If you are viewing this course as a recorded course after the live webinar, you can use the scroll bar at the bottom of the player window to pause and navigate the course.

This handout is for reference only. It may not include content identical to the PowerPoint. Any links included in the handout are current at the time of the live webinar, but are subject to change and may not be current at a later date.

- Technical Assistance: 800-753-2160
- CEU Total Access members can earn credit for this course
  - Must complete outcome measure with passing score (within 7 days for live webinar; within 30 days of registration for recorded/text/podcast formats)
- Questions? Call 800-753-2160 or use Contact link on AudiologyOnline.com
MarkeTrak 9 Points the Way in a Time of Change

Carole M. Rogin, M.A.
Harvey B. Abrams, Ph.D.

Hearing Industries Association

Learner Objectives:

As a result of this Continuing Education Activity, participants will be able to:

1. Describe the methodology differences between MT9 and previous MarkeTrak surveys;
2. Describe the potential changes in government policies toward amplification products and their implications for a practice;
3. Describe the findings of MT9 and their implications for a practice

MarkeTrak 9: Exciting New Beginning

Carole M. Rogin, President
Hearing Industries Association
www.hearing.org
www.betterhearing.org
HIA Members

HIA Programs

Government Relations
Statistics
Market Development

Market Development

Better Hearing Institute, www.betterhearing.org
Exploring the Consumer’s Journey
- Focus Groups and Personal Interviews (2012)
MarkeTrak (1984-Present)
- Longitudinal study to track issues related to hearing loss
- Attitudes and perceptions
- Barriers to hearing aid use
Public Affairs Objective

Raise the importance of hearing in hierarchy of health issues

Be careful what you wish for...

NIDCD Working Group on Accessible and Affordable Hearing Health Care for Adults with Mild to Moderate Hearing Loss
August 2009

Access – Confusing to consumer, ill-defined professional roles, competing financial interests and multiple points of entry
Affordability – Definition “undetermined,” 76% of non-adopters mention cost, price range is unknown
Assumption – Need to improve both

Institute of Medicine (IOM)/National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine

Mission – Help those in government and the private sector make informed decisions by providing evidence...
• Hearing Loss and Healthy Aging Workshop January 2014
  Report on the effects of age-related hearing loss on healthy aging
• Consensus Study
  4 Meetings in 2015 – April, June, September (2)
  1 as we speak...
• Report and Recommendations due Spring 2016
President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST)

Charge – Leading scientists who advise POTUS

“Aging America & Hearing Loss: Imperative of Improved Hearing Technologies”
• Individual Interviews
• 2 Meetings in 2015 – September, October
• PCAST Letter Report issued to President last month

PCAST Recommendation #1

• Encourage the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to create another class of hearing aids and hearing tests to that can be sold over the counter and online for persons with mild-to-moderate hearing loss typically seen in aging. The FDA should exempt this class of hearing aids from the typical quality regulatory oversight of the agency, and instead adopt standards that are more closely aligned with the consumer electronics industry

PCAST Recommendation #2

• Ask the FDA to withdraw its draft guidance of personal sound amplification products (PSAPs). These devices should be for discretionary use by the consumer and can be used to augment or improve hearing
PCAST Recommendation #3

• Similar to optometrists, audiologists and dispensers should be required to provide a copy of hearing tests results to the consumer to allow them to shop for the best value in devices. These results should be provided at no additional cost to the consumer and must not be conditional upon the purchase of products.

PCAST Recommendation #4

• The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) should define a process that would authorize hearing aid vendors (e.g., online) the right and ability to obtain a copy of the hearing test results at no additional cost to the consumer.

