

Research Article

Knowledge Is Power: Improving Outcomes for Patients, Partners, and Professionals in the Digital Age

Melanie Ferguson,^{a,b,c} David Maidment,^{a,b} Helen Henshaw,^{a,b} and Rachel Gomez^{a,c}

Purpose: The aim of this research was to develop and evaluate methods to address poor knowledge of hearing aids, hearing loss, and communication in patients, partners, and nonaudiologic health and social care professionals.

Method: An interactive multimedia educational program (C2Hear) has been co-produced with hearing aid users and audiologists to provide high-quality information and demonstrate complex concepts relating to hearing aids and communication.

Results: A randomized controlled trial showed numerous benefits for first-time hearing aid users that included better knowledge and skill, and increased hearing aid use and satisfaction. Patients reported that C2Hear was highly useful, enjoyable, and preferable to written information. C2Hear Online is now freely available on YouTube and has global

reach, well in excess of 150,000 views. Further developments include a version for communication partners, which showed that joint-working between hearing aid users and their communication partners resulted in joint responsibility for communication that facilitated communication behaviors. In addition, a behavior theory-driven version for use with mobile technologies (m2Hear) has been designed to be tailored to the needs of individual hearing aid users. m2Hear includes more activities/interaction to maximize user engagement and learning. Finally, C2Hear has been used to improve hearing-related knowledge in other health and social care professionals, such as carehome assistants.

Conclusion: This range of educational programs and tools aims to improve knowledge and skills, leading to better outcomes for patients, partners, and health care professionals.

Knowledge and understanding of hearing aids and the negative consequences of hearing loss by patients, family and friends, nonaudiologic health care professionals, and the general public are generally poor (Desjardins & Doherty, 2009). This can lead to ineffective communication and social engagement, and the psychosocial consequences of this can result in social isolation, withdrawal and loneliness, and depression, leading to reduced quality of life (Barker, Leighton, & Ferguson, 2017; Heffernan, Coulson, Henshaw, Barry, & Ferguson, 2016; Strawbridge, Wallhagen, Shema, & Kaplan, 2000). Hearing aids are effective at improving listening, participation in everyday life,

and health-related quality of life (Ferguson et al., 2017), but despite this, take-up and adherence are often far from ideal (Davis, Smith, Ferguson, Stephens, & Gianopoulos, 2007). Only one in three who would benefit from hearing aids has them, and nonuse of hearing aids ranges between 3% and 24% (Ferguson et al., 2017). There are a number of reasons for non- or sub-optimal hearing aid use, and these can include physical factors and comfort, handling and maintenance, psychosocial and situational factors, and attitude of health care professionals (McCormack & Fortnum, 2013). Furthermore, expectations about the benefits of hearing aids can be set too high (Ferguson, Woolley, & Munro, 2016). Many of these reasons can be addressed by good-quality information.

There is a growing awareness that self-management of long-term chronic conditions, such as hearing loss, can enhance health care. Those who take an active role in their

^aNational Institute for Health Research, Nottingham Biomedical Research Centre, Nottingham, United Kingdom

^bHearing Sciences, Division of Clinical Neuroscience, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom

^cNottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Queens Medical Centre, Nottingham, United Kingdom

Correspondence to Melanie Ferguson:
melanie.ferguson@nottingham.ac.uk

Editor: Rebecca Kelly-Campbell

Received July 9, 2018

Revision received November 21, 2018

Accepted January 1, 2019

https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_PERS-SIG7-2018-0006

Disclosures

Financial: Melanie Ferguson has no relevant financial interests to disclose. David Maidment has no relevant financial interests to disclose. Helen Henshaw has no relevant financial interests to disclose. Rachel Gomez has no relevant financial interests to disclose.

Nonfinancial: Melanie Ferguson has no relevant nonfinancial interests to disclose. David Maidment has no relevant nonfinancial interests to disclose. Helen Henshaw has no relevant nonfinancial interests to disclose. Rachel Gomez has no relevant nonfinancial interests to disclose.

care are more likely to adopt better health behaviors, leading to better patient outcomes (Mosen et al., 2006). A recent systematic review on a range of long-term conditions has highlighted a number of key components of self-management, which include provision of education, strategies to support adherence to treatments, practical support tailored to the individual with the long-term condition, and social support (Taylor et al., 2014). Within audiology, knowledge exchange and patient education have been highlighted as important aspects of patient-centered care (Grenness, Hickson, Laplante-Levesque, & Davidson, 2014) and self-management of hearing loss (Barker, Mackenzie, Elliott, Jones, & de Lusignan, 2016). In the United Kingdom, national guidelines recommend that good-quality information for both patients and their families is provided (NICE, 2018). Information to promote knowledge on hearing loss, hearing aids, and communication is often delivered verbally or through written materials. Remote delivery of information is also an option and includes videotapes, DVDs, and the Internet (Ferguson, Brandreth, Leighton, Brassington, & Wharrad, 2016; Kramer, Allesie, Dondorp, Zekveld, & Kapteyn, 2005; Thorén, Öberg, Wänström, Andersson, & Lunner, 2014).

To address knowledge limitations in hearing aid users, we have developed a series of multimedia, interactive educational videos, known as C2Hear. In this article, we discuss (a) how C2Hear was developed and evaluated in first-time hearing aid users, (b) the translation from a research tool to clinical practice, (c) how C2Hear has been evaluated with family members and nonaudiologic health care professionals, and (d) current developments leading to a program that has been designed for delivery through mobile technologies to meet the specific needs of individuals.

