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Abstract
The field of audiological rehabilitation in adults faces an array of opportunities. Some of these are technological, as with the advent of fully digital hearing-aids, and some involve clinical practice, such as opportunities for true multidisciplinary working, and for changes in hearing-aid prescription and provision. The development of well-validated questionnaire instruments should facilitate robust research into the effectiveness of clinical interventions in adult audiological rehabilitation, for such evidence is urgently needed if the field is to thrive.
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Introduction
The history of audiological rehabilitation is an interesting and varied field, with many pioneers and technological breakthroughs to celebrate. At no point in that history, however, has there been such an exciting, and perhaps bewildering array of opportunities and developments as there is at the present time. The objective of this article is to briefly review the opportunities, and indeed threats, that are evident in the discipline of adult audiological rehabilitation and to propose how these might be utilized for the benefit of hearing-impaired individuals. In order to describe the extent of the opportunities in this field this article has been structured in sections considering how audiological handicap can be determined quantitatively and qualitatively (thus facilitating better definitions of audiological handicap, disability and impairment), advances in techniques and technology, models of multidisciplinary practice, and the present paucity of evidence of effectiveness. Various trends are extrapolated from the recent past, but the authors agree with Edmund Burke (1729–1797) in that:

‘You can never plan the future by the past’
and so expect their vision of the future to be superseded by yet more exciting events and opportunities.

Quantifying handicap and benefit
The nature of the handicap experienced by an individual with a hearing impairment, and indeed by that individual’s friends, family and colleagues, is complex and specific to that individual. This has meant that many clinicians working with such individuals came to rely upon intuitive judgments about rehabilitation needs and goals. Such clinical acumen has a place in both audiology and otology, but should ideally be complemented by quantitative data from well-normed and validated questionnaires. The ability to perform baseline assessments in audiological rehabilitation, and then to describe the effects of intervention has been a major advance, and augurs well for the future.

In assessing the handicap associated with a hearing loss, the hearing handicap inventory (HHIA) and the many similar instruments (see Noble for a comprehensive review), provide the ability to quantify self-perceived hearing functions. The research undertaken in this area is impressive, and includes deliberation on the relationship between the terms ‘handicap’, ‘disability’ and ‘impairment’. In assessing the benefit of a clinical intervention the above instruments provide the ability to undertake before and after repeat measures. Some questionnaires have been developed for particular interventions, such as hearing aid fitting. The Glasgow Hearing-Aid Benefit Profile and the abbreviated profile of hearing-aid benefit (APHAB) provide good examples of such instruments, and are becoming widely used.

An alternative approach is the use of open-ended questions, that allow the individual to express all of the issues associated with their hearing impairment.
This approach provides qualitative data about a patient's self-perceived situation, and has been proposed as a useful adjunct to quantitative data. Thus a body of work has been undertaken that allows the quantitative and qualitative determination of handicap and of benefit in audiological rehabilitation. This work is fundamental both to future studies which shall explore the effectiveness of rehabilitation strategies, and to the application of strategies in an individual that address their specific concerns and issues.

Techniques and technology
The introduction of fully digital hearing-aid devices promises to be a dramatic influence upon audiological rehabilitation. Whilst digitally programmable hearing-aids facilitated the fitting of difficult hearing losses, the signal processing technology remained analogue. The latest generation of hearing-aids which utilize digital technology throughout the signal processing pathway allow noise management strategies and complex loudness compensation algorithms to be implemented. Thus, these devices better meet the needs of the majority of individuals with cochlear hearing loss who not only have raised auditory thresholds, but also have altered loudness perception, reduced temporal and frequency resolution and impaired localization ability. These advances in hearing aid practice have been well publicised, and have raised the expectations of patients informed by the media and the internet. Other hearing-aid advances have involved bone anchored hearing-aids and hearing-aid transducers attached to the ossicular chain. Whilst candidates for such devices is strict, one should expect this technology to become more widely available, though in the latter case evidence of safety and efficacy is not yet complete.

