

**This is an electronic reprint of the original article.  
This reprint *may differ* from the original in pagination and typographic detail.**

**Author(s):** Mikkola, Tuija; Portegijs, Erja; Rantakokko, Merja; Gagné, Jean-Pierre; Rantanen, Taina; Viljanen, Anne

**Title:** Association of Self-Reported Hearing Difficulty to Objective and Perceived Participation Outside the Home in Older Community-Dwelling Adults

**Year:** 2015

**Version:**

**Please cite the original version:**

Mikkola, T., Portegijs, E., Rantakokko, M., Gagné, J.-P., Rantanen, T., & Viljanen, A. (2015). Association of Self-Reported Hearing Difficulty to Objective and Perceived Participation Outside the Home in Older Community-Dwelling Adults. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 27(1), 103-122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0898264314538662>

All material supplied via JYX is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

Association of Self-Reported Hearing Difficulty to Objective and  
Perceived Participation outside the Home in Older Community-Dwelling  
Adults

Tuija M. Mikkola, PhD,<sup>1</sup> Erja Portegijs, PhD,<sup>1</sup> Merja Rantakokko, PhD,<sup>1</sup> Jean-Pierre Gagné,  
PhD,<sup>2,3</sup> Taina Rantanen, PhD,<sup>1</sup> and Anne Viljanen, PhD<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Gerontology Research Center and Department of Health Sciences, University of Jyväskylä,  
Finland, <sup>2</sup>Université de Montréal, École d'orthophonie et d'audiologie, Montréal, Canada, <sup>3</sup>Centre  
de Recherche, Institute Universitaire de Geriatrie de Montréal, Canada

**Corresponding author:**

Tuija M. Mikkola

Gerontology Research Center, P.O. Box 35 (Viv), FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä, FINLAND

tel. +358405025772, email: [tuija.m.mikkola@jyu.fi](mailto:tuija.m.mikkola@jyu.fi)

**Running head:**

Association of Hearing to Participation outside the Home

# 1 ABSTRACT

## 2 Objectives

3 To investigate whether hearing difficulty is associated with objective and perceived  
4 participation in social and leisure activities outside the home in older adults.

## 5 Methods

6 Self-reported hearing difficulty, frequency of participation, perceived participation and Mini-  
7 Mental State Examination (MMSE) were obtained from 848 community-dwelling men and  
8 women aged 75-90.

## 9 Results

10 Among persons with  $MMSE \leq 24$ , hearing was not associated with participation. In persons with  
11  $MMSE > 24$ , relative to persons who reported no difficulty hearing, participants with major  
12 hearing difficulty had a higher odds ratio for infrequent participation in group activities (OR 2.1,  
13 95%CI 1.2-3.6) and more restricted perceived participation (OR 2.1, 95%CI 1.2-3.7). Participants  
14 with and without hearing difficulty did not differ in their frequency of attending non-group  
15 activities or meeting (grand)children or acquaintances.

## 16 Discussion

17 Hearing difficulty may restrict older adults with normal cognition from participating in social  
18 and leisure activities and living their life as they would like to outside the home.

19

20 **Key words:** aging, hearing, social participation, autonomy, cognition

21

## 22 INTRODUCTION

23

24 Good hearing is a prerequisite for verbal communication and thus essential for social  
25 interaction with other people (Brink & Stones, 2007). However, hearing problems are extremely  
26 common in older adults. Prevalence of hearing loss ranging from 27% to 63% (Lin, Thorpe,  
27 Gordon-Salant, & Ferrucci, 2011) has been reported for audiometrically measured hearing  
28 detection thresholds (Chia et al., 2007; Kiely, Gopinath, Mitchell, Browning, & Anstey, 2012; Lin  
29 et al., 2011; Viljanen et al., 2009) and 37% to 56% for self-reported hearing impairment (Chia et  
30 al., 2007; Hannula, Mäki-Torkko, Majamaa, & Sorri, 2010; Kiely et al., 2012) in older adults.  
31 Hearing loss increases dramatically as a function of age (Chia et al., 2007; Kiely et al., 2012).  
32 Excluding the ototoxic effects of some medications, hearing problems in older adults are most  
33 often related to progressive degeneration of cochlear structures and the auditory nervous  
34 system (Schuknecht, 1964; Schuknecht et al., 1974). Impaired hearing may cause frustration  
35 and embarrassment in social interaction (Gopinath, Hickson et al., 2012) and older adults may  
36 avoid situations in which good hearing abilities are needed (Gopinath et al., 2012; Stephens,  
37 Jaworski, Lewis, & Aslan, 1999).