Development of C2Hear

C2Hear is based on the concept of reusable learning objects (RLOs), which are bite-sized chunks of multimedia e-learning that are designed to meet specific learning goals (Windle & Wharrad, 2010). RLOs include the following pedagogical components: (a) presentation of a procedure or concept to support the learning goal, (b) activity to promote engagement with RLO content, (c) self-assessment to test what has been learned, and (d) links to other resources. The C2Hear RLOs were co-produced using a participatory approach involving hearing aid users and hearing health care professionals, who were core to the development process (Ferguson, Leighton, Brandreth, & Wharrad, 2018). We originally started work on developing C2Hear in December 2011, and at that time, there was relatively little in the literature as to what good-quality information for first-time hearing aid users should look like. To address this, we took a two-stage approach.

Delphi Review

Our first step was to reach a consensus among hearing health care professionals on the informational needs

of first-time hearing aid users by undertaking a Delphi review (Ferguson et al., 2018). This is an iterative process that refines opinions on a specific subject until an accepted degree of consensus is reached by an expert group. A Delphi review contains four core characteristics: an expert panel, a number of iterations and controlled feedback, statistical feedback, and anonymity of responses (Diamond et al., 2014). The Delphi review was delivered via e-mail to a panel of 33 U.K. hearing health care professionals comprising National Health Service (NHS) audiologists, hearing therapists, hearing researchers, hearing charity representatives, hearing aid company representatives, and independent hearing aid dispensers.

A three-round Delphi review was conducted. Round 1 asked 10 open-ended questions about ideal information for first-time hearing aid users and nonuse of hearing aids. Thematic analysis was used to analyze responses, leading to seven themes and 43 subthemes, which resulted in a bank of 67 statements on information needs. These statements formed the basis of Rounds 2 and 3, and participants scored the statements on a 5-point Likert scale (*strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*). Consensus was reached when $\geq 90\%$ of the panel agreed or strongly agreed with a statement. In addition, the participants were asked to rank-order 15 proposed topics for the RLOs that arose from Round 1.

At the end of Round 3, 100% agreement was reached for 21 statements (31.3%), and between 90% and 99% agreement for a further 21 statements (31.3%). In nine statements (13.4%), there was less than 50% agreement. Examples are shown in Table 1. The top 10 ranked topics were as follows: hearing aid insertion, hearing aid controls, hearing aid maintenance, getting used to hearing aids, communication tactics, hearing aid benefits and limitations, information for communication partners, listening in different situations, expectations of hearing aids, telephones, and assistive listening devices.

Workshops

The second step was to involve patients and audiologists in the development of the content through the co-production of A0 (841x1189mm) storyboards. Thirty-two hearing aid users and 11 audiologists participated in three 1-day workshops. The top 10 topics of ideal information from the Delphi review were discussed by the participants, and their views and perspectives of these topics were captured on the storyboards to provide visual representations of their personal thoughts and experiences around these topics. Each group developed two or three storyboards.

Development and Production of the RLOs

The Delphi statements that reached consensus ($\geq 90\%$ agreement) and key points from the storyboard content were then mapped and integrated onto the relevant RLO title derived from the top 10 topics. Written specifications for

Table 1. Examples of Delphi review statements that met 100%, 90%–99%, and < 90% agreement.

Agreement	Statement
100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All new hearing aid users should receive information on how to use their hearing aid(s). All new hearing aid users should receive information on how to maintain their hearing aid(s). Information to the patient should include communication skills (e.g., lipreading), hearing tactics (e.g., asking the speaker to speak louder/clearer), and strategies (e.g., managing their environment). New hearing aid users need to be reassured that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> using a hearing aid regularly allows the brain to adapt to everyday sounds; and the benefit they will get in different listening situations will vary (e.g., in quiet and in noise).
90%–99%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Making patients aware of the limitations of hearing aid(s) is an important part of learning to wear hearing aids. Patients should receive information on how to use a telephone/mobile phone effectively with the hearing aid(s). Patients need to be <ul style="list-style-type: none"> warned that perception of sounds when using the hearing aid(s) will not sound natural (e.g., own voice, other speakers); and be aware of other sources of follow-up support (e.g., peer support, sensory support services, support groups, useful websites).
< 90%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RLOs should include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an explanation of the range of assistive listening devices available (71% agreement); and instruction and demonstration on how to use assistive listening devices appropriate to the patient (45% agreement). The audiologist needs to explain the audiogram to the patients to enable them to understand the impact of their hearing loss on their communication abilities (60% agreement). Patients should be reassured that wearing a hearing aid all of the time is in their best interest (36% agreement).

the RLOs were then developed with our public and patient involvement group who were hearing aid users. These were then developed into the multimedia RLOs. There were a total of seven RLOs plus an introductory RLO. The titles were: Introduction; Getting to know your hearing aids; How to insert hearing aids; What to expect when wearing hearing aids; Adapting to wearing hearing aids; Communication tactics; Using the phone and other devices; Hearing aid care and troubleshooting. Each RLO included visual illustrations of concepts, engagement with content, and self-assessment using a 2 or 3 question multiple-choice quiz. The RLOs were developed across 2011 and 2012, and around that time we had previously shown that the use of PCs and Internet in the 70- to 74-year age group in Nottingham was quite low, at 36% and 17%, respectively (Henshaw, Clark, Kang, & Ferguson, 2012). As a result, we chose a DVD platform on which to produce the RLOs to maximum accessibility for typical first-time hearing aid users. This limited the possibilities for extensive interaction but meant that we could deliver RLOs through DVD for TV or computer, as well as online through the Internet. Participants had the freedom to choose which RLO to watch, and when, and for as many times as they liked, with the option to fast-forward, rewind, and pause.

