires about their own educational level. Information about the first language of children, preterm birth, and birthweight was collected from questionnaires used in the first part of the Nijmegen Otitis Media Study, when the children were 3 years of age.

**Table I: Tests used in MANOVAs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language tests</th>
<th>Reading and spelling tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General language</td>
<td>Grapheme knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Forms Production test</td>
<td>Grapheme knowledge test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concealed Meanings test</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonological ability</td>
<td>Spelling test, using real words and pseudowords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonemic Segmentation test, using real words and pseudowords</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Blending test, using real words and pseudowords</td>
<td>One minute test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory Discrimination test, using like pairs of real words and pseudowords</td>
<td>Word recognition test, using real words and pseudowords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and unlike pairs of real words and pseudowords</td>
<td>Sentence verification test, using correct and incorrect sentences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedure**

The follow-up data were collected between September 1990 and February 1991 at the Department of Otorhinolaryngology of the Nijmegen University Hospital, in order of the subjects’ birthdates.

The reading and spelling tests were administered by two of us (SAFP and KH), who were unaware of the OME histories of the subjects. All subjects were tested individually. All tests were administered in the same order. With parents’ permission, questionnaires were sent to the children’s teachers.

**Analysis**

To study the effects of OME in combination with risk factors on language ability and educational attainment, two approaches were followed. First, it was expected that the performance of OME subjects would be lower if an additional risk
factor were present. To test this primary hypothesis, four groups of subjects were considered in a two-by-two design, according to level of subjects' risk (high and low) and the presence of OME (OME subjects compared with controls). The hypothesis was that the effect of OME is greater in subjects with an additional risk than in subjects without one. Thus an interaction effect was defined. The hypothesis assumed that there is indeed a risk factor. This was verified by testing the effect of the risk factor in the control subjects.

Another question was whether OME subjects with an additional risk derive benefit from treatment with ventilation tubes. This was statistically tested by comparing two groups of subjects with an additional risk: a group of untreated OME subjects and a group of treated OME (OME-VT) subjects. The data of this contrast analysis were only considered when the interaction between OME and the additional risk factor proved to be significant.

A secondary hypothesis was that the more risk factors are present, the larger will be the negative effect of OME on the child's performance, with effects ranging from small (when no additional risk factor is present) to substantial (when more than two risk factors coincide). This question was tested by comparing the trend of each effect at three levels of additional risk (0, 1, or more). The language and educational achievement measures of the variables were similarly grouped for the different MANOVAs as in Grieveink et al. (1993) and Peters et al. (1994) (Table 1).

Results
In the first part of this section, the effects of OME plus a single risk factor are considered. One-tailed tests were used. In the second part of the section, the effect of a number of risk factors together with OME are considered. The F-test outcomes in this part are given only when results were in the predicted direction and were significant.

Combined effect of a single risk factor plus OME
As revealed by either a χ² test or a t test, there were no significant differences between the OME (N=151) and control subjects (N=82) with regard to sex (χ²(1, N=233)=3.45, P=0.06), grade level (χ²(3, N=233)=1.36, P=0.72), age (t(231)=0.13, P=0.90) or intelligence (t(231)=0.40, P=0.69).

Educational level of parents
When the data were analyzed with the educational level of the parents as the risk variable, the children of parents with a low educational level constituted the risk group. A low educational level was defined as primary educational level and/or vocational training. The data of some children could not be used because information of the educational level of one or both parents was missing. Of the 151 children in the OME sample, 25 had two parents with a low educational level and 109 had at least one parent with a higher educational level. Of the 37 children with OME who were treated using ventilation tubes, 11 had two parents with a low educational level and 24 did not. Of the 81 subjects without OME, 18 belonged to the high-risk group and 51 belonged to the low-risk group. There were no interaction effects between the educational level of the parents and OME on general language ability, phonological ability, grapheme knowledge, spelling or reading.

There were differences, in the predicted direction, in the educational level of the parents in the non-OME group for general language ability [F(2,235)=4.52, P<0.01; univariate effect on Word Forms Production, F(5,236)=8.95, P<0.01], for spelling [F(2,235)=2.28, P=0.05; univariate effect on real words, F(5,236)=4.48, P<0.05, and on pseudowords, F(5,236)=2.85, P<0.05] or for word reading (One-Minute test, F(1,234)=5.17, P=0.05; Word Recognition, F(4,187)=1.96, P=0.05; univariate effect on latency of pseudowords, F(5,190)=3.90, P<0.05]. No differences were found for phonological ability, grapheme knowledge or sentence verification.

OME apparently had no additional negative effect on language, reading, and spelling ability in subjects of parents with a low educational level. The general language, reading, and spelling abilities of the OME children of parents with a low educational level were relatively poor, but a low educational level of parents did not appear to constitute a risk factor for phonological ability or sentence verification.