MarkeTrak 9 (MT9) 2014

• On-line
• Best Practices (e.g. blinded study objective)
• Coordination with EuroTrak
• Survey Flow

17k households profiled individuals

Hearing difficulty continue
No hearing difficulty – complete

1K owners 2K non-owners
Question 1

- What percentage of the American population report a hearing difficulty?
  a. 5%
  b. 10%
  c. 15%
  d. 20%

Question 2

- What percentage of the American population own at least 1 hearing aid?
  a. 1%
  b. 2%
  c. 3%
  d. 4%
Hearing Difficulty & Hearing Aid Adoption

Rates for hearing difficulty and hearing aid ownership are in familiar ranges at 10.6% and 3.2% equating to a hearing aid adoption rate of 30.2%.

As expected, both hearing difficulty and hearing aid ownership:
- Increase with age
- Are higher for men than women (moderately)
- Are bilateral/binaural for the vast majority

Answer 1

- What percentage of the American population report a hearing difficulty?
  a. 5%
  b. 10%
  c. 15%
  d. 20%

Answer 2

- What percentage of the American population own at least 1 hearing aid?
  a. 1%
  b. 2%
  c. 3%
  d. 4%
Hearing Difficulty & Hearing Aid Adoption

- At 30.2%, US hearing aid adoption rate is higher
  - Largest increase among the **youngest people**
  - **Average age** of owners is slightly lower
  - More **first-time** buyers

- Owners report more severe hearing losses
- Increase in owners who report mild/moderate loss from 60% to 72%
- Adoption rates increase with severity, except for those with profound losses
- Average age of first purchase decreased from 69 to 63 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Reported Level of Loss</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>HA Owners (%)</th>
<th>HA Non-Owners (%)</th>
<th>Adoption Rates by Level (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hearing Difficulty & Hearing Aid Adoption
Question 3

- The satisfaction rate for hearing aids is:
  a. 60%
  b. 70%
  c. 80%
  d. 90%

Hearing Aid Satisfaction

Those who got their current hearing aids more recently have a higher level of satisfaction. The top-3 box “score” (on a 7-point satisfaction scale) is:
  • 90% for those who got in the last year
  • 78% for those who got 2-5 years ago
  • 74% for those who got 6 or more years ago

Satisfaction scores for all owners, regardless of the age of the hearing aid, is 81%, up from 74% in MT VIII.

Answer 3

- The satisfaction rate for hearing aids is:
  a. 60%
  b. 70%
  c. 80%
  d. 90%
The age of the hearing aids varies widely among current owners, but over half have relatively new hearing aids.

Hearing Aid Satisfaction

Satisfaction with current hearing aids has increased from 74% to 81%

- Higher with newer aids – satisfaction at 85% for aids four years old or newer
- Hearing aids “in the drawer” decreased from 12% to 3%
- Repeat buyers rate current aids as substantially better

Among all hearing aid owners, 88% feel their current hearing aid is meeting or exceeding their expectations. The newer, the better likely due to:

- Improvements in the hearing aids
- Managed expectations

Half of repeat purchasers feel their current hearing aid is much better
Question 4

• What is the percentage of hearing aids reported to be “in the drawer”?
  a. 3%
  b. 6%
  c. 9%
  d. 12%

Hearing Aid Satisfaction

• 74% of adults are binaural users
• 57% report they are first-time users
• 87% use their hearing aids at least weekly

Answer 4

• What is the percentage of hearing aids reported to be “in the drawer”?
  a. 3%
  b. 6%
  c. 9%
  d. 12%
Question 5

- What is the satisfaction rate for hearing care professionals among hearing aid owners?
  a. 60%
  b. 70%
  c. 80%
  d. 90%

Hearing Care Professional Satisfaction

Hearing aid owners are more likely to be satisfied with their hearing care professional than non-owners. A less than satisfactory experience may have been a reason why some non-owners did not try hearing aids. Nonetheless, the vast majority of both groups are more satisfied than not. The top-3 box satisfaction score (on a 7-point scale) is:

- 93% for owners
- 83% for non-owners

For those who saw their HCP in the last 4 years, the rates are 95% and 87% respectively.