Evaluation of C2Hear: Patients

Following development of the RLOs, their effectiveness was evaluated in a registered, randomized controlled trial (RCT) of 203 first-time hearing aid users who attended the Nottingham Audiology Service (ISRCTN11486888). Patients were prospectively recruited and remotely randomized by the Nottingham Clinical Trials Unit into either the intervention group (RLO+, $n = 103$) who received the RLOs or the waitlist control group (RLO-, $n = 100$) who received standard care.

The primary outcome was hearing aid use from the Glasgow Hearing Aid Benefit Profile (GHABP; Gatehouse, 1999), and the study was powered to show a 12.5% difference between the RLO+ and RLO- groups. Allowing for a 15% attrition rate, 200 patients needed to be recruited. The RLO+ group received the RLOs at the hearing aid fitting appointment, and both groups were seen for a follow-up evaluation at 6–7 weeks postfitting ($M = 6.8$ weeks). The research audiologists were blinded to the group allocation, and at the end of the follow-up session, the RLO- group was offered the RLOs. A range of outcomes were measured prefitting and at follow-up, including the GHABP, the International Outcome Inventory for Hearing Aids (IOI-HA; Cox & Alexander, 2002), and the Hearing Handicap Inventory for the Elderly (HHIE; Ventry & Weinstein, 1982). In addition, a video diary was used to record use and usefulness of the RLOs, and patient feedback on the RLOs was obtained based on 20 statements, such as “I found the videos enjoyable,” using a 5-point Likert scale (*strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*).

The most common delivery format was DVD for TV (50.6%), followed by Internet delivery (32.9%) and DVD for PC (15.2%). One person used a DVD with autoplay. One hundred sixty-seven patients attended the follow-up.

Take-Up and Adherence Were High; Feedback Was Positive

Take-up and adherence of the RLOs were high (78.4% and 97.4%, respectively). Only two participants failed to watch any of the RLOs. The average number of views was 13 per participant, and around half (49.2%) watched the RLOs at least twice, with 22% watching the RLOs at least three times. The reuse of the RLOs suggests that they were used to self-manage their hearing loss. The RLOs were rated as 9/10 on average (0 = *not useful*, 10 = *extremely*

useful), and 78.4% said they would recommend the RLOs to other people. Patient feedback was favorable. For content, the vast majority (92%) agreed the illustrations and videos aided their understanding. For activity and engagement, 91% agreed the quiz gave a clear message, and 88% would refer back to the RLOs if they had a problem. Finally, participants reported they preferred the RLOs to written information (82.9%), and felt more confident in discussing hearing aid and communication with others (81.3%). Focus groups confirmed that the RLOs were generally very well received. Key themes were repeated watching, sharing of RLOs, provided reassurance, and help people to remember seen in the statements below.

...I found that I had missed something, so I went back and looked again.

I have passed my DVD onto an old couple who both have hearing aids.... I kept telling her, play that DVD and you will know why....

The DVD explained how we have to relearn to rehear things. That was not an aspect that I was aware of, to re-educate your brain to interpret what you hear.

RLOs Benefitted Patients

In terms of outcome measures, there were significant improvements for the RLO+ group compared to the control RLO- group for

- knowledge of hearing aids (Hearing Aid and Communication Knowledge [Ferguson, Brandreth, Brassington, & Wharrad, 2015]; $p < .001$, with a large clinical effect size of $d = 0.95$; see Figure 1);
- practical handling skills (Practical Hearing Aid Skills Test [Desjardins & Doherty, 2009]; $p < .001$; see Figure 2); and
- hearing aid use (GHABP), in those who did not wear their hearing aids all the time ($p = .03$; with a large clinical effect size, $d = 0.83$). There was no difference

Figure 1. Hearing Aid and Communication Knowledge scores. Mean \pm 95% confidence interval for the intervention (RLO+) and control (RLO-) groups. d = Cohen's effect size; RLO = reusable learning object.





Figure 2. Practical Hearing Aid Handling Skills Test (PHAST) scores. Mean \pm 95% confidence interval for the intervention (RLO+) and control (RLO-) groups. d = Cohen's effect size; HA = hearing aid; RLO = reusable learning object.



in overall hearing aid use for the whole sample (Mdn: RLO+ = 100%, RLO- = 96.7%; $p = .48$), in part because many reported 100% use, so ceiling effects were evident.

For other outcomes, there was no group difference for general hearing aid benefit (GHABP, International Outcome Inventory for Hearing Aids), participation (HHIE), satisfaction, patient activation, and quality of life. Finally, a health economic analysis showed that the RLOs in DVD format were highly cost-effective.

To conclude, the educational intervention (C2Hear) showed key benefits of greater knowledge, hearing aid handling skills, and hearing aid use. RLO uptake and adherence were high, and C2Hear was rated as highly useful.