38

39 The World Health Organization (WHO) recognizes participation relative to one's needs,  
40 including optimization of participation in social and cultural affairs, as a vital element of active  
41 aging (WHO, 2002). The consequences of social withdrawal may be considerable: it has been  
42 shown to be associated with poorer life satisfaction (Huxhold, Fiori, & Windsor, 2013; Sampaio  
43 & Ito, 2013) as well as increased risk for institutionalization (Pynnönen, Törmäkangas,  
44 Heikkinen, Rantanen, & Lyyra, 2012), and death (Holt-Lunstad, Smith, & Layton, 2010;  
45 Pynnönen et al., 2012). Previous studies investigating the relationship between hearing and  
46 social activity have used 'objective' measures of social participation, where respondents are  
47 asked to rate the frequency or extent of their participation in various activities. However, it is  
48 also possible to measure 'perceived' participation also referred as autonomy (Cardol, de Haan,  
49 de Jong, van den Bos, & de Groot, 2001; Seekins et al., 2012). Perceived participation describes  
50 a person's experience relative to the person's needs to be involved in various life situations (in  
51 and outside the home, self-care, social relations, work) (Cardol et al., 2001; Wilkie et al., 2011).  
52 In other words, perceived participation scales measure the opportunity that a person has to live  
53 life in the way that s/he would like to (Cardol et al., 2001). Thus, perceived participation may be  
54 more relevant for the well-being of an individual than objective participation. Perceived  
55 participation has been found to be associated with number of health conditions, activity  
56 limitations, mental problems, and income (Wilkie, Peat, Thomas, & Croft, 2007). However,  
57 knowledge on perceived participation among persons with hearing difficulty appears to be very  
58 limited. One study found that deaf persons had a 1.4 times higher odds ratio for perceived

59 participation restriction measured using the Keele Assessment of Participation questionnaire in  
60 a large sample of adults aged 50 years and older (Wilkie et al., 2007). However, to our  
61 knowledge, no studies have thus far explored the relationship of hearing to perceived  
62 participation in persons with milder hearing impairment.

63

64 Some investigators (Crews & Campbell, 2004; Simonsick, Kasper, & Phillips, 1998), but not all  
65 (Yamada, Nishiwaki, Michikawa, & Takebayashi, 2012), have reported an association between  
66 self-reported hearing difficulty and a lower level of social participation. Crews et al. found that  
67 persons with any hearing problem in a sample of nearly 10 000 older adults aged 70 or older  
68 were less likely (OR 0.8-0.9) to visit friends, attend church and go to movies (Crews & Campbell,  
69 2004). Simonsick and colleagues found that hearing difficulties in a crowded room were  
70 associated with infrequent in-person contact (OR 1.6) in a sample of 1 000 community-dwelling  
71 disabled women aged 65 and older. In another study, self-reported hearing difficulties were  
72 associated with social loneliness but not with emotional loneliness in a sample of over 800  
73 adults aged 55 to 85 (Pronk et al., 2011). However, in a longitudinal study conducted among  
74 more than 1 000 adults aged 65 to 98, hearing another person in a quiet room did not have any  
75 significant influence on decline in social participation over a 3-year follow-up period. The social  
76 participation subscale was measured according to reported engagement in visiting friends,  
77 giving advice to family or friends, visiting friends or family in the hospital, and initiating  
78 conversations with young people (Yamada et al., 2012).

79 The differences between these investigations may be due to the particular different variables  
80 chosen to measure social and leisure participation. Previous studies have either investigated  
81 rather specific types of leisure activity separately or combined them as a scale. These  
82 approaches do not take into account whether the activities require social contact with others or  
83 are carried out in a non-group context, both of which might be relevant factors in terms of  
84 hearing. This issue clearly warrants further investigation. Further, it has been suggested that  
85 cognitive abilities may be related to both hearing and social participation (James, Wilson,  
86 Barnes, & Bennett, 2011; Pronk et al., 2011; Rahman, Mohamed, Albanouby, & Bekhet, 2011;  
87 Wang, Karp, Winblad, & Fratiglioni, 2002), although the relationships posited between these  
88 three phenomena have not been confirmed when included in the same study (Pronk et al.,  
89 2011; Simonsick et al., 1998). However, the possible associations necessitate the inclusion of  
90 cognition when investigating the relationships between hearing and social participation.

91

92 The purpose of this study was to investigate whether self-reported hearing difficulty among  
93 older community dwelling men and women is associated with 1) less frequent participation in  
94 social activities and group or non-group leisure activities and 2) more restricted perceived  
95 participation outside the home. Further, these relationships were investigated taking into  
96 account the cognitive status of the participants.

97

98



## 99 METHODS

100

### 101 Design and sample

102 The analyses made use of cross-sectional data gathered for the LISPE (Life-Space Mobility in Old  
103 Age) project, which is a study of community-dwelling older adults. The project has been  
104 described in detail elsewhere (Rantanen et al., 2012). Briefly, a sample of 2 550 older persons  
105 between 75 and 90 years of age and living in the municipalities of Muurame and Jyväskylä, both  
106 located in Central Finland, was drawn from the population register. A telephone interview was  
107 used to screen eligible participants. Of this sample, 268 persons were not reached. In total, 1  
108 070 persons declined to participate. Most of the persons declined were either not interested in  
109 participating in the project or perceived their health as too poor to participate. The inclusion  
110 criteria included: living independently, residing in the recruitment area, being able to  
111 communicate, and willingness to participate in the study. Based on these criteria, 321 persons,  
112 of whom 47 persons were excluded since they were unable to communicate, were excluded  
113 during the project recruitment phase. Further, the data of two participants were lost due to  
114 technical problems. The final data set comprised 848 individuals who participated in structured  
115 computer-assisted interviews in their homes. The LISPE project was approved by the ethical  
116 committee of the University of Jyväskylä. The subjects signed an informed consent at the start  
117 of the home interview.

118

## 119 Hearing

120 Hearing was assessed by the following question: “Do you have difficulty hearing when  
121 conversing with another person in a noisy environment?” The response categories were 1) No  
122 difficulty, 2) Sometimes, some difficulty, and 3) Yes, major difficulty. The participants were  
123 asked to estimate their level of difficulty when using a hearing aid if they had one.

