



Impact of Hearing Loss on Quality of Life in Adults

***Vivek Kumar Jha **Rajbir Singh**

* Associate Professor & Research Scholar, Faculty of behavioural Sciences, Shree Guru Gobind Singh Tricentenary University, Gurugram, Haryana, India

**Professor of Psychology, Faculty of Behavioural Sciences, Shree Guru Gobind Singh Tricentenary University, Gurugram, Haryana, India

Abstract: The normal sense of hearing is essential in the social, emotional, psychological and communicative fields. It is needed for safety and also for having a more meaningful life. Causes of hearing loss in adults can be genetic or due to immune diseases, infections such as meningitis, mumps, scarlet fever, Meniere's disease, exposure to loud noises, tumors, head injuries or aging (presbycusis). The word "presbycusis" implies a decrease in hearing associated with the phase of degenerative cochlear aging. Presbycusis is by definition bilateral, symmetric and incremental. Presbycusis can affect on an individuals' quality of life (QOL). Therefore, the main aim of the research is to evaluate the Impact of hearing loss on QOL (Quality of Life) in Adults. Total 100 subjects were taken for this study. Out of 100 subjects, 50 subjects were taken as control group and 50 subjects were taken as experimental group and diagnosed to be hearing loss (Severe sensorineural hearing loss). A 25-point sample developed from the initial HHIE by Weinstein et al. The Hearing Handicap Inventory (HHIA) II is often consisting of a 13-point emotional subscale and 12-point social-situational subscales. Further, the study concluded that in an effort to remedy its growth, we need to strengthen our understanding of this disease and its physiopathology. Furthermore, developing approaches to recognise and deteriorate Presbycusis patients would be of considerable significance, thus expanding the resources provided for hearing aids, assisting communication systems and auditory therapy. Individuals of hearing damage, the use of effective hearing aids or other hearing aids, and education strategies may have a favourable influence on older people's quality of life.

Keyword: Hearing Loss, HHIE, HHIA, IOI-HA, Presbycusis and QoL (quality of life).

***Corresponding Author**

***Vivek Kumar Jha , Vivek Kumar Jha, Associate Professor & Research Scholar, Faculty of behavioural Sciences, Shree Guru Gobind Singh Tricentenary University, Gurugram, Haryana, India**



Received On 28 November 2020

Revised On 25 December 2020

Accepted On 29 December 2020

Published On 31 December 2020

Funding This research did not receive any specific grant from any funding agencies in the public, commercial or not for profit sectors.

Citation *Vivek Kumar Jha **Rajbir Singh , Impact of Hearing Loss on Quality of Life in Adults.(2020).Int. J. Life Sci. Pharma Res.10(5), 221-225 <http://dx.doi.org/10.22376/ijpbs/lpr.2020.10.5.L221-225>



I. INTRODUCTION

The normal sense of hearing is essential in the social, emotional, psychological and communicative fields. It is needed for safety and also for having a more meaningful life. Causes of hearing loss in adults can be genetic or due to immune diseases, infections such as meningitis, mumps, scarlet fever, Meniere's disease, exposure to loud noises, tumors, head injuries or aging (presbycusis). The word "Presbycusis" implies hearing decline associated with the cochlear degenerative ageing phase. Presbycusis is, by definition, bilateral, symmetrical, and incremental. Presbycusis is the most frequent source of hearing loss for adults; it is known to be the most severe auditory disability in elderly persons aged 75 and over. As our culture matures, more residents survive by causes such as better diet and health insurance in their 1960, 1970, and 1980, and beyond. Hearing problems are a widespread issue related to senescence, and changing population demographics in the developing world would definitely be more troublesome. There can be a profound effect on the physical, practical and psychological well-being of the person (Dalton et al., 2003)¹. On the one hand, it is critical that we do not grasp this mechanism and that we are incapable of remediating its development. At present, doctors may use the experience of the family only to evaluate the extent of disability, measure the possible probable hearing damage, and prescribe amplification through hearing aids, utilising the documentation of the initiation and improvement and audiology results. On the other hand, an appraisal and measurement of quality of life (QoL) can also be used in the optimum control of this situation. The explanation for this is that many reports have already indicated that presbycusis has detrimental impacts on the standard of life and psychological well-being of the people involved – social alienation, depression, anxiety, and even cognitive decay was reported (Dalton et al., 2003; Gates and Mills, 2005; Heine and Browning, 2002)¹⁻³. Clinicians are not yet able to remedy their development, amid attempts to consider disease mechanisms.