Early Delivery of C2Hear

The RCT delivered C2Hear at the fitting appointment, but increasing knowledge prior to that has obvious advantages, such as enhancing readiness and self-efficacy for hearing aids. An RCT of 47 first-time hearing aid users received either C2Hear ($n = 24$, intervention group) or the standard clinic booklet ($n = 23$, control group) at the hearing assessment appointment (Gomez, Wilson, & Ferguson, 2017).

Four weeks later, there was significantly greater knowledge of hearing aids and communication at the fitting appointment for the C2Hear group compared to the booklet (control) group ($p < .001$). Results were similar to the previous RCT, but with an even larger clinical effect size ($d = 1.61$). There was a significant between-group improvement in self-efficacy for hearing aids measured by the Measure of Audiologic Rehabilitation for Self-Efficacy for Hearing Aids (MARS-HA; West & Smith, 2007) between assessment and fitting appointment ($p = .001$, $d = 0.83$). Where self-efficacy improved for all the subscales for the C2Hear group, there was no change in self-efficacy for all MARS-HA subscales for the control group. There was no

between-group difference in readiness measured by the Ida Institute Motivation Line Tool (Ferguson, Maidment, Russell, Gregory, & Nicholson, 2016).

Early delivery of C2Hear at the time that hearing is assessed improves knowledge of hearing aids and communication, and “primes” the patients so they have greater self-efficacy and are better prepared to use hearing aids when they receive them. Further research is needed to identify what the longer-term effects of early delivery are.

From Research Into Practice

The ultimate aim of the research was to make the RLOs widely available to whoever wanted to use them. First, we revised the RLOs to take into account feedback from the study participants and focus groups. The end result was 10 RLOs, with the testimonials removed from the main body of the RLOs, and the total time was reduced from 1 hr to 45 min. C2Hear was made available on DVD in 2014, but to maximize accessibility, C2Hear Online was launched in November 2015 on YouTube (www.youtube.com/C2HearOnline) and is freely available. To date, there have been > 150,000 unique views from around the world (38% from North America). C2Hear Online is used in audiology clinics across the United Kingdom and is included in national U.K. guidelines (BSA, 2016; NICE, 2018). It has been translated into American English and is part of a large U.S. longitudinal study of Aging, Cognitive, and Hearing Evaluation in Elders, and we are currently working on translating it into Chinese and Spanish.

Involving Others in Knowledge Exchange: Partners and Professionals

As interpersonal communication is a two-way process, hearing loss affects not only the person who has the hearing loss but also those with whom they communicate (Barker et al., 2017). Those who communicate regularly with persons who have hearing loss (PHLs), such as their family and friends (communication partners [CPs]), are an intrinsic component in managing hearing loss and improving communication. For example, involving CPs in the rehabilitation process results in greater inclusivity and has been shown to be highly beneficial (Carson, 2016; Knudsen, Öberg, Nielsen, Naylor, & Kramer, 2010; Scarinci, Worrall, & Hickson, 2008; Schulz et al., 2017; Stark & Hickson, 2004). Furthermore, many CPs experience some degree of third-party disability (Kamil & Lin, 2015; Scarinci, Worrall, & Hickson, 2012). This may be alleviated through shared understanding of the challenges associated with their partners' hearing loss (including its management) and communication, leading to better aligned coping strategies and better outcomes for both parties (Barker et al., 2017).

Focus groups held with family members following the initial development of the RLOs indicated that they would benefit from RLOs that were specifically tailored to them (Ferguson, Brandreth, et al., 2016). To address this, one of

the original RLOs (communication tactics) was redesigned with wording that was more generic for ‘others’, such as family members and the general public, rather than for hearing aid users. In addition, we redeveloped the RLO onto a mobile technology platform (mRLO) to increase the capacity of greater interaction (Ferguson, 2017). Quality, usability, relevance, and impact of the repurposed mRLO were examined for both individual (PHL or CP) and joint-working (PHL and CP) conditions using mixed methods (Henshaw, Barker, Maidment, Wharrad, & Ferguson, 2017), that is, quantitatively via the User-Mobile Application Rating Scale (Stoyanov, Hides, Kavanagh, & Wilson, 2016) and qualitatively using video-recorded Think Aloud techniques (Olmsted-Hawala, Murphy, Hawala, & Ashenfelter, 2010). Qualitative data from the Think Aloud recordings were analyzed using inductive thematic analysis using BORIS video coding software (Friard & Gamba, 2016), and generated codes were interpreted according to the COM-B system of health behaviors (Michie, van Stralen, & West, 2011).

Nine dyads comprising PHLs (seven male, two female) and their CPs (two male, seven female) took part in the research. CPs were primarily the PHLs' spouse, except for one daughter. Both PHLs and CPs preferred the enhanced mRLO over the original. Quantitative results from the User-Mobile Application Rating Scale showed users rated the mRLO as of high quality (maximum score of 5.0; overall quality ratings by PHLs: $M = 3.8$, $SD = 0.45$; by CPs: $M = 3.7$, $SD = 0.37$), with PHLs and CPs rating the average perceived impact of the mRLO to change behavior as 3.5 ($SD = 0.89$) and 4.1 ($SD = 0.73$) respectively.

To examine how the mRLO might encourage behavior change, mRLO content was mapped to the COM-B system using the Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF; Cane, O'Connor, & Michie, 2012). Content spanned all three areas of capability (*knowledge and awareness of a specific behavior*), opportunity (*social, environmental, and contextual factors that can influence behavior*), and motivation (*beliefs, views, goals, and affects that can initiate and direct behaviors*). Qualitative analysis of Think Aloud videos showed the greatest impact was for joint-working conditions. The mRLO enabled users to become jointly aware of inhibiting factors that prevented optimal communication and provided alternative facilitating factors that could help counteract these issues. Inhibitors and facilitators were present within the mRLO content itself but also emerged from novel conversations triggered by using the mRLO together.

*Do you find it's [hearing] a problem in the car?
(CP, female)*

...Erm, you talking to me from the kitchen, I can't hear. (PHL, male)

I never thought about that, traffic, out in traffic. (CP, female)

This improved awareness and mindfulness of behaviors that inhibited communication, resulted in joint responsibility

for improving communication between CPs and PHLs, and encouraged users (primarily CPs) to adopt facilitative behaviors to improve communication.

Now, having seen this video, that's what we shall look for [a quiet restaurant table with good lighting]. (CP, female)

In addition to CPs, others who interact with PHLs and who would benefit from information and support for hearing loss, hearing aids, and communication include nonaudiologic health care professionals and carers. We have conducted a number of preliminary studies to evaluate the benefits of using the RLOs to train nonaudiologic health and social care groups about hearing-related matters. Three studies with residential care home staff (Finegold, 2014; McShea, Corrigan, Greatrex, & Ferguson, 2016; Rocks & Ferguson, 2013) showed a highly significant increase in knowledge of hearing aids and communication, and improvement in hearing aid handling skills, with large effect sizes. Staff reported that the training was very useful and improved their efficiency and effectiveness, and that they felt empowered to increase opportunities to help individuals with their hearing aids and communication. A study of 95 nurses showed highly significant improvements in knowledge of hearing aids and communication (Hussein, 2017). Aligned with the views of CPs, one of the recurrent themes identified across all groups in these studies was the desire for RLOs tailored for their own workplace situations. Future research aims to expand the mRLO concept to flexible, individualized tools for CPs and a range of health and social care professionals to meet their training and information requirements on hearing-related matters.

Tailoring Information to Meet Individual Needs: Personalization

The functionality of mobile technologies (e.g., smartphones, tablets) provides a platform that has been shown in other health care domains to increase user interactivity to enhance learning potential (Bennett & Glasgow, 2009; Zhang, Zhou, Briggs, & Nunamaker, 2006). Furthermore, mobile technologies can enable tailoring of an intervention to meet individual needs, so that patients can better manage their condition (Murray, Burns, See, Lai, & Nazareth, 2005). Over the recent years, there has been a year-on-year increase in smartphone ownership in those aged 55+ years (2012 = 19%, 2017 = 71%; Deloitte, 2017), and the proportion of 55- to 64-year-olds accessing the Internet “on-the-go” via a smartphone has also increased exponentially (2012 = 29%, 2017 = 64%; Office for National Statistics, 2017). The increasing digital literacy in older adults suggests the time is right to develop and evaluate mobile-enabled RLOs (or mRLOs) to enable greater personalization and interactivity. To this end, we have redeveloped the C2Hear RLOs from a “one size fits all” approach into a theoretically driven personalized intervention for use with mobile technologies (m2Hear).

The development of m2Hear was informed by the COM-B system (Michie et al., 2014). Specifically, the TDF can be used to identify the constructs or “active ingredients” (e.g., knowledge, physical skills, social influences, reinforcement) that are necessary to bring about behavior change, thereby informing the design and implementation of an intervention. We repurposed the C2Hear RLOs by dividing them into short learning segments that were approximately 30–60 s in duration. This process was theoretically grounded, whereby each segment was classified according to the TDF, which links to a specific determinant of behavior (i.e., capability, opportunity, motivation). The end result was a series of 42 short mRLOs, each identified by a set of domains that are necessary to bring about the target behavior (i.e., hearing aid use). Table 2 provides an example of how this was done for two C2Hear RLOs.

To complement this theoretical approach, we adopted an ecological method to label each mRLO. To facilitate this, we employed a concurrent Think Aloud evaluation technique, which is widely used in health research to evaluate digital interventions. To obtain the end-user perspective, 15 hearing aid users were asked to view and simultaneously talk about the mRLOs in terms of what was particularly important, relevant, and valuable to them with regard to their hearing and communication experiences and needs. All sessions were designed to encourage participants to reflect upon and describe in their own words their views on the mRLOs with minimal guidance from the researcher who guided the task. The Think Aloud sessions were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. These data were then used to label each mRLO with a specific question (see Table 2). In addition, the majority of participants commented that the information users would need to know immediately (e.g., how to change the hearing aid battery) should be separated from that needed after hearing aids had been used for some time (e.g., how to clean and maintain hearing aids). We therefore opted to cluster the mRLOs into the following five areas: (a) using hearing aids, (b) getting used to hearing aids, (c) looking after hearing aids, (d) communication with others, and (e) using the telephone and other devices. Together with the questions generated for each mRLO, these five superordinate areas would act as an interface to enable individualized tailoring.