In the non-OME group, there were differences between the boys and the girls for spelling [F(2,233)=2.63, P<0.05], but none of the univariate tests proved to be significant. There were no differences in general language ability, phonological ability, grapheme knowledge or reading.

Because an interaction effect between sex and OME for spelling of pseudowords was found, any effect of treatment with ventilation tubes was sought for the boys with OME; none was found.

Early OME appeared to affect the later spelling performance of boys. In the non-OME group, no differences were found between boys and girls with regard to language ability, phonological ability, spelling, or reading. Treatment with

---

**Figure 1:** Mean percentages of correctly spelled words for OME and control subjects according to subjects' sex.
ventilation tubes was not found to affect the spelling performance of the boys with OME.

Non-verbal intelligence
The children were divided into two groups. A risk group, consisting of all the children scoring below the 35th centile on the Raven Coloured Progressive Matrices, was compared with the remaining children. Of the 151 OME subjects, 16 were at risk; of the 37 OME VT subjects, seven were at risk; of the 82 control subjects, 13 were at risk. There was no interaction between intelligence and OME for general language ability, phonological ability, grapheme knowledge, spelling, or reading.

There was an effect of intelligence within the non-OME group on general language ability ($F(2.233) = 8.41$, $P < 0.001$; both univariate tests: Word Forms Production, $F(5.264) = 4.14$, $P < 0.05$; Consonant Meanings, $F(5.264) = 16.03$, $P < 0.0001$), phonological ability (Phonemic Segmentation and Sound Blending, $F(4.264) = 1.05$, $P < 0.05$; univariate tests for phonemic segmentation: real words, $F(1.264) = 2.89$, $P < 0.05$, pseudowords $F(1.264) = 6.25$, $P < 0.05$; grapheme knowledge $F(1.264) = 5.30$, $P < 0.05$; spelling $F(2.263) = 3.48$, $P < 0.05$; both univariate tests: real words, $F(1.264) = 6.53$, $P < 0.05$, pseudowords, $F(1.264) = 3.32$, $P < 0.05$), and reading (One-Minute test, $F(1.262) = 3.30$, $P < 0.05$; Word Recognition, $F(4.208) = 2.70$, $P < 0.05$; univariate tests of percentage correct by word type: real words, $F(1.211) = 10.01$, $P < 0.01$, pseudowords, $F(1.211) = 3.16$, $P < 0.05$). There were no effects on auditory discrimination or sentence verification.

The combination of low non-verbal intelligence and OME did not appear to have a detrimental effect on language, reading, or spelling ability. A low non-verbal intelligence alone appeared to decrease a child's general language ability, phonological segmentation skills, grapheme knowledge, and spelling and reading ability but did not appear to influence auditory discrimination or sentence verification.

Preterm birth and/or low birthweight
Children with a gestational age less than 32 weeks and/or LBW children (birthweight less than 2500g) constituted the risk group in these analyses; this group consisted of 13 of the 138 subjects with OME, 4 of the 37 with OME VT and 2 of the 80 control subjects. There was no interaction of preterm birth and LBW with OME for general language ability, phonological ability, grapheme knowledge, spelling, or sentence verification. However, there were interactions for reading, but not in the predicted direction (Figs. 2–4).

There was an effect of preterm birth and low birthweight in the control group. Both subjects with the risk factor showed the poorest scores: phonological ability (Auditory Discrimination, like pairs and unlike pairs, both $P < 0.01$; Phonemic Segmentation and Sound Blending, $F(4.240) = 3.29$, $P < 0.05$; both univariate tests: real words, $F(1.240) = 11.22$, $P < 0.001$, and pseudowords, $F(1.240) = 11.50$, $P < 0.001$; word reading (One-Minute test $F(1.247) = 4.28$, $P < 0.05$; Word Recognition, $F(4.194) = 8.88$, $P < 0.001$; univariate tests: percentage correct of real words, $F(1.197) = 23.16$, $P < 0.001$, and of pseudowords, $F(1.197) = 5.30$, $P < 0.05$) latency of real words, $F(1.197) = 40.04$, $P < 0.01$, and of pseudowords, $F(1.197) = 5.40$, $P < 0.05$). There was no effect on general language ability; grapheme knowledge, spelling, or sentence verification.

There seemed to be no specific effect of OME when it co-occurs with preterm birth and LBW. Preterm and/or LBW children had lower scores than controls for phonological abil-

**Figure 2:** Mean number of correct answers on One-Minute test for OME and control subjects, according to risk factor gestational age or birthweight. LBW = low birthweight.

**Figure 3:** Mean percentage of correct answers on Word Recognition test for OME and control subjects, according to type of word (real or pseudo) and to risk variable (gestational age and birthweight).