Answer 5

- What is the satisfaction rate for hearing care professionals among hearing aid owners?
  a. 60%
  b. 70%
  c. 80%
  d. 90%
Hearing Care Professional Satisfaction

Satisfaction with hearing care professionals has increased
• Owners – 93%, Non-owners – 82%
• Non-owner satisfaction may contribute to lack of motivation to purchase hearing aids

Question 6

• The hearing aid adoption rate is much higher in countries with national health care programs that cover hearing aids
  a. True
  b. False

Adoption Rates by Age and Nation

- The adoption rate for MT9 is highest within the oldest segments. The next highest rates are within the youngest segments, which are higher than in 2008
- The distribution is very similar to and consistent with the shape of the curves from EuroTrak.
Answer 6

- The hearing aid adoption rate is much higher in countries with national health care programs that cover hearing aids
  a. True
  b. False

Question 7

In my practice:
  a. We refer tinnitus patients out to specialty clinics
  b. We provide initial evaluation, counseling and amplification only
  c. We provide evaluation, amplification and limited sound therapy options
  d. We provide a full scope tinnitus program with a variety of treatment options

MT9 Tinnitus

[Bar chart showing rates for tinnitus]

- Suffer from Tinnitus
- Have Tinnitus Device/Marker
Tinnitus

Most indicate it is a bilateral condition (similar to hearing loss)

There is a fairly even split between those who say it is constant versus those who say it is intermittent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>All Ages with Tinnitus (n=2,712)</th>
<th>Adults 20+ with Tinnitus (n=2,627)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral condition (both ears)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilateral condition (one ear)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant (always there)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 8

What percentage of those with hearing difficulties report owning a PSAP?

a. 5%
b. 10%
c. 15%
d. 20%

Personal Sound Amplification Product (PSAP)

Defined as “a device that amplifies sound that was not fit by a hearing care professional”

About 1% of the population reported having a personal sound amplifier, based upon this definition

This equates to about 10.6% of those with hearing difficulty
Answer 8

• What percentage of those with hearing difficulties report owning a PSAP?
  a. 5%
  b. 10%
  c. 15%
  d. 20%

MT9 PSAPs

• "...consumers think of many different categories of devices when they see this phrase or the term ‘personal sound amplifier’
  • For example, when asked to state a brand, some people who knew their brand listed brands for devices in the amplification space that are not traditional PSAPs and some that are not even body-worn
  • This is eye opening and sheds light on the difficulty defining PSAPs and the confusion that exists in the marketplace minds of consumers."

MDHearingAid.com
There’s an app for that...

App store: “Hearing Aid”
Question 9

• What percentage of adults report having had a hearing screening at their last physical exam?
  a. 5%
  b. 15%
  c. 25%
  d. 35%

Physician Screening

• 23% of adults report screening in latest physical – up from 15%
• Another 11% report hearing was at least mentioned
• Previous studies indicate physician recommendation is key to action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing loss assessment of physical in last year among all individuals (with and without hearing difficulty)</th>
<th>All Ages ( \geq 18 ) yrs</th>
<th>Adults 20+ yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screened at physical</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screened hearing test at physical, but not “screened”</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed hearing level at physical (but not “screened”)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not have physical</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer 9

• What percentage of adults report having a hearing screening at their last physical exam?
  a. 5%
  b. 15%
  c. 25%
  d. 35%
Question 10

What’s your feeling about online hearing screening?

a. I’m OK with online testing, what can go wrong?
b. Are you kidding? NO! It will devalue my worth
c. No, It cannot be calibrated
d. No, the public may be mislead and delay diagnosis of a serious problem
e. I’m OK with online testing as long as I can bill for it

Types of Tests

- Formal test (using equipment, booth, etc.)*
- An online tool
- 'App’ on a smart phone or tablet