Following the development of the mRLOs, the m2Hear online platform was constructed using background programming to suit the mobile device (e.g., smartphone, tablet, laptop) from which it is being accessed. The development of the platform was iterative, informing any content or usability modifications. Specifically, following a user-centered design, a panel of hearing aid users from the Think Aloud evaluation ($n = 4$), as well as members of the project-specific patient and public involvement panel, formatively reviewed the intervention both in the laboratory and independently from home. These sessions were designed to assess user perceptions and interactions with the platform, as well as identify any potential problems.

The m2Hear platform was completed in February 2018, and we are currently testing the feasibility of the intervention

Table 2. Repurposing of the original “Communication tactics” and “What to expect when wearing hearing aids” C2Hear reusable learning objects (RLOs) into mobile-enabled RLOs (mRLOs). Each RLO was divided into short segments (relative timings provided). Each segment was then classified according to the Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF), which links to one of the components from the COM-B model (capability, opportunity, and motivation) model. A label for each mRLO was derived separately using Think Aloud evaluation techniques involving existing hearing aid users to obtain their real-world perspectives.

C2Hear RLO	Segment timings (minutes:seconds)		mRLO label	TDF	COM-B
	Start	Finish			
Communication tactics https://youtu.be/gssPxftB0e8	1:28	2:23	What tips can help me improve in taking part in conversations?	Social influences Environmental context	Opportunity
	4:54	5:24	What can I change around me to help improve conversations?	Behavioral regulation	Capability
	2:38	3:54	What can I do to help me take part in conversations in restaurants, supermarkets, and cars?	Environmental context	Opportunity
	3:55	4:41	How do I work with others to help me take part in conversations?	Social influences	Opportunity
What to expect when wearing hearing aids https://youtu.be/ZM3S1bO_y9w	1:08	1:32	What can I expect when wearing hearing aids for the first time?	Knowledge Memory, attention, and decision processes	Capability
	2:48	3:08		Reinforcement	Motivation
	1:33	1:48	How do I get used to wearing my hearing aids?	Behavioral regulation	Capability
	3:09	4:08			

in naive first-time hearing aid users. Following 10–12 weeks of independent use, we are assessing delivery, accessibility, usability, acceptability, and adherence of m2Hear using both patient-reported outcome measures ($n = 50$) and semi-structured interviews ($n = 15$). Preliminary findings indicate that patients like the short and concise nature of the mRLOs, as they provide key take-home messages that users can apply in their everyday lives. In addition, participants have reported that they particularly appreciate the opportunity to return and revisit the mRLOs whenever they are needed and find the questions valuable in identifying which mRLOs to watch. Additional interactivities that we have incorporated into the platform, such as where to sit in a restaurant, are also reported as highly useful, often acting as an “aide memoire” to the information provided in the mRLOs.

Summary

We describe here the evolution of C2Hear from its early development, with patients and audiologists at its core, to an individualized, interactive mHealth intervention for use with mobile technologies. These developments are not only for first-time hearing aid users but also others who would also benefit from better knowledge of hearing loss, hearing aids, and communication, such as CPs, health and social care professionals, and the wider public. Benefits extend to more than just better knowledge but include greater hearing aid use, self-efficacy, and confidence. This research also extends beyond the laboratory, as C2Hear now has a global reach. Our longer term goal is to develop a self-management system that incorporates latest

developments in technology, while taking a patient-centered approach that builds on the latest in health behavior psychology.

Acknowledgments

This article presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research under its Research for Patient Benefit (RfPB) programme (grants PB-PG-0909-20294 and PB-PG-0815-20019). Thanks to Heather Wharrad and her team at the Health and eLearning Media Group who developed the reusable learning object. Thanks also to Neil Coulson who has inspired us with his thinking on behavior change theory, Alex Barker who worked on the CP reusable learning object, and Yasmin Ali who analyzed the qualitative CP data. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, the National Institute for Health Research, or the Department of Health and Social Care.

References

- Barker, A., Leighton, P., & Ferguson, M. (2017). Coping together with hearing loss: A qualitative meta-synthesis of the psychosocial experiences of people with hearing loss and their communication partners. *International Journal of Audiology, 56*(5), 297–305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2017.1286695>
- Barker, F., Mackenzie, E., Elliott, L., Jones, S., & de Lusignan, S. (2016). Interventions to improve hearing aid use in adult auditory rehabilitation. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 8*, CD010342. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD010342.pub3>
- Bennett, G. G., & Glasgow, R. E. (2009). The delivery of public health interventions via the Internet: Actualizing their potential. *Annual Review of Public Health, 30*, 273–292.