**Figure 4:** Mean latency of correct answers on Word Recognition test for OME and control subjects, according to type of word (real or pseudo) and to risk variable (gestational age and birthweight).
ty, spelling, and word reading. They did not differ from the controls in general language ability, auditory discrimination, grapheme knowledge, or sentence verification. However, both of the subjects in the risk group without a history of OME produced markedly poorer results than the other subjects.

Additional analyses
Preterm and LBW children nevertheless form a special risk group because they seem to be very susceptible to OME (Pearce et al. 1988, Engel et al. 1996). Because of the high number of preterm and LBW children with a history of OME in our study, only two children could be found with this risk but without a history of OME; this group was compared with control children without this risk or a history of OME in an additional analysis.

There were no significant differences between the preterm and LBW subjects with a history of OME and the control subjects in general language ability, auditory discrimination, reading of real words and sentence verification. However, there were significant differences in phonological ability (Phonemic Segmentation and Sound Blending F(4,246)=2.63, P<0.05; univariate tests of phoneme segmentation: real words, F(5,249)=8.58, P<0.01, and pseudowords, F(5, 249)=7.61, P<0.05; univariate test of sound blending: real words, F(5, 249)=5.22, P<0.05), grapheme knowledge [F(1,249), P<0.01, spelling [F(2,248)=3.38, P<0.05; univariate tests: real words, F(5, 249)=4.73, P<0.05, and pseudowords F(5, 249)=4.69, P<0.05], and word reading [Word Recognition, F(4,194)=2.06, P<0.05; univariate tests of percentage correct: real words, F(5,197)=3.08, P<0.05, and pseudowords, F(5,197)=5.15, P<0.05]. Furthermore, the non-verbal intelligence levels of these subjects also appeared to be significantly lower than those of the controls [F(1,249)=4.36, P<0.05].

Preterm and LBW children had lower scores than the controls for non-verbal intelligence, phonological ability, grapheme knowledge, spelling, and word reading but not for general language, auditory discrimination, or sentence verification.

First language
There were 35 L2 subjects (children whose first language was other than Dutch), and 270 L1 subjects (children with Dutch as a first language). The distribution among the L2 subjects was: 14 OME subjects, 1 OME-VT subject, and 20 control subjects. No differences were found between the L1 subjects and the L2 subjects in age (t(267)=1.51, P=0.13), sex (χ^2 (1, N=267)=0.08, P=0.42) or year at school (χ^2 (3, N=267)=2.81, P=0.42). There was a difference in the intelligence levels for the two groups (t(267)=7.38, P<0.001). The L2 subjects had poorer non-verbal intelligence scores than L1 subjects. The educational levels of the parents were not useful because in the L2 group there was no information for 29 of the 34 mothers and 31 of the 34 fathers. There were no interaction effects for first language and OME on general language ability, phonological ability, grapheme knowledge or reading. There was an interaction effect on spelling, not in the predicted direction (Figs. 5, 6).

An effect of having a language other than Dutch as a first language was observed for general language ability [F(2,298)=7.16, P<0.0001; both univariate tests: Word Forms Production, F(5,299)=14.08, P<0.0001, and Consoned Meanings, F(5,299)=8.07, P<0.01], spelling [F(2,295)=2.65, P<0.05; both univariate tests: real words, F(5,296)=3.55, P<0.05, and pseudowords, F(5,296)=5.31, P<0.05] and reading [Word Recognition, F(4,239)=2.30, P=0.05; univariate effect on percentage correct of real words, F(1,240)=4.61, P<0.05; Sentence Verification, F(4,239)=2.56, P<0.05; univariate effect on percentage correct of real words, F(1,246)=4.61, P<0.05]. Sentence Verification, F(4,239)=2.56, P<0.05; univariate effect on percentage correct of real words, F(1,246)=4.61, P<0.05]. There were no effects of this variable on phonological ability, grapheme knowledge, or reading. The results suggest that having a language other than Dutch as a first language constitutes a risk factor for language, spelling and reading ability. Combined with a history of OME, however, the problems do not become worse.

Interaction between OME and the number of risk factors
If OME is and of itself is not enough to affect language and literacy negatively but might do so in combination with other risk factors, the effect of OME should become larger with an increasing number of risk factors. To consider this issue, trend analyses were performed with the following risk variables: educational level of both parents, sex, gestational age, and birthweight, and non-verbal intelligence. The variable 'number of risk factors' was added and consisted of three levels: no risk factor, one risk factor, or two or more risk factors.

There were no interaction effects for the number of risk fac-

---

**Figure 5:** Mean percentage of correctly spelled real words for OME and control subjects, according to subjects' first language (Dutch or non-Dutch).