124

## 125 Participation in social and leisure activities

126 Objective participation was measured by asking the participants how often they 1) attend  
127 group activities outside the home, such as a choir, physical activity class or church activities, 2)  
128 engage in non-group cultural or other activities outside the home, such as going to a concert,  
129 the theater, or a coffee house, 3) meet their children or grandchildren 4) meet close friends,  
130 and 5) meet acquaintances. The response set included seven categories, from daily to never.

131

132 Perceived participation was measured using the Impact on Participation and Autonomy (IPA)  
133 questionnaire (Cardol et al., 2001; Kanelisto & Salminen, 2011). In the LISPE study, only the  
134 domain of autonomy outdoors was used. This domain contains 5 questions regarding perceived  
135 opportunity to: 1) visit relatives and friends, 2) take trips and travel, 3) use leisure time, 4) meet

136 other people, and 5) live life the way one wants to. The response categories ranged from 0  
137 (very good) to 4 (very poor). The scores of all the questions are then summed to yield an  
138 aggregate score, with a higher score indicating poorer perceived participation. Total score was  
139 also calculated for participants with one missing item (n=2).

140

#### 141 Potential confounders

142 Cognitive function was assessed using the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) (Folstein,  
143 Folstein, & McHugh, 1975). The test contains 30 items and the score ranges from 0 to 30, with  
144 higher scores indicating better cognitive functioning. For the present study, the MMSE scores  
145 were dichotomized into  $MMSE > 24$  and  $MMSE \leq 24$ . MMSE score  $\leq 24$  is considered to be  
146 indicative of at least mild cognitive impairment in the Finnish evidence-based guidelines for  
147 clinical practice (Working group appointed by the Finnish Medical Society Duodecim, Societas  
148 Gerontologica Fennica, the Finnish Neurological Society, Finnish Psychogeriatric Association and  
149 the Finnish Association for General Practice, 2010).

150

151 Number of chronic diseases was determined with a question that required the participant to  
152 have been diagnosed with the disease in question by a physician. The question was followed by  
153 a list of 22 chronic diseases and an open question. The relevance of diseases reported in the

154 open question was checked by a physician. Auditory diseases and traumas were omitted from  
155 the total number of diseases.

156

157 Those who reported being unable to walk 2 km without difficulty were defined as having  
158 mobility limitation. A participant was considered to have impaired vision if s/he reported that  
159 vision problems restricted their mobility. The participants were also asked whether they lived  
160 alone, whether they were a caregiver to a close relative (daily), whether they had sufficient  
161 financial resources relative to their needs, and how many years of education they had  
162 completed (Rantanen et al., 2012). These potential confounders were chosen, as poor mobility  
163 has previously been found to be associated with lower social participation (Nilsson, Avlund, &  
164 Lund, 2011). We also hypothesized that persons who live alone, care for a close relative, have  
165 inadequate financial resources and less education are less likely to participate in social and  
166 leisure activities than others.

167

## 168 **Statistics**

169 The statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows software version  
170 20.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). There were missing values: information on hearing, group  
171 activities, non-group activities and meeting friends were missing for only one participant in  
172 each case. The pairwise analysis option was used where possible i.e. subjects with some missing

173 values were not excluded from the analysis. First, the distributions of categorical variables  
174 across the hearing groups were analyzed using cross-tabulations and chi-square tests. Due to  
175 the non-normal distributions, median and interquartile range (IQR) were calculated for the  
176 continuous variables. The Kruskal-Wallis H-test was used to compare the distributions of the  
177 continuous variables between the hearing groups.

178

179 To investigate the relationship between self-reported hearing categories and participation,  
180 ordered logistic regression analyses with proportional odds were used. The regression  
181 coefficient describes the odds of a group (in the present study some difficulty or major difficulty  
182 in hearing), compared to the reference group (no hearing difficulty), having a certain value of  
183 the ordinal outcome variable (participation restriction) versus all the higher values. The  
184 proportional odds model assumes constant distances between the outcome variable levels and  
185 thus the model produces only one odds ratio (OR) for each group of the independent variable  
186 (hearing) except for the reference group. In other words, OR that describes the odds of the  
187 lowest versus all the higher categories of the outcome variable is the same as the OR that  
188 describes the relationship between the next lowest category and all the higher categories. For  
189 the ordered logistic regression analysis, the number of categories of the objective participation  
190 variables was reduced. This was achieved by merging categories with a small number of  
191 observations with adjacent categories in order to better meet the parallel line assumption of  
192 the analysis. Owing to the different distributions of observations in the objective participation

193 variables, the final number of categories varied from 3 to 5 depending on the variable. Although  
194 the IPA scale was continuous, its distribution was non-normal in the hearing groups. Hence, IPA  
195 was divided into quartiles and ordered logistic regression analysis was also used for this  
196 variable. The higher values of the outcome variables correspond to less frequent or poorer  
197 perceived participation. Thus, the results show the odds for less frequent objective  
198 participation or poorer perceived participation. Statistical significance was set at  $p < 0.05$ .