MT9 High-Level Conclusions

- Hearing loss rates are stable... and there are 78 million people moving into range
- Hearing aid purchase percentages are up...
  - Technology
  - Satisfaction
  - Physician screening
  - Word-of-mouth
- Physician screening rates are up... and people want guidance from their doctors
- Consumer satisfaction is up... with both hearing care professionals and hearing aids
Let's meet John

- 68 year old married retiree
- Increasing problems understanding his wife and friends
- Has to turn up the TV
- Wondering what he should do next

John’s Journey
MT9

Part-1: Estimate Rates

- With hearing difficulty
- With professionals
- With hearing aids/solutions

Part-2: Gain Insight on Journey

- Hearing difficulty
- Hearing aid ownership
- Hearing aid adoption

17K Household Reporters

Person with HD in Household – continue

1K HA owners

2K Non-owners

No person with HD in household – complete

Transtheoretical (Stages of Change) Model
Prochaska & DiClemente (1983)

Pre-contemplation

http://adamsledd.com/applications-of-recovery EDUCATION IN RECOVERY/ PRE-CONTINUATION
Contemplation

Health Belief Model
Glanz, Rimer, & Lewis (2002).

What are John’s barriers?
Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Information Needed &amp; of That Time</th>
<th>EAP Present Ex Con</th>
<th>Non-Owners Ex Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General information about hearing loss (e.g., causes, symptoms, implications, help, etc.)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on hearing aids (e.g., types, styles, features, prices, etc.)</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on hearing history or ear-related medical history</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on alternative solutions/devices</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on costs and indicators of benefits (e.g., coverage, repair, etc.)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on a specific hearing care professional, clinic, or office</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on medical evidence (e.g., documentation, research, studies, etc.)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on a particular brand or hearing aid</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do consumers think about hearing aids?

Hearing Aid Category Classification

- Recommendations
- Availability of a specific product
- Reputation of a specific provider
- Personal experience
- General knowledge
- Personal experience
- Advice of a physician
- Inability to consider cost

Action
Who will John visit?

Influence of PCPs
### PCP Recommendations

- **Referred to ENT:**
  - HA Owners (n=231)
  - Non-HA Owners (n=765)
  - Total (n=996)

- **Recommended Surgery/Procedure:**
  - HA Owners (n=231)
  - Non-HA Owners (n=765)
  - Total (n=735)

### Influence of ENTs

- **Total (n=735):**
  - HA Owners (n=293)
  - Non-HA Owners (n=442)

### ENT Recommendations

- **Total (n=735):**
  - HA Owners (n=293)
  - Non-HA Owners (n=442)
Influence of HCPs

Conclusions from HCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total (n=1692)</th>
<th>HA Owners (n=915)</th>
<th>Non-Owners (n=777)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion or recommendation indicated hearing loss</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Said I had hearing loss directly</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Said hearing loss not bad enough to warrant HA(s)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Said hearing loss would not help enough</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicated HA(s) would not help enough</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Said wait awhile before retesting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Said hearing was normal</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HCP Recommendations

Recommended surgery/procedure

Recommended HA(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total (n=1692)</th>
<th>HA Owners (n=915)</th>
<th>Non-Owners (n=777)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended surgery/procedure</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended HA(s)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How motivating is the healthcare provider?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total (n=1692)</th>
<th>HA Owners (n=915)</th>
<th>Non-Owners (n=777)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivating healthcare provider</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with ENT</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with 1st HCP*</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with HCP who fit HA/last saw</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results from first official hearing test (for current difficulty)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reasons for choosing HCP

- Felt pressure from HCP to purchase HA(s) (3%)
- Felt pressure from doctor/ENT to purchase HA(s) (3%)
- Free trial (8%)
- Special offer/promotion (8%)
- Felt pressure from others to purchase HA(s) (10%)
- Satisfaction guarantee (money back, etc.) (13%)
- Liked the organization/practice (18%)
- Could afford it (had funds to purchase HA(s)) (26%)
- The price was right/reasonable (27%)
- Was impressed with technology/features (28%)
- The trial clearly showed HA(s) could improve hearing (28%)
- Had some coverage/help paying for HAs (33%)
- Trusted the hearing care professional (42%)
- Hearing test clearly demonstrated need for HA(s) (54%)
- Very satisfied with HCP (36%)