- British Society of Audiology.** (2016). *Practice guidance: Common principles of rehabilitation for adults in audiology services*. Retrieved from <http://www.thebsa.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/OD104-52-Practice-Guidance-Common-Principles-of-Rehabilitation-for-Adults-in-Audiology-Services-2016.pdf>
- Cane, J., O'Connor, D., & Michie, S.** (2012). Validation of the theoretical domains framework for use in behaviour change and implementation research. *Implementation Science*, 7(1), 37. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-7-37>
- Carson, A. J.** (2016). The decision-making spiral in seeking help for hearing problems. *The Hearing Journal*, 69(1), 28–30.
- Cox, R. M., & Alexander, G. C.** (2002). The International Outcome Inventory for Hearing Aids (IOI-HA): psychometric properties of the English version: El Inventario Internacional de Resultados para Auxiliares Auditivos (IOI-HA): propiedades psicometricas de la version en ingles. *International Journal of Audiology*, 41(1), 30–35.
- Davis, A., Smith, P., Ferguson, M., Stephens, D., & Gianopoulos, I.** (2007). Acceptability, benefit and costs of early screening for hearing disability: A study of potential screening tests and models. *Health Technology Assessment*, 11(42), 1–294.
- Deloitte.** (2017). *State of the smart: Seventh annual mobile consumer survey*. London, United Kingdom. Retrieved from <https://www2.deloitte.com/uk/en/pages/technology-media-and-telecommunications/articles/mobile-consumer-survey.html>
- Desjardins, J. L., & Doherty, K. A.** (2009). Do experienced hearing aid users know how to use their hearing aids correctly? *American Journal of Audiology*, 18, 69–76.
- Diamond, I. R., Grant, R. C., Feldman, B. M., Pencharz, P. B., Ling, S. C., Moore, A. M., & Wales, P. W.** (2014). Defining consensus: A systematic review recommends methodologic criteria for reporting of Delphi studies. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 67(4), 401–409.
- Ferguson, M.** (2017). Knowledge is power: The power of mobile technologies to enhance hearing-related knowledge. *ENT and Audiology News*, 26, 82–84.
- Ferguson, M., Brandreth, M., Brassington, W., & Wharrad, H.** (2015). Information retention and overload in first-time hearing aid users: An interactive multimedia educational solution. *American Journal of Audiology*, 24, 329–332.
- Ferguson, M., Brandreth, M., Leighton, P., Brassington, W., & Wharrad, H.** (2016). A randomized controlled trial to evaluate the benefits of a multimedia educational programme for first-time hearing aid users. *Ear and Hearing*, 37(2), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000237>
- Ferguson, M., Kitterick, P. T., Chong, L. Y., Edmondson-Jones, M., Barker, F., & Hoare, D. J.** (2017). Hearing aids for mild to moderate hearing loss in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 9, CD012023. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012023.pub2>
- Ferguson, M., Leighton, P., Brandreth, M., & Wharrad, H.** (2018). Development of a multimedia educational programme for first-time hearing aid users: A participatory design. *International Journal of Audiology*, 57(8), 600–609.
- Ferguson, M., Maidment, D. W., Russell, N., Gregory, M., & Nicholson, N. R.** (2016). Motivational engagement in first-time hearing aid users: A feasibility study. *International Journal of Audiology*, 55(Suppl. 3), S23–S33.
- Ferguson, M., Woolley, A., & Munro, K. J.** (2016). The impact of self-efficacy, expectations and readiness on hearing aid outcomes. *International Journal of Audiology*, 55(Suppl. 3), S34–S41.
- Finegold, L.** (2014). *Providing interactive video training for staff within residential care to improve audiological knowledge and care (MSc Audiology)*. Aston University, Birmingham, United Kingdom.
- Friard, O., & Gamba, M.** (2016). BORIS: A free, versatile open-source event-logging software for video/audio coding and live observations. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7(11), 1325–1330. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12584>
- Gatehouse, S.** (1999). Glasgow Hearing Aid Benefit Profile: Derivation and validation of client-centred outcome measures for hearing aid services. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology*, 10(2), 80–103.
- Gomez, R., Wilson, E., & Ferguson, M.** (2017). *Early delivery of C2Hear increases self-efficacy for hearing aids in first-time hearing aid users*. Paper presented at the British Academy of Audiology Annual Conference, Bournemouth, United Kingdom.
- Grenness, C., Hickson, L., Laplante-Levesque, A., & Davidson, B.** (2014). Patient-centred audiological rehabilitation: Perspectives of older adults who own hearing aids. *International Journal of Audiology*, 53(Suppl. 1), S60–S67.
- Heffernan, E., Coulson, N., Henshaw, H., Barry, J. G., & Ferguson, M. A.** (2016). Understanding the psychosocial experiences of adults with mild–moderate hearing loss: A qualitative study applying Leventhal's self-regulatory model. *International Journal of Audiology*, 55(Suppl. 3), S3–S12.
- Henshaw, H., Barker, A., Maidment, D. W., Wharrad, H., & Ferguson, M. A.** (2017). *'Thinking Aloud' to examine usability, relevance and impact of mHealth tailored to communication partners*. Paper presented at the British Society of Audiology Annual Conference, Harrogate, United Kingdom.
- Henshaw, H., Clark, D., Kang, S., & Ferguson, M. A.** (2012). Computer skills and Internet use in adults aged 50–74 years: Influence of hearing difficulties. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 14(4), e113.
- Hussein, W.** (2017). *Effectiveness of interactive videos for enhancing knowledge of communication and hearing aids in student nurses (BSc Hons Audiology)*. De Montfort University, Leicester, United Kingdom.
- Kamil, R. J., & Lin, F. R.** (2015). The effects of hearing impairment in older adults on communication partners: A systematic review. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology*, 26(2), 155–182.
- Knudsen, L. V., Öberg, M., Nielsen, C., Naylor, G., & Kramer, S. E.** (2010). Factors influencing help seeking, hearing aid uptake, hearing aid use and satisfaction with hearing aids: A review of the literature. *Trends in Amplification*, 14(3), 127–154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1084713810385712>
- Kramer, S. E., Alessie, G. H. M., Dondorp, A. W., Zekveld, A. A., & Kapteyn, T. S.** (2005). A home education program for older adults with hearing impairment and their significant others: A randomized trial evaluating short- and long-term effects. *International Journal of Audiology*, 44(5), 255–264.
- McCormack, A., & Fortnum, H.** (2013). Why do people fitted with hearing aids not wear them? *International Journal of Audiology*, 52(5), 360–368. <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2013.769066>
- McShea, L., Corrigan, D., Greatrex, J., & Ferguson, M.** (2016). *Identifying the requirements of multimedia training on hearing loss and hearing aids for support workers in residential care*. Paper presented at the British Academy of Audiology, Glasgow.
- Michie, S., Johnston, M., West, R., Abraham, C., Hardeman, W., & Wood, C.** (2014). Designing behavior change interventions: The behavior change wheel and behaviour change techniques. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 47, S157.
- Michie, S., van Stralen, M., & West, R.** (2011). The Behaviour Change Wheel: A new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. *Implementation Sciences*, 6, 42. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-6-42>