199

200 First, a crude model including all participants was constructed. Using the crude model, it was  
201 tested whether hearing and age, gender, hearing aid ownership or MMSE had significant  
202 ( $p < 0.05$ ) interaction effects on participation. Only MMSE score was found to have  
203 systematically significant interaction effects with hearing on participation. Consequently, crude  
204 models were built separately for participants with  $MMSE > 24$  and  $MMSE \leq 24$  in order to  
205 determine whether the association between self-reported hearing difficulty and participation  
206 was significant in these two groups. The crude analyses in these subgroups revealed that  
207 hearing difficulty was not associated with objective participation in the group of participants  
208 with  $MMSE \leq 24$ . Adjusting the models for age, gender, number of diseases, mobility, vision,  
209 living alone, financial situation, caregiving for a close relative and years of education did not  
210 markedly change this result. Hence, the adjusted models of objective participation are reported  
211 only for the participants with normal cognitive function. The first criteria for a covariate were its  
212 associations ( $p < 0.2$ ) with both hearing (independent variable) and participation (dependent).

213 This was done using ANOVA for continuous, and crosstabs with chi-square test for categorical  
214 variables. The potential covariates meeting these criteria were added separately to the ordered  
215 logistic regression models with hearing as the independent and participation as the dependent  
216 variable. Next, the potential covariates were added to the ordered logistic regression model  
217 one by one in the order of change induced in the regression coefficient of hearing (the variable  
218 that induced the biggest change was added first). The criterion for keeping the covariate in the  
219 model was that adding the covariate changed the OR of hearing by 10% or more.

220

## 221 RESULTS

222 Of the participants, 43% reported no difficulty, 46% some difficulty and 10% major difficulty in  
223 hearing when conversing with another person in the presence noise (Table 1). The group with  
224 major difficulty in hearing had the largest and the group with no hearing difficulty the smallest  
225 proportion of participants who reported hearing aid ownership and mobility limitation. Also,  
226 median age was highest in the group with major difficulty in hearing and lowest in the group  
227 with no hearing difficulty. With respect to the distribution of number of diseases reported and  
228 MMSE scores, significant differences were observed across the three categories of hearing  
229 status: the group with major difficulty in hearing had greater median number of diseases and  
230 lower median MMSE score than the other groups.

231

232 The participants with major hearing difficulty met close friends less frequently than those with  
233 no or some hearing difficulty (chi square test  $p=0.019$ ) (Table 2.). The data also showed a trend  
234 indicating that hearing difficulty is associated with less frequent participation in group activities  
235 ( $p=0.082$ ). The majority of the participants with major hearing difficulty were in the quartile of  
236 poorest perceived participation (i.e. high IPA score), whereas the majority of participants in the  
237 no hearing difficulty group were in the quartile of greatest perceived participation (low IPA  
238 score) ( $p<0.001$ ). The hearing groups did not differ significantly in the frequency of attending



239 non-group activities outside the home, meeting children and grandchildren, or meeting  
240 acquaintances.

241

## 242 Objective participation

243 The results of the ordered logistic regression analyses used to investigate the relationship  
244 between hearing difficulty and participation are shown in Table 3. The crude models revealed  
245 that, relative to the participants who reported no difficulty in hearing, those who reported  
246 major difficulty in hearing had 1.6 (95%CI 1.1-2.5) times higher odds of infrequent participation  
247 in group activities, 1.6 (95% CI 1.0-2.5) times higher odds of infrequent participation in non-  
248 group activities outside the home and 1.7 (95%CI 1.1-2.6) times higher odds of meeting close  
249 friends infrequently. In the crude models containing all the participants, hearing was not  
250 significantly associated with meeting children and grandchildren or acquaintances.

251

252 When the participants were divided into groups based on their cognitive status, the crude  
253 models showed that none of the types of objective participation was associated with hearing in  
254 persons with MMSE $\leq$ 24 (Table 3). Adjusting the models did not change the result. However,  
255 among persons with MMSE $>$ 24, hearing was found to be associated with meeting friends and  
256 attending to group activities: those with major hearing difficulty had 2.1 (95%CI 1.2-3.7) times  
257 higher odds of infrequent attendance at group activities and 1.9 (95%CI 1.2-3.3) times higher

258 odds of meeting friends infrequently. Adjusting the models did not markedly change the odds  
259 (2.0, 95%CI 1.2-3.6 and 1.7, 95%CI 1.0-2.9, respectively), although the p-value of the odds of  
260 meeting friends increased ( $p=0.054$ ). In persons with  $MMSE>24$ , hearing was not significantly  
261 associated with frequency of engagement in non-group activities, meeting  
262 children/grandchildren or meeting acquaintances. Also, participants who reported only some  
263 difficulty in hearing did not significantly differ from the participants who reported no difficulty  
264 in any of the measures of objective participation.

265

#### 266 Perceived participation

267 In the crude models, participants who reported some or major difficulty hearing had 1.5 (95%CI  
268 1.1-1.9) and 3.3 (95%CI 2.2-5.1) times higher odds of perceived participation restriction,  
269 respectively, than those who reported no hearing difficulty (Table 3). The odds were of the  
270 same order of magnitude among participants with  $MMSE\leq 24$  and those with  $MMSE>24$ . After  
271 introducing the covariates into the model, among participants with  $MMSE>24$ , the odds of  
272 more restricted perceived participation were reduced to 2.3 (95%CI 1.3-4.0) in those with major  
273 difficulty in hearing. After adjustment, the older adults with some difficulty in hearing no longer  
274 differed significantly from those who reported no difficulty in hearing. After adjustment, among  
275 participants with  $MMSE\leq 24$ , the odds of more restricted perceived participation was not  
276 significant for those who reported some or major hearing difficulty. Specifically, the ORs of

277 participants with some and those with major hearing difficulty were 1.5 (95%CI 0.8-2.6) and 1.5  
278 (95%CI 0.6-3.5), respectively.