I.I QUALITY OF LIFE AND PRESBYCUSIS

Understanding the effect of hearing loss on quality of life is very relevant when contact problems impact relationships with others. This is an important feature of daily life that can severely affect people with hearing loss, culminating in a perceived QoL decrease (Felce and Perry, 1995; Monzani et al., 2008)^{4,5}. The word "QoL" is used for determining people's overall well-being. There is a great deal of consensus on the concept of multidimensional QoL evaluation: physical well-being, material well-being, social well-being and emotional well-being (Felce and Perry, 1995)⁴. Many scholars have now stated that hearing loss has become an extremely important problem in public health related to decreased QoL, as it can impair the sharing of information. Presbycusis results on QoL are recorded

- Emotional responses such as soleness, loneliness, addiction, resentment, sadness, anxiety, rage, uncertainty, dissatisfaction, and belief.
- Bluffing, withdrawing, accusing and demanding behavioural answers
- Neurological responses, including confusion, problems thinking, intrusive thinking, diminished egoism and behavioural disorders (Felce and Perry, 1995; Monzani et al., 2008)^{4,5}.

Therefore, keeping above points in psyche the current research is conducted on the Impact of hearing loss on QoL (Quality of Life) in Adults. In order to know, Instruments have been adopted for evaluating the effect on QoL of hearing deprivation. The determination of QoL deterioration due to hearing loss may be rendered by a variety of instruments as shown in multiple literature studies (Felce and Perry, 1995; Monzani et al., 2008)^{4,5}. These can be split down into QoL instruments specific to hearing (table I) and generic QoL equipment.

2. OBJECTIVE OF THE RESEARCH

To evaluate the effect of hearing deprivation on adults' Quality of Life (QoL).

3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Joore et al. (2002)⁶ also showed the reduction in distress and distress encountered by new consumers of hearing aids during use. In comparison, Joore et al. (2003)⁷ and Stark and Hickson (2004)⁸ recorded increased domain ratings on the SF-36 owing to the usage of hearing aids (Joore et al., 2003; Stark and Hickson, 2004)^{7,8}. Mulrow et al (1990)⁹ have also reported decreased hearing aid users to minimise stress assessed by geriatric depression scales. McArdle et al. (2005)¹⁰ administered generic and auditory QoL measurements in a broad, multi-site trial to 380 randomised participants in experimental (immediate hearing aid treatment) and control (delayed ear aid treatment) classes. Hearing aids have been seen to enhance both generic and audio-related QoL areas, while QoL has increased even more, as assessed by audiological tests (McArdle et al., 2005)¹⁰. In several trials HHIE assessed decreases in both mental and social implications of hearing loss after wear and body wear (Stark and Hickson, 2004; McArdle et al., 2005; Malinoff and Weinstein, 1989; Abrams et al., 1992; Chmiel and Jerger, 1996)^{8,10,11,12,13}. Chisholm et al. (2007)¹⁴ found in their meta-analysis in particular, that hearing aids increased the ratings of HHIE for adults by minimising the neurological, social, and emotional impact of hearing loss. There has been just a little research based on the results of binaural hearing restoration and QoL affect. The capacity of the central audition device to incorporate binaural details has been shown that binaural hearing aid wearers may benefit from benefits such as summation of binaural loudness, masking difference, position and the absence of head-shade (Tsakiroglou et al., 2007; Chao and Chen, 2008; Antonucci, 1990)¹⁵⁻¹⁷. Approximately 80 percent of patients with extreme bilateral hearing loss wear has been recorded on an international scale. In addition, Chao and Chen (2008)¹⁶ have reported that the usage of hearing aids may also be seen as a cost-effective recovery method for elderly people with hearing impairment (Tsakiroglou et al., 2007; Chao and Chen, 2008; Antonucci, 1990; Joore et al., 2003)¹⁵⁻¹⁸. Based on average hearing benefit Q-related to Q, Joore et al. have also indicated the use of hearing aid and returning people with hearing disability to a regular lifestyle is psychological. The key variables impacting this calculation are the various types of hearing loss, active usage rates of hearing aid and satisfaction rates of use of hearing aid (Chao and Chen, 2008; Joore et al., 2003)^{16,18}. Presbycusis is estimated to affect 40 % of the population aged over the age of 75 in the US and is becoming ever more common in ageing societies ((Dalton et al., 2003; Gates and Mills, 2005; Heine and Browning, 2002; Huang and Tang, 2010; Tremblay and