Technological innovation is not restricted to hearing-aids however. Wilson in a review of the future of cochlear implants, described speech processing strategies and stimulation strategies that when implemented hold promise for the increase in the quality of sound perceived by the user. In addition the confident application of cochlear implants in individuals with moderate/severe sensorineural hearing loss means that many will benefit from these techniques in the future. Another technical advance is the application of auditory brainstem implants in patients with neurofibromatosis type II that holds the promise of some hearing sensation for patients with this condition.

Whilst the technological developments described may prove to be beneficial to hearing-impaired individuals in the longer term, it may well be a change in clinical practice that is most effective in the near future. The use of real ear insertion gain measurements for hearing-aid fitting and verification has been limited in the United Kingdom because of the extraordinary pressure upon Departments of Audiology. This has resulted in many sub-optimal hearing-aid fittings, and has surely been a contributory factor to the non-use of many hearing-aids. There are indications that the use of verification techniques in hearing-aid fitting are becoming more widespread, and the existence of such well-evaluated hearing-aid prescription formulae as NAL and NAL-NL1, and the newer DSL for non-linear hearing-aids, and the Cambridge formulae means that appropriate hearing-aid fitting can be undertaken without difficulty in the majority of cases. All of these formulae now vary the amount of target gain as a function of input level, rather than by thresholds alone and thus allow the fitting of low threshold compression aids. Without such changes in clinical practice, the potential benefits of digital hearing-aids may not be realised.

Each of the exciting areas of technological development as described holds promise for the hearing impaired: but at a price. Whilst cochlear implant services were initially well funded, there is some recent anecdotal evidence of adults who are suitable for implantation having to wait, or for that intervention to be denied on grounds of cost. Audiology in the United Kingdom has traditionally been under resourced, and whilst at the time of writing the introduction of a limited trial of digital hearing-aids on the NHS is being discussed the scale of investment needed, not least in training, is daunting.

It should be noted that whilst the under resourcing of services for hearing-impaired individuals in the UK is regrettable, in many areas of the world the situation is far worse. The prospect of digital hearing-aid technology for the first world is exciting, but advances in the implementation of programmes involving prevention of hearing impairment and provision of basic hearing-aid technology for less affluent nations would be equally welcome.

Multidisciplinary practice
Given the multifaceted nature of adult audiological rehabilitation, it should not be surprising that no one professional group possesses all the skills needed in this demanding area of clinical practice. The skills and abilities of medical staff, audiologists and hearing therapists, clinical scientists, speech and language therapists and psychologists are complementary. In an ideal setting there are opportunities for synergy between the clinical practice of each of these professionals to the immense benefit of hearing-impaired individuals. It should be acknowledged however that audiology in the United Kingdom falls short of this ideal, and there have been, and continue to be, some professional conflicts. These can only have a negative impact upon patient care, and are an undifying sight. The development of true multi-disciplinary teams, with no one profession adopting priority or power over any other remains a challenge, but one that the authors are confident will be addressed in the next decade. The example set by many multi-disciplinary cochlear implant teams working with mutual respect and collaboration is indicative of the potential for success.
Evidence of effectiveness
Evidence-based medicine (EBM) provides a rigorous and robust framework for the evaluation of a clinical intervention. Repeatability of evidence from well-designed randomized controlled trials is required, and the paucity of such evidence in audiological rehabilitation is a significant weakness. This is particularly troubling when placed against the need for investment in audiological rehabilitation, particularly if digital hearing-aids are to be introduced in an effective manner. Whilst there are a number of trials of digital versus analogue hearing-aid technology in the literature, the majority of these would not withstand a rigorous EBM evaluation and were not in fact designed for that purpose.

Audiological rehabilitation is far from alone in this situation, but this position cannot be maintained. The implementation of studies of clinical effectiveness of audiological intervention, using the well validated questionnaire instruments described in conjunction with more traditional tests is urgent.

Conclusion
The future of adult audiological rehabilitation appears bright, with opportunities for improved practice in many areas. These benefits will only be achieved, however, if supported by an evidence base, training, and appropriate resources.
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