## 279 DISCUSSION

280 The results of the present study suggest that, among older adults with normal cognition, there  
281 is an association between self-reported hearing difficulty and social and leisure activity.

282 Moreover, the association appears to be activity-specific. Older adults with normal cognition  
283 and who report major hearing difficulty participate less frequently in group activities and tend  
284 to meet less frequently with their close friends than older adults who do not report any  
285 difficulty in hearing. However, older adults who report hearing difficulty do not differ in their  
286 frequency of participation in non-group activities and meeting relatives or acquaintances from  
287 those who report no difficulty in hearing. Also, among older adults with normal cognition those  
288 who report a major hearing difficulty perceive their participation to be more restricted relative  
289 to their needs outside the home than the others.

290

291 Participation in social and leisure activities seems to be vital for older adults. In this population,  
292 social activity has been shown to be associated with functional ability (Avlund, Lund, Holstein, &  
293 Due, 2004; James, Boyle, Buchman, & Bennett, 2011), cognitive functioning (James et al., 2011;  
294 Wang et al., 2002) and mortality (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010; Pynnönen et al., 2012). In addition,  
295 older adults who are socially active are more satisfied with their life than those who are less  
296 active (Huxhold et al., 2013; Sampaio & Ito, 2013). Our results suggest that self-reported major  
297 hearing difficulty may compromise active aging through a reduced level of social participation.

298 Previous studies investigating the relationship between hearing and social activity have  
299 reported conflicting results. Recently, Yamada et al. found no associations between self-  
300 reported hearing and decline in social participation (Yamada et al., 2012). In a study involving  
301 adults aged 70 years and older, Marsiske et al. observed that good hearing acuity, assessed  
302 using pure-tone audiometry, was associated with more time spent in leisure activities  
303 (Marsiske, Klumb, & Baltes, 1997). Hearing loss has also been found to be related to feeling  
304 lonely or left out in group situations (Pronk et al., 2011; Strawbridge, Wallhagen, Shema, &  
305 Kaplan, 2000). Our results suggest that also severity of hearing problems counts. Those who  
306 reported major hearing difficulty participated less often in some social activities while those  
307 who reported only some hearing problems were equally socially active than persons who  
308 reported good hearing.

309

310 The finding that reported major hearing difficulty was associated with less participation in some  
311 activities, but not all, suggests that hearing ability may have an activity-specific effect on  
312 participation. In relation to the activity of meeting relatives and friends, the trend seen in the  
313 present results is consistent with those reported by Crews et al. who found that, compared to  
314 older adults with no hearing or vision impairment, individuals with self-reported hearing loss  
315 were less likely to have visited friends within the past two weeks (Crews & Campbell, 2004).  
316 However, self-reported hearing difficulty did not have an effect on meeting relatives. In the  
317 present investigation, reported major difficulty in hearing was negatively associated with

318 participation in group activities but not with non-group activities outside the home. These  
319 findings are intuitively plausible. Group activities may be more challenging for people with  
320 hearing loss, as they typically involve communicating with one or more persons in a noisy  
321 environment. On the other hand, our results partly contradict the results of Crews et al., who  
322 reported that, compared to older adults with no hearing difficulty, persons with reported  
323 hearing loss less often go to church and the movies, both non-group activities (Crews &  
324 Campbell, 2004). However, it could be argued that these activities may be challenging for  
325 people with hearing loss. Further, the authors did not observe an effect of reported hearing  
326 difficulty for two activities that, depending on the situation, may or may not have group-like  
327 features, namely, eating out and exercising. Nevertheless, and notwithstanding the differences  
328 between the present results and those reported by Crews et al., it appears as though at least  
329 some of the inconsistencies that have been observed across the studies that have investigated  
330 the relationship between hearing difficulty and participation may be resolved by taking into  
331 account the specific type of social and leisure activities in question.

332

333 Cognitive function seems to be related to both hearing abilities and social participation. Hearing  
334 impairment and a low level of social activity level have been shown to predict a steeper decline  
335 in cognitive functions with aging (James et al., 2011; Lin et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2002). In the  
336 present study, social and leisure activities were associated with hearing but only among  
337 persons with normal cognitive function. Several factors could explain the influence of cognitive

338 function on the association observed between hearing difficulty and social participation. It is  
339 possible that poor hearing makes it more difficult to understand the instructions when  
340 cognitive tests are administered. This may result in poorer performance on cognitive tests  
341 (Räihä et al., 2001) as well as strengthen the relationship observed between hearing difficulty  
342 and cognition. It has also been shown that even mild cognitive impairment has a deleterious  
343 effect on auditory processing (Rahman et al., 2011), which in turn may hamper verbal  
344 communication. According to Brink et al., impaired verbal communication is a factor that  
345 mediates the influence of hearing loss on social engagement (Brink & Stones, 2007). Further,  
346 cognitive problems may disturb verbal communication due to the misinterpretations of  
347 nonliteral meanings used in spoken language (Maki, Yamaguchi, Koeda, & Yamaguchi, 2013).