**Figure 6:** Mean percentage of correctly spelled pseudowords for OME and control subjects, according to subjects' first language (Dutch or non-Dutch).
tors and OME on general language ability, phonological ability, grapheme knowledge, spelling, reading of real words or pseudowords, and sentence verification. There was a significant interaction effect on the reading of real words only [One-Minute test, F(2,186) = 2.91, P < 0.05] (Fig. 7). The effect was quadratic. ([180] = 2.16, P < 0.05).

There was a main effect of the number of risk factors on general language ability [F(4,374) = 7.75, P < 0.001; univariate tests: Word Forms Production F(2,187) = 7.18, P < 0.004. Consonant Meanings, F(2,187) = 14.22, P < 0.0001], phonological ability [Phonemic Segmentation and Sound Blending, F(3,370) = 1.95, P < 0.05; univariate tests of phonological segmentation: real words, F(2,187) = 5.30, P < 0.01, and pseudo words, F(2,187) = 3.17, P < 0.05]. There was also an effect on auditory discrimination [Auditory Discrimination (like pairs) and Auditory Discrimination (unlike pairs), F(3,368) = 2.00, P < 0.05; univariate test of real words in unlike pairs, F(2,186) = 1.02, P > 0.01, spelling [Spelling F(4,374) = 3.81, P < 0.01; significant univariate tests: real words, F(2,187) = 7.81, P < 0.001, and pseudowords, F(2,187) = 3.34, P < 0.01], and reading [One-Minute test, F(2,186) = 3.96, P < 0.05; univariate tests: percentage correct of real words, F(2,150) = 4.38, P < 0.01, pseudowords, F(2,150) = 4.22, P < 0.01, and latency of real words, F(2,150) = 2.99, P < 0.05; Sentence Verification, F(8,324) = 1.92, P < 0.05; univariate tests: percentage correct of correct sentences, F(2,164) = 5.57, P < 0.001, incorrect, F(2,164) = 2.98, P < 0.05, and latency of incorrect sentences, F(2,164) = 3.10, P < 0.05].

The hypothesis that an increased number of risk factors might augment the effects of OME on language, reading, and spelling ability does not appear to be confirmed in this study. There was a significant interaction effect between OME and the number of risk factors on the reading of real words. As no other interaction effects were found, and the one significant interaction showed a quadratic effect, the explanation for this finding remains unclear. However, an increased number of risk factors generally has an increasingly detrimental effect on language, reading, and spelling performance.

**Discussion**

The results of the present study indicate that the combined effect of early bilateral OME and other risk factors is only small.

First, the interaction of OME with one additional risk factor was investigated. The results showed OME to produce no effects in combination with the following single risk factors: low educational level of parents, low non-verbal intelligence, prematurity birth and/or LMBD, and another language than Dutch as a first language. Only one of the predicted interaction effects was found; namely, boys with a history of OME showed a lower spelling ability than boys without a history of OME; there was no such difference for girls. Treatment with ventilation tubes produced no differences.

Second, the possibility that more risk factors would produce a larger effect of OME on language, reading, and spelling performance was investigated. Although a negative linear relation between the number of risk factors and the language, reading, and spelling scores was found (suggesting that the risk factors indeed affect primary and secondary language skills), the results did not confirm the hypothesis of an incremental effect of OME in combination with an increased number of risk factors.

In contrast to suggestions in the literature about possible interactions of OME with risk factors (Bishop and Edmondson 1986, Roberts and Schuele 1990), the present large-scale longitudinal study did not find such interactions. The current study avoided a number of the shortcomings found in previous studies. This study included a large number of children, who were not selected, because a birth cohort was used. The age range of the children was limited. The OME histories of the children were systematically documented using tympanometry, which is a reliable way of measuring OME (Zielhuis et al. 1989b). In addition, the present study is the first prospective study to explicitly analyze the relation between OME and several other risk factors (i.e., one risk factor versus an increasing number of risk factors). Comparisons with other studies are difficult, because in most of the recent prospective studies the relation between OME and the risk variables was not studied explicitly. An exception is a handful of studies on the detrimental effects of prematurity and low birthweight in combination with OME. When risk factors have been included, the ages of the children under study have differed widely, and mostly children in the preschool age have been studied. These differences in the assessment for OME might also account for differences between the present study and others, for example, that of Tecele et al. (1990). Our subjects were all at least 2 years of age. It has been suggested that OME is particularly detrimental if it occurs in the first year of life.

In the present study, a significant interaction between OME and sex was found for spelling. Boys with OME performed particularly poorly in spelling. No interaction effects were found for OME and sex on language or reading ability, a finding which is in accord with that of Roberts et al. (1994).

Our finding that there was no interaction between OME and parental background is supported by the results of a few previous prospective studies. Tecele et al. (1990) found no significant interactions between socioeconomic status of subjects and OME when later cognitive abilities were considered, Roberts et al. (1991) studied the later language performance of children between 4 and 6 years of age from families with lower or middle socioeconomic status (SES). These authors specifically investi-
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