Ross, 2007)^{1-3,19,20}. In the UK National Hearing Condition Survey, 1995, 20 % of adults had hearing loss (audiometrically more than 25 dB) in better ears; 75% were impaired by Presbycusis. Aging is characterised as the biologic process and its relationships, as well as the intrinsic and extrinsic ageing factors that affect the degree and rate of our hearing age. The frequency of presbycusis is therefore expected to be primarily dictated by hereditary influences; environmental factors, such as noise, ototoxic medications, alcohol, and diabetes, can, however, also affect it. Any research also investigated the advantages and comfort of having hearing aids for elderly with hearing impairments (Chisholm et al., 2007; Tsakiroupolou et al., 2007)^{14,15}.

5. ANALYSIS

Table-I:Main specific instruments to evaluate the impact of hearing loss on QoL.

Instrument	Goal	Items	Reference
HHIE10	Measures the effects of hearing impairment on the emotional and social adjustment of elderly people	25	4,5,21
HHIA11	Measures the effects of hearing impairment on the emotional and social adjustment of adults	25	5
IOI-HA12	Explores the perceived usefulness of hearing aids	7	22

The Hearing Loss Inventory for the Elderly (HHIE) is an example of an audio-related instrument that incorporates a problem expressly devised by QoL (Weinstein et al., 1986)²¹. Which is an auto-assessment method intended to quantify the mental and social correction of elderly people through hearing disabilities. This inventory consists of two subscales: a subscale of 13 items that discusses the cognitive impact of hearing disability and a subscale of 12 items that explains social effects and circumstances. An effective and valid instrument and a simple to use questionnaire were judged to be the HHIE (Felce and Perry, 1995; Monzani et al., 2008)^{4,5}. A 25-item survey from the initial HHIE by Weinstein et al. (1986)²¹ The auditory loss inventory for adults (HHIA) 11 also consisted of a 13-item emotional subscale and a 12-item socio-situational subscale. In a comparable brief examination which is easy to perform, the IOI-HA is an easy one to interpret. The Cox et. al (2000)²³ International Outcome Inventory (IOI-HA) tests the perceived effectiveness of hearing aids. Each of their seven concerns has the following objectives: utilising hearing aid (number of hours regular use of hearing aid); improving hearing activity; residual practises limits; fulfilment; limitations on the presence of residual people; effects on others; and quality of life. Everyone has a different emphasis on seven issues: Generic QoL tests do not rely on underlying conditions or therapies, instead on the individual's general perceived health condition. In order to clarify the QoL level of topics, those more widely included along with hearing tools are The MOS 36-Item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36). The SF-36 consists of 36 items that assesses eight health concepts: (1) limitations in physical activities because of health problems; (2) limitations in social activities because of physical or emotional problems; (3) limitations in usual role activities because of physical health problems; (4) bodily pain; (5) general mental health (psychological distress and well-being); (6) limitations in usual role activities because of emotional problems; (7) vitality (energy and fatigue); and (8) general health perceptions. It has been used by several authors to evaluate the level of mental and physical activity in subjects affected by hearing loss (Monzani et al., 2008; Cox et. al., 2000)^{5,23} The Social Functioning Questionnaire. It has been proposed by several

4. METHODS

Sampling Technique- Total 100 subjects were taken for this study. Out of 100, 50 subjects were taken in the control group and remaining 50 subjects were having hearing loss (severe sensor neural hearing loss) and taken as experimental group. **Research Area-** The study has collected data from SGT Medical College and Hospital, Department of Audiology, Gurugram, Haryana. **Data Collection Procedure-** They have been contacted for study during ENT/Audiological Follow-up. 50 severely hearing-impaired cases have been fitted with a proper class of hearing aids. After 6 months use of hearing aids, again they have been contacted for HHIA and QoL scale were again used to check the quality of life.