348

349 Novel components of the present study included the use of various indicators of social activity  
350 and investigation of perceived participation. To our knowledge, the association between  
351 hearing and perceived participation has been addressed in only one other study. Wilkie et al.  
352 used the Keele Assessment of Participation questionnaire to explore the association between  
353 hearing loss, among other health conditions, and participation in various aspects of life in older  
354 adults (Wilkie et al., 2007). The authors reported that persons with hearing loss had 1.4 times  
355 higher odds than persons without hearing loss for participation restrictions, i.e. not  
356 participating when and in the way they wanted to all or most of the time. The present results  
357 show that older adults with self-reported major hearing difficulty perceived more restrictions

358 on their participation in life situations outside the home than those who reported no hearing  
359 difficulties. The questionnaire included the IPA domain of autonomy outdoors, which includes  
360 items related to perceived opportunities for social activity, life in general, trips and leisure  
361 (Cardol et al., 2001; Kanelisto & Salminen, 2011). Participation outside the home may be an  
362 especially sensitive indicator of autonomy restriction among community-dwelling older adults,  
363 as found in the present sample, as it is the most likely area of participation restriction in older  
364 individuals (Wilkie, Peat, Thomas, & Croft, 2006). In the present study, participants with major  
365 hearing difficulty met relatives and acquaintances and engaged in non-group activities as often  
366 as persons with no hearing difficulty. However, it is noteworthy that this type of social  
367 participation was not sufficient for the participants with hearing difficulty to experience a sense  
368 of autonomy comparable to that of non-hearing impaired.

369

370 It should be noted that we studied self-rated hearing irrespective of hearing aid use.  
371 Participants were asked to rate their hearing while wearing a hearing aid, if they had one. We  
372 assessed hearing irrespective of hearing aid use, as we consider that perceived hearing ability in  
373 everyday life is a more important determinant of participation than use of a hearing aid as such.  
374 However, we used just one question to determine level of hearing in the analyses. Therefore,  
375 we do not know whether some of those using a hearing aid and hence reporting good hearing,  
376 have difficulties in other situations which might limit their participation. If so, our results  
377 underestimate the strength of the association between hearing and participation. It is



378 challenging to study the influences of hearing aid use in an observational study, as hearing aid  
379 use is statistically confounded by hearing difficulty. Owing to the design, we were unable to  
380 determine the influence of hearing aid use on participation which could have yielded valuable  
381 information on the importance of audiologic rehabilitation for participation in older people.

382  
383 The results should be interpreted with caution. First, a cross-sectional design was used. This  
384 limits any causal relationship that may be drawn among the variables investigated. However, it  
385 seems intuitively more plausible that hearing loss leads to reduced participation than vice  
386 versa. A strength of this study was having a population-based sample of community-dwelling  
387 older adults. Although a marked number of those invited to participate declined to do so, this is  
388 not exceptional in studies of older people (Mody et al., 2008). For one thing, poor health status  
389 is likely to decrease the willingness to participate in research (Mody et al., 2008). In fact, the  
390 non-participants significantly more often perceived their health as poor or very poor and  
391 moved outdoors less often than those who participated in the present study (Rantanen et al.,  
392 2012). Moreover, some persons were excluded because they were not able to communicate  
393 during the telephone screening or home interview. This exclusion criterion is likely to have  
394 diminished the number of persons with severe hearing impairment in this study. If these  
395 persons had participated the associations observed between hearing and participation might  
396 have been stronger. Unfortunately, the data on hearing status were based on responses to a  
397 self-report question rather than on audiometric measurements. However, self-reports of

398 hearing are widely used in epidemiological research (Chia et al., 2007; Crews & Campbell, 2004;  
399 Pronk et al., 2011; Strawbridge et al., 2000; Yamada, Nishiwaki, Michikawa, & Takebayashi,  
400 2011) and have been shown to have sufficient sensitivity and specificity in comparison with  
401 pure-tone audiometry (Salonen, Johansson, Karjalainen, Vahlberg, & Isoaho, 2011; Sindhusake  
402 et al., 2001). Further, it could be argued that in some respects, relative to indices of hearing  
403 detection thresholds, self-report estimates of hearing difficulty are a more appropriate variable  
404 for investigating issues related to well-being (Gopinath, Schneider et al., 2012). Given the range  
405 of adaptive strategies that can be used to optimize communication as well as the complex  
406 constellation of physical and social environments in which individuals maneuver (Garstecki &  
407 Erler, 1996; Gomez & Madey, 2001; Hallberg, Hallberg, & Kramer, 2008), it is possible that the  
408 effects of hearing status on social participation are better accounted for by responses to a self-  
409 reported questionnaire than hearing detection thresholds obtained in a sound treated test  
410 suite. Further, our question on hearing when conversing in the presence of noise may be  
411 especially suitable for assessing hearing in older adults since understanding speech in noise is  
412 one of the most frequent hearing disabilities perceived by older people (Kramer, Kapteyn, &  
413 Festen, 1998; Plomp & Mimpen, 1979).