Reasons for purchasing at particular clinic

- Felt pressure from HCP to purchase HA(s) (3%)
- Felt pressure from doctor/ENT to purchase HA(s) (3%)
- Free trial (5%)
- Special offer/promotion (5%)
- Felt pressure from others to purchase HA(s) (7%)
- Satisfaction guarantee (money back, etc.) (13%)
- Recommendation from professional (21%)
- Recommendation from non-professional (23%)
- Near place I already go (23%)
- Hours worked for me (27%)
- Practice had good reputation (28%)
- To find out about technology (33%)
- To evaluate hearing aids (36%)
- Easy place to get to (38%)
- Tired of asking to repeat (42%)
- To purchase hearing aid(s) (43%)
- To get hearing tested (45%)
- Very satisfied with HCP (49%)

Satisfaction with HCP

- Very satisfied with HCP (59%)
- Satisfied with HCP (27%)
**Key areas influencing satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Areas</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Hearing Aids Owners (%)</th>
<th>Non Hearing Aids Owners (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of service during the fitting period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of service after the purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presentation of the hearing aids “in vivo”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The explanation of the operation/procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the support staff/consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of service provided throughout</td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of organization/efficiency of the practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purchase policy (financing, trial, guarantee, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reduction of hearing aid comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What would have made John purchase sooner?**

- Knowing that untreated sensorineural loss can contribute to or exacerbate other health issues
- Evidence that technology has significantly better than ever before
- A positive recommendation from my doctor
- A hearing test that makes it clear to me that I need one
- Having insurance that will cover some/more of the cost
- A recommendation from a hearing care professional
- A place to evaluate or try hearing aids without feeling pressure to buy on the first visit
- Knowing that unaided hearing loss can contribute to or exacerbate other health issues (memory loss, etc.)
Factors that Increase in Importance

- Half of repeat purchasers feel their current hearing aid is much better than their first because:
  - Quality of product is better
  - HCP did a better job
  - Willing to use current HA
  - Better sense of what they need, specifically:
    - premium sound quality
    - reduced feedback
    - ease of use

Key factors influencing satisfaction

- Out of pocket price paid
- Value (quality/performance vs. price paid)
- Effectiveness of enhanced features
- Sound quality
- Effort required for maintenance
- Physical comfort
- Appearance (visibility, aesthetics, etc.)
- Product quality
- Ease of use

Digging Deeper
Satisfaction as a function of specific listening situations

MarkeTrak Satisfaction
% top 3 on scale, all HA purchased within last 3 years
Non-Auditory Benefits: Forgetfulness

In the last year, have you found yourself getting more forgetful?

No

Yes, somewhat more

Yes, much more

Memory and cognition

Cognitive disorder screening should be part of a comprehensive hearing assessment

a. Yes

b. No

c. Not sure
Recent trade journal emphasis
Six Item Cognitive Impairment Test (6CIT)

• Developed in 1983
• Useful dementia screening tool in Primary Care.
• Uses an inverse score method to produce a possible total of 28 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–7</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–9</td>
<td>Mild cognitive impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–28</td>
<td>Significant cognitive impairment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://primedr.com/images/Forms/Cognitive_Function_Screening.pdf

Item 1: What is the year?

Item 2: What is the month?
Item 3: Repeat an address out loud

5 element address:
1. First name
2. Last name
3. Number
4. Street
5. City

Item 4: About what time is it?

Item 5: Count backwards from 20 out loud
Item 6: Recite the months of the year backwards

Item 7: What was the address from earlier?

Non-Auditory Benefits:
Lack of Interest or Pleasure

Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you been bothered by "Little interest or pleasure in doing things?"

- Nearly Every Day
- For More Than Half the Days
- For Several Days
- Not at All

Non‐Auditory Benefits:
Lack of Interest or Pleasure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nearly Every Day</th>
<th>For More Than Half the Days</th>
<th>For Several Days</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Hearing Difficulty (n=4006)

Hearing Difficulty with no HA (n=426)

Hearing Difficulty and a HA (n=233)
Non-Auditory Benefits: Depression

Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you been bothered by: "Feeling down, depressed or hopeless"?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Nearly every day</th>
<th>For more than half the days</th>
<th>For several days</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hearing Difficulty (n=4006)

No Hearing Difficulty with no HA (n=426)

Hearing Difficulty and a HA (n=233)

Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you been bothered by:

"Feeling down, depressed or hopeless"?

Nearly Every Day

For More Than Half the Days

For Several Days

Not at All

Question 12

- Depression screening should be part of a comprehensive hearing assessment
  a. Yes
  b. No
  c. Not sure

Impact of depression?

"Hearing loss is associated with substantially reduced mental health ratings among some young and middle-aged persons, but usually does not affect mental health much among older persons."

Tambs, Kristian PhD

"Hearing loss is associated with substantially reduced mental health ratings among some young and middle-aged persons, but usually does not affect mental health much among older persons."
Physician Quality Reporting System (PQRS)

- Measure #134: Preventive Care and Screening: Screening for Clinical Depression and Follow-Up Plan
- Required when you perform the procedure represented by 92625 (Tinnitus evaluation)

Depression Screening Tools

- Adolescent screening tools:
  - Patient Health Questionnaire for Adolescents (PHQ-A), Beck Depression Inventory-Primary Care Version (BDI-PC), Mood Feeling Questionnaire (MFQ), Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D), and PRIME MD-PHQ2

- Adult screening tools:
  - Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9), Beck Depression Inventory (BDI or BDI-II), Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D), Depression Scale (DEPS), Duke Anxiety-Depression Scale (DADS), Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS), Cornell Scale Screening, and PRIME MD-PHQ2

Relapse
Relapse Risks

- Major life changes
  - Loss of spouse
  - Loss of job
  - Loss of independence
  - Major illness or injury
- Significant change in hearing
- Inadequate follow-up
- Unresolved hearing aid complaint(s)
- Failure to provide post-fitting rehabilitation
  - Group-based aural rehabilitation
  - Auditory training

Can we train the brain?

You Betcha!

What’s available?

- LACE
- Brain HQ
- Lumosity
- ReadMyQuips
Gamification

- The concept of applying game mechanics and game design techniques to engage and motivate people to achieve their goals
- Gamification taps into the basic desires and needs of the user's impulses which revolve around the idea of Status and Achievement

https://badgeville.com/wiki/Gamification
LACE (Sweetow & Henderson-Sabes, 2007)
Quality of life improvement with HA use

Beyond MT9
What does this all mean for my practice?

Review your clinical protocols

- Upgrade your health history to include all key co-morbidities
- Explain the co-existence; be careful not to imply causality
- Advise that amplification may improve communications with physicians and general outlook on/engagement with life
- Employ meaningful measures of hearing and communication performance
- Provide post-fitting rehabilitation tools

Untreated hearing loss is not a benign condition

James Firman, PhD; President, National Council on the Aging

What does this all mean for my practice?

Connect/reconnect with your local medical community

- Many of your patients want hearing aid recommendation from MD
- Majority of physical exams DO NOT include a hearing check of any kind (Medicare now requires that each patient have their hearing screened)
- Most specialists are not aware of connection between their condition/disease and hearing loss

Hearing loss is not only a pervasive problem but also one that can affect virtually all aspects of a person’s life.

Institute of Medicine Workshop, January 2014
It is good to have an end to journey toward; but it is the journey that matters, in the end.

- Ernest Hemingway
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