- Mosen, D. M., Schmittiel, J., Hibbard, J., Sobel, D., Remmers, C., & Bellows, J. (2006). Is patient activation associated with outcomes of care for adults with chronic conditions? *Journal American Care Management*, 30(1), 21–29.
- Murray, E., Burns, J., See, T. S., Lai, R., & Nazareth, I. (2005). Interactive Health Communication Applications for people with chronic disease. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 4, CD004274. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD004274.pub4>
- National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2018). *Hearing loss in adults: Assessment and management*. Retrieved from <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/indevelopment/gid-cgwave0833/documents>
- Office for National Statistics. (2017). *Internet access—Households and individuals*. Retrieved from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/householdcharacteristics/homeinternetandsocialmediausage/bulletins/internetaccesshouseholdsandindividuals/2017#toc>
- Olmsted-Hawala, E., Murphy, E. D., Hawala, S., & Ashenfelter, K. T. (2010). *Think-Aloud protocols: A comparison of three Think-Aloud protocols for use in testing data-dissemination web sites for usability*. Paper presented at the CHI 2010: 1001 Users, Atlanta, GA.
- Rocks, T., & Ferguson, M. (2013). *Does training care-staff using interactive videos improve their hearing aid practical skills, understanding and perception of the importance of hearing aids?* Paper presented at the British Academy of Audiology Annual Conference, Manchester.
- Scarinci, N., Worrall, L., & Hickson, L. (2008). The effect of hearing impairment in older people on the spouse. *International Journal of Audiology*, 47(3), 141–151.
- Scarinci, N., Worrall, L., & Hickson, L. (2012). Factors associated with third-party disability in spouses of older people with hearing impairment. *Ear and Hearing*, 33(6), 698–708.
- Schulz, K. A., Modeste, N., Lee, J. W., Roberts, R., Saunders, G. H., & Witsell, D. L. (2017). Burden of hearing loss on communication partners and its influence on pursuit of hearing evaluation. *Ear and Hearing*, 38(5), e285–e291.
- Stark, P., & Hickson, L. (2004). Outcomes of hearing aid fitting for older people with hearing impairment and their significant others. *International Journal of Audiology*, 43(7), 390–398.
- Stoyanov, R. S., Hides, L., Kavanagh, J. D., & Wilson, H. (2016). Development and validation of the User Version of the Mobile Application Rating Scale (uMARS). *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 4(2), e72. <https://doi.org/10.2196/mhealth.5849>
- Strawbridge, W. J., Wallhagen, M. I., Shema, S. J., & Kaplan, G. A. (2000). Negative consequences of hearing impairment in old age: A longitudinal analysis. *The Gerontologist*, 40(3), 320–326.
- Taylor, S. J., Pinnock, H., Epiphaniou, E., Pearce, G., Parke, H. L., Schwappach, A., . . . Greenhalgh, T. (2014). A rapid synthesis of the evidence on interventions supporting self-management for people with long-term conditions: PRISMS—Practical Systematic Review of Self-Management Support for long-term conditions. *Health Services Delivery Research*, 2(53).
- Thorén, E. S., Öberg, M., Wänström, G., Andersson, G., & Lunner, T. (2014). A randomized controlled trial evaluating the effects of online rehabilitative intervention for adult hearing-aid users. *International Journal of Audiology*, 53(7), 452–461.
- Ventry, I. M., & Weinstein, B. E. (1982). The Hearing Handicap Inventory for the Elderly: A new tool. *Ear and Hearing*, 3(3), 128–134.
- West, R., & Smith, S. L. (2007). Development of a hearing aid self-efficacy questionnaire. *International Journal of Audiology*, 46(12), 759–771.
- Windle, R. J., & Wharrad, H. (2010). Reusable learning objects in health care education interprofessional e-learning and collaborative work: Practices and technologies. In A. Bromage, L. Clouder, F. Gordon, & J. Thistlethwaite (Eds.), *Interprofessional e-learning and collaborative work: Practices and technologies*. PA: IGI-Global Publishing.
- Zhang, D., Zhou, L., Briggs, R. O., & Nunamaker, J. F. (2006). Instructional video in e-learning: Assessing the impact of interactive video on learning effectiveness. *Information and Management*, 43, 15–27.