414

415 In conclusion, major hearing difficulty among older community-dwelling adults with normal  
416 cognition increases the risk for less frequent participation in group activities, fewer meetings  
417 with friends and poorer perceived participation outside the home. Audiologic rehabilitation

418 services should be available for older adults with hearing difficulties in order to optimize their  
419 participation in social and leisure activities. Pertinent rehabilitation intervention strategies may  
420 include the use of technological equipment, learning strategies to appropriately manage the  
421 social and physical environment and, the use of effective communication strategies.

422

423

## AUTHOR'S NOTES

### ***Acknowledgment***

Gerontology Research Center is a joint effort between the University of Jyväskylä and the University of Tampere.

### ***Funding***

This work is funded by the Academy of Finland [grant number 263729]. The LISPE project is funded by the Academy of Finland, the future of living and housing [ASU-LIVE; grant number 255403] program and Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture. AV is financially supported by a personal grant from the Academy of Finland [grant number 251723].

## REFERENCES

- Avlund, K., Lund, R., Holstein, B. E., & Due, P. (2004). Social relations as determinant of onset of disability in aging. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, *38*(1), 85-99.
- Brink, P., & Stones, M. (2007). Examination of the relationship among hearing impairment, linguistic communication, mood, and social engagement of residents in complex continuing-care facilities. *The Gerontologist*, *47*(5), 633-641.
- Cardol, M., de Haan, R. J., de Jong, B. A., van den Bos, G. A., & de Groot, I. J. (2001). Psychometric properties of the impact on participation and autonomy questionnaire. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, *82*(2), 210-216.  
doi:10.1053/apmr.2001.18218
- Chia, E. M., Wang, J. J., Rochtchina, E., Cumming, R. R., Newall, P., & Mitchell, P. (2007). Hearing impairment and health-related quality of life: The blue mountains hearing study. *Ear and Hearing*, *28*(2), 187-195. doi:10.1097/AUD.0b013e31803126b6
- Crews, J. E., & Campbell, V. A. (2004). Vision impairment and hearing loss among community-dwelling older americans: Implications for health and functioning. *American Journal of Public Health*, *94*(5), 823-829.
- Folstein, M. F., Folstein, S. E., & McHugh, P. R. (1975). Mini-mental state: A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *12*(3) 189-198.

- Garstecki, D. C., & Erlen, S. F. (1996). Older adult performance on the communication profile for the hearing impaired. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 39*(1), 28-42.
- Gomez, R. G., & Madey, S. F. (2001). Coping-with-hearing-loss model for older adults. *The Journals of Gerontology. Series B, Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 56*(4), P223-5.
- Gopinath, B., Hickson, L., Schneider, J., McMahon, C. M., Burlutsky, G., Leeder, S. R., & Mitchell, P. (2012). Hearing-impaired adults are at increased risk of experiencing emotional distress and social engagement restrictions five years later. *Age and Ageing, 41*(5), 618-623.  
doi:10.1093/ageing/afs058.
- Gopinath, B., Schneider, J., Hickson, L., McMahon, C. M., Burlutsky, G., Leeder, S. R., & Mitchell, P. (2012). Hearing handicap, rather than measured hearing impairment, predicts poorer quality of life over 10 years in older adults. *Maturitas, 72*(2), 146-151.  
doi:10.1016/j.maturitas.2012.03.010.
- Hallberg, L. R., Hallberg, U., & Kramer, S. E. (2008). Self-reported hearing difficulties, communication strategies and psychological general well-being (quality of life) in patients with acquired hearing impairment. *Disability and Rehabilitation, 30*(3), 203-212.  
doi:10.1080/09638280701228073.
- Hannula, S., Mäki-Torkko, E., Majamaa, K., & Sorri, M. (2010). Hearing in a 54- to 66-year-old population in Northern Finland. *International Journal of Audiology, 49*(12), 920-927.  
doi:10.3109/14992027.2010.510146.

- Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., & Layton, J. B. (2010). Social relationships and mortality risk: A meta-analytic review. *PLoS Medicine*, *7*(7), e1000316. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316.
- Huxhold, O., Fiori, K. L., & Windsor, T. D. (2013). The dynamic interplay of social network characteristics, subjective well-being, and health: The costs and benefits of socio-emotional selectivity. *Psychology and Aging*, *28*(1), 3-16. doi:10.1037/a0030170.
- James, B. D., Boyle, P. A., Buchman, A. S., & Bennett, D. A. (2011). Relation of late-life social activity with incident disability among community-dwelling older adults. *The Journals of Gerontology. Series A, Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, *66*(4), 467-473. doi:10.1093/gerona/glq231.
- James, B. D., Wilson, R. S., Barnes, L. L., & Bennett, D. A. (2011). Late-life social activity and cognitive decline in old age. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society : JINS*, *17*(6), 998-1005. doi:10.1017/S1355617711000531.
- Kanelisto, K., & Salminen, A. (2011). *IPA-kyselylomake valinnoista ja osallistumisesta jokapäiväisessä elämässä. Toimintakyvyn itsearviointimenetelmä aikuisille, joilla on fyysisiä toimintarajoitteita.* (Sosiaali- ja terveysturvan selosteita No. 76). Helsinki: Kela.
- Kiely, K. M., Gopinath, B., Mitchell, P., Browning, C. J., & Anstey, K. J. (2012). Evaluating a dichotomized measure of self-reported hearing loss against gold standard audiometry: Prevalence estimates and age bias in a pooled national data set. *Journal of Aging and Health*, *24*(3), 439-458. doi:10.1177/0898264311425088.