authors to investigate the social behaviour and dimension of those affected by presbycusis (Monzani et al., 2008; Cox et. al., 2000)^{5,23}. This is an eight-item, self-rating scale (score range 0–24) covering the most important domains of social life, such as work, home activities, finances, spare time activities, and social, family, and sexual relationships. It has been used in combination with the revised version of the Symptom Checklist-90-R (SCL-90-R), which is a valid and reliable psychiatric multidimensional self-report inventory, used to screen for psychopathological symptom patterns and levels of distress in community and medical responders (such as somatization, obsessive-compulsive behaviors, depression, anxiety, and hostility) (Monzani et al., 2008; Cox et. al., 2000)^{5,23}. A collection of practical patient priorities may be established and drawn up by otolaryngologists and audiologists following the administration of the listed resources. These devices have been developed to investigate and satisfy patient needs; prosthesis demands have improved by promoting certain hearing aids on a commercial basis, for example, adaptive microphones and reducing input from the area. The determination of detailed patient-specific priorities will enable otolaryngologists and audiologists pick those features to meet their patients' needs. In order to create a basis for evidence-based clinical practise guidelines for hearing recovery, these instruments have been developed; clinical practise guidelines will minimise the results uncertainty, optimise care efficacy, reduce harm, reduce waste, increase patient satisfaction and help third-party payors raise knowledge of the audiovisual profession; As the medical sector is still in competition, otolaryngologists and audiologists will show that hearing therapy eliminates restrictions on operations, lowers involvement limits and increases the quality of life relevant to wellbeing. Otolaryngologists and audiologists may only be confident if recovery is a difference and people achieve their medication by monitoring performance. However, as for most QoL scales, a significant downside with these devices is that, with time, the value of various QoL measurements can vary across people and between persons, such that standardised indicators may be unreliable or unsensitive (Carr et al., 1996)²⁴. Of all the individuals with hearing loss, just 39

percent perceive an outstanding global degree of QoL or really good physical fitness compared with 68 percent without hearing loss. Fair or worse wellbeing with about a third of the population with audible losses contrasted with just 9% of the population without hearing loss; those with auditory disorders are less happy with "the entire life" than the average person without hearing loss (The National Council on the Aging, 1999)²⁵. Presbycusis was documented to trigger diminished communicative experiences and diminished emotional and social connections in research on the impact of hearing loss on QoL.¹⁶ In particular, presbycusis is reported to be a source of soleness, loneliness, and deterioration in community, cognitive problems and family life disadvantages (Lotfi et al)²⁶.

6. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Those with hearing losses may be recorded to view their social abilities as weak as a consequence of maladaptive communication techniques, but they will still have poorer self-esteem if a mixture of hearing disability and poor coping strategies lead to their task failure. Furthermore, some scholars have claimed that some people dread hearing loss and fear finding healthcare for hearing loss. This could escalate to a further degree of disability and handicap for people with hearing impairments⁵. Untreated hearing loss can significantly impact a person's quality of life. In our research, just 39 percent perceive an outstanding global degree of QoL or really good physical fitness compared with 68 percent without hearing loss. Older people with untreated hearing loss lead a lower quality of life than those without hearing loss or those whose hearing loss was treated with hearing aids. The emotional factors are an important part of the problem. Hearing loss adds perspective that an elderly person is "sluggish" or that they are losing their abilities, which is generally not the case. This negative perspective of others can lead to a negative perspective of self, which gives frustration, lower self-esteem, and even depression. However, the depression, anger, and frustration of hearing loss don't work in a vacuum. All aspects of life are influenced by these negative emotions. Those with age-related hearing loss often find that their family relationships suffer because of their hearing problem or low- participation in gatherings. It will be beneficial if primary care practitioners screened for hearing damage on a routine basis in adults and referred hearing affected individuals routinely to audiology centres⁵.

11. REFERENCES

1. Dalton DS, Cruickshanks KJ, Klein BE, Klein R, Wiley TL, Nondahl DM. The impact of hearing loss on quality of life in older adults. *Gerontologist*. 2003 Oct 1;43(5):661-8. doi: 10.1093/geront/43.5.661, PMID 14570962.
2. Gates GA, Mills JH. Presbycusis. *Lancet*. 2005 Sep 24;366(9491):1111-20. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)67423-5, PMID 16182900.
3. Heine C, Browning CJ. Communication and psychosocial consequences of sensory loss in older adults: overview and rehabilitation directions. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2002 Jan 1;24(15):763-73. doi: 10.1080/09638280210129162, PMID 12437862.
4. Felce D, Perry J. Quality of life: its definition and measurement. *Res Dev Disabil*. 1995 Jan 1;16(1):51-74. doi: 10.1016/0891-4222(94)00028-8, PMID 7701092.
5. Monzani D, Galeazzi GM, Genovese E, Marrara A, Martini A. Psychological profile and social behaviour of working adults with mild or moderate hearing loss. *Acta Otorhinolaryngol Ital*. 2008 Apr;28(2):61-6. PMID 18669069.
6. Joore MA, Potjewijd J, Timmerman AA, Anteunis LJ. Response shift in the measurement of quality of life in hearing impaired adults after hearing aid fitting. *Qual Life Res*. 2002 Jun 1;11(4):299-307. doi: 10.1023/a:1015598807510, PMID 12086115.
7. Joore MA, Brunenberg DE, Chenault MN, Anteunis LJ. Societal effects of hearing aid fitting among the moderately hearing impaired. *Int J Audiol*. 2003 Jan 1;42(3):152-60. doi: 10.3109/14992020309090424, PMID 12705780.
8. Stark P, Hickson L. Outcomes of hearing aid fitting for older people with hearing impairment and their significant others. *Int J Audiol*. 2004 Jan 1;43(7):390-8. doi: 10.1080/14992020400050050, PMID 15515638.

Prevention, screening for early identification, early intervention, and rehabilitation through hearing devices are among the strategies that mitigate hearing loss and its consequences. Those who treat their hearing loss with hearing aids and/or cochlear implants show improvement in social, emotional, and psychological well-being. Interventions can significantly decrease isolation, increase self-esteem, and lead to better employment opportunities and earnings—all of which will benefit society as a whole. Any research also investigated the advantages and comfort of having hearing aids for elderly with hearing impairments^{14,15}.

7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Presbycusis is a dynamic disorder with controversial hereditary, environmental and medical influences affecting physiopathology. The dilemma of public health, which is increasingly critical, will contribute to a lower quality of life, loneliness, dependency, and dissatisfaction. In the immediate future, our awareness regarding this disease and its physiopathology must be strengthened in order to remedy its advancement. Furthermore, developing approaches to recognise and deteriorate presbyopic patients would be of considerable significance, thus expanding the resources provided for hearing aids, assisting communication systems and auditory therapy. Individuals of hearing damage, the use of effective hearing aids or other hearing aids to improve the communication, and education strategies may have a favourable influence on older people's quality of life. Most important thing is to seek professional's advice to treat hearing problem effectively.

8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writers have no interest disputes in this work.

9. AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Mr. Vivek Kumar Jha gathered data, perceived the idea with the help of guide, carried out the research study with regard to this work. Dr Rajbir Singh (Guide) helped in statistical analysis and reviewed the manuscript.

10. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Conflict of interest declared none.

9. Mulrow CD, Aguilar C, Endicott JE, Tuley MR, Velez R, Charlip WS, Rhodes MC, Hill JA, DeNino LA. Quality-of-life changes and hearing impairment. A randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med.* 1990 Aug 1;113(3):188-94. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-113-3-188. PMID 2197909.
10. McArdle R, Chisolm TH, Abrams HB, Wilson RH, Doyle PJ. The WHO-DAS II: Measuring outcomes of hearing aid intervention for adults. *Trends Amplif.* 2005;9(3):127-43. doi: 10.1177/108471380500900304. PMID 16244759.
11. Malinoff RL, Weinstein BE. Measurement of hearing aid benefit in the elderly. *Ear Hear.* 1989 Dec;10(6):354-6. doi: 10.1097/00003446-198912000-00006. PMID 2606284.
12. Abrams HB, Hnath-Chisolm T, Guerreiro SM, Ritterman SI. The effects of intervention strategy on self-perception of hearing handicap. *Ear Hear.* 1992 Oct 1;13(5):371-7. doi: 10.1097/00003446-199210000-00013. PMID 1487096.
13. Chmiel R, Jerger J. Hearing aid use, central auditory disorder, and hearing handicap in elderly persons. *J Am Acad Audiol.* 1996 Jun;7(3):190-202. PMID 8780992.
14. Chisolm TH, Johnson CE, Danhauer JL, Portz LJ, Abrams HB, Lesner S, McCarthy PA, Newman CW. A systematic review of health-related quality of life and hearing aids: final report of the American Academy of Audiology Task Force on the Health-Related Quality of Life Benefits of Amplification in Adults. *J Am Acad Audiol.* 2007 Feb 1;18(2):151-83. doi: 10.3766/jaaa.18.2.7. PMID 17402301.
15. Tsakiroupolou E, Konstantinidis I, Vital I, Konstantinidou S, Kotsani A. Hearing aids: quality of life and socio-economic aspects. *Hippokratia.* 2007 Oct;11(4):183-6. PMID 19582191.
16. Chao TK, Chen TH. Cost-effectiveness of hearing aids in the hearing-impaired elderly: a probabilistic approach. *Otol Neurotol.* 2008 Sep 1;29(6):776-83. doi: 10.1097/MAO.0b013e31817e5d1b. PMID 18725859.
17. Antonucci TC. Social support and social relationships. *Handb of Aging and the Soc Sci.* 1990:205-26.
18. Joore MA, van der Stel H, Peters HJ, Boas GM, Anteunis LJ. The cost-effectiveness of hearing-aid fitting in the Netherlands. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2003 Mar 1;129(3):297-304. doi: 10.1001/archotol.129.3.297. PMID 12622538.
19. Huang Q, Tang J. Age-related hearing loss or presbycusis. *Eur Arch Oto-Rhino-Laryngol.* 2010 Aug 1;267(8):1179-91. doi: 10.1007/s00405-010-1270-7. PMID 20464410.
20. Tremblay K, Ross B. Effects of age and age-related hearing loss on the brain. *J Commun Disord.* 2007 Jul 1;40(4):305-12. doi: 10.1016/j.jcomdis.2007.03.008. PMID 17433356.
21. Weinstein BE, Spitzer JB, Ventry IM. Test-retest reliability of the HEARING Handicap Inventory for the Elderly. *Ear Hear.* 1986 Oct;7(5):295-9. doi: 10.1097/00003446-198610000-00002. PMID 3770324.
22. Newman CW, Weinstein BE, Jacobson GP, Hug GA. The HEARING Handicap Inventory for Adults: psychometric adequacy and audiometric correlates. *Ear Hear.* 1990 Dec;11(6):430-3. doi: 10.1097/00003446-199012000-00004. PMID 2073976.
23. Cox R, Hyde M, Gatehouse S, Noble W, Dillon H, Bentler R, Stephens D, Arlinger S, Beck L, Wilkerson D, Kramer S, Kricos P, Gagné JP, Bess F, Hallberg L. Optimal outcome measures, research priorities, and international cooperation. *Ear Hear.* 2000 Aug 1;21(4);Suppl:106S-15S. doi: 10.1097/00003446-200008001-00014. PMID 10981601.
24. Carr AJ, Thompson PW, Kirwan JR. Quality of life measures. *Br J Rheumatol.* 1996;35(3):275-81. doi: 10.1093/rheumatology/35.3.275. PMID 8620304.
25. The National Council on the Aging. The consequences of untreated hearing loss in older persons. Washington, DC: National Council on the Aging; 1999 [cited May 23, 2012]. Available from: <http://www.hearingoffice.com/download/UntreatedHearingLossReport.pdf>.
26. Lotfi Y, Mehrkian S, Moossavi AE, Faghih-Zadeh S. Quality of life improvement in hearing-impaired elderly people after wearing a hearing aid. *Arch Iran Med.* 2009;12(4):365-70. PMID 19566353.