# The impact of Assistive Technology Devise Use on the Social Participation Levels of Older Adults

By: Judith E. Walsh and Jennifer L. Troyer

Comments by Ofira Schwartz-Soicher

5<sup>th</sup> Workshop on Social Capital and Health

Toronto, Canada

6-7 October, 2014

#### Overview

- Examination of whether the use of assistive technology devices (ADT's) is associated with older adults' participation in societal and civic engagement activities.
- A very important and interesting topic given the aging of the population (18% increase in population 65 and older since 2000, AOA)
- Interesting results:
  - hearing aids use is associated with increased participation in many activities.
  - Mobility devices' use is associated with decreased social activity.

#### Literature Review

- A bit too general; literature discussing the specific question at hand should be added.
- Related "smaller" studies should also be mentioned, e.g.,:
  - Older adults report both positive and negative psychosocial impact on their lives because of medical device use (Thomson, Martin and Sharples, 2013).
  - A study not limited to older adults found evidence that mobility device improved user's activity and participation and increased mobility (Salminen et al., 2009).

# Framing/Hypotheses

 What is the role of the different societal and civic engagement activities in older adults' life?

 How and why would specific ADTs be expected to affect certain types of activities?

 The hypotheses should be more developed and should be referred to in the discussion of the results.

#### Data

- National Health and Aging Trends Study (NHATS) –
   Two waves: 2011 and 2012.
- This is a contemporary, nationally representative dataset, very appropriate to the research question.
- How does the analytic sample compare to the relevant U.S. population?

#### Methods-Measures

- Outcome variables are not explicitly defined. Showing the specific questions' wording may be informative.
- Confounding variables are not clearly defined and definitions would be helpful.
- There may be variation in quality of specific types of ATDs (e.g., different hearing aids) – this could cause some measurement error.
- Self-reported nature of key variables could cause measurement error.
- May want to consider controlling (if available in survey) for mental health, number of devices used and cognitive ability.
- May want to consider excluding those diagnosed with dementia from the sample.

## Methods - Analysis

- Endogeneity difficult to disentangle the use of the device from the presence/severity of the problem.
  - How was severity addressed/controlled?
  - Is it possible to assess sensitivity to alternative criteria?
  - Reverse causality people may get device because they participate in an activity.

## Model Assistive Devices/Social Interactions

- Presence of Disabling Condition
- Severity of this Condition
- Incidence/Severity of other conditions
- Income/Access
- Family/Social Supports



**Social Interactions** 

- Visit family/friends
- Religious services
- Clubs/meetings
- Goes out for enjoyment
- Volunteer work

Why is endogeneity such a problem? Blue arrow is what is estimated. Black dotted lines are the confounding relationships. Some of the right-hand variables included in the model (barriers, importance of activity, social supports, problem performing without supports) may add to the confounding. Try simpler models.

## Methods - Analysis

- First difference (FE) models don't add much.
- Rationale for random effect models is not clear.
- In general, more transparency about both measurements and analytic models would be helpful.
- Robustness and sensitivity analysis.
  - Cross-sectional logistic regression
  - Controlling for the outcome at wave 1 in wave 2 model.

### Results

#### Descriptive Statistics

 May be more interesting to compare characteristics of users and non-users of the different ATDs.

#### Empirical Results

- Try to tell a story.
- 2. Several of the findings are perverse (e.g., dressing assistive devices) underscoring the concerns about endogeneity.

## Interesting Findings

 Mobility devices are negatively associated with participation in social activities. What may explain these unexpected results?

 Hearing aids use is associated with increased participation in societal and civic engagement activities. May have implication for policy makers.

## Thank You!