- Kramer, S. E., Kapteyn, T. S., & Festen, J. M. (1998). The self-reported handicapping effect of hearing disabilities. *Audiology : Official Organ of the International Society of Audiology*, 37(5), 302-312.
- Lin, F. R., Thorpe, R., Gordon-Salant, S., & Ferrucci, L. (2011). Hearing loss prevalence and risk factors among older adults in the united states. *The Journals of Gerontology.Series A, Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 66(5), 582-590. doi:10.1093/gerona/glr002.
- Lin, F. R., Yaffe, K., Xia, J., Xue, Q. L., Harris, T. B., Purchase-Helzner, E., . . . Health ABC Study Group. (2013). Hearing loss and cognitive decline in older adults. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 173(4), 293-299. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.1868.
- Maki, Y., Yamaguchi, T., Koeda, T., & Yamaguchi, H. (2013). Communicative competence in Alzheimer's disease: Metaphor and sarcasm comprehension. *American Journal of Alzheimer's Disease and Other Dementias*, 28(1), 69-74. doi:10.1177/1533317512467677.
- Marsiske, M., Klumb, P., & Baltes, M. M. (1997). Everyday activity patterns and sensory functioning in old age. *Psychology and Aging*, 12(3), 444-457.
- Mody, L., Miller, D. K., McGloin, J. M., Freeman, M., Marcantonio, E. R., Magaziner, J., & Studenski, S. (2008). Recruitment and retention of older adults in aging research. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 56(12), 2340-2348. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2008.02015.x.



- Nilsson, C. J., Avlund, K., & Lund, R. (2011). Onset of mobility limitations in old age: The combined effect of socioeconomic position and social relations. *Age and Ageing, 40*(5), 607-614. doi:10.1093/ageing/afr073.
- Plomp, R., & Mimpen, A. M. (1979). Speech-reception threshold for sentences as a function of age and noise level. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 66*(5), 1333-1342.
- Pronk, M., Deeg, D. J., Smits, C., van Tilburg, T. G., Kuik, D. J., Festen, J. M., & Kramer, S. E. (2011). Prospective effects of hearing status on loneliness and depression in older persons: Identification of subgroups. *International Journal of Audiology, 50*(12), 887-896. doi:10.3109/14992027.2011.599871.
- Pynnönen, K., Törmäkangas, T., Heikkinen, R. L., Rantanen, T., & Lyyra, T. M. (2012). Does social activity decrease risk for institutionalization and mortality in older people? *The Journals of Gerontology. Series B, Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 67*(6), 765-774. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbs076.
- Rahman, T. T., Mohamed, S. T., Albanouby, M. H., & Bekhet, H. F. (2011). Central auditory processing in elderly with mild cognitive impairment. *Geriatrics & Gerontology International, 11*(3), 304-308. doi:10.1111/j.1447-0594.2010.00684.x.
- Räihä, I., Isoaho, R., Ojanlatva, A., Viramo, P., Sulkava, R., & Kivelä, S. L. (2001). Poor performance in the mini-mental state examination due to causes other than dementia. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 19*(1), 34-38.

- Rantanen, T., Portegijs, E., Viljanen, A., Eronen, J., Saajanaho, M., Tsai, L. T., . . . Rantakokko, M. (2012). Individual and environmental factors underlying life space of older people - study protocol and design of a cohort study on life-space mobility in old age (LISPE). *BMC Public Health, 12*, 1018-2458-12-1018. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-1018.
- Salonen, J., Johansson, R., Karjalainen, S., Vahlberg, T., & Isoaho, R. (2011). Relationship between self-reported hearing and measured hearing impairment in an elderly population in finland. *International Journal of Audiology, 50*(5), 297-302. doi:10.3109/14992027.2010.549517.
- Sampaio, P. Y., & Ito, E. (2013). Activities with higher influence on quality of life in older adults in Japan. *Occupational Therapy International, 20*(1), 1-10. doi:10.1002/oti.1333.
- Schuknecht, H. F. (1964). Further observations on the pathology of presbycusis. *Archives of Otolaryngology (Chicago, Ill.: 1960), 80*, 369-382.
- Schuknecht, H. F., Watanuki, K., Takahashi, T., Belal, A. A., Jr, Kimura, R. S., Jones, D. D., & Ota, C. Y. (1974). Atrophy of the stria vascularis, a common cause for hearing loss. *The Laryngoscope, 84*(10), 1777-1821. doi:10.1288/00005537-197410000-00012.
- Seekins, T., Shunkamolah, W., Bertsche, M., Cowart, C., Summers, J. A., Reichard, A., & White, G. (2012). A systematic scoping review of measures of participation in disability and rehabilitation research: A preliminary report of findings. *Disability and Health Journal, 5*(4), 224-232. doi:10.1016/j.dhjo.2012.05.002.

- Simonsick, E. M., Kasper, J. D., & Phillips, C. L. (1998). Physical disability and social interaction: Factors associated with low social contact and home confinement in disabled older women (the women's health and aging study). *The Journals of Gerontology. Series B, Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 53(4), S209-17.
- Sindhusake, D., Mitchell, P., Smith, W., Golding, M., Newall, P., Hartley, D., & Rubin, G. (2001). Validation of self-reported hearing loss. The Blue Mountains Hearing Study. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 30(6), 1371-1378.
- Stephens, S. D., Jaworski, A., Lewis, P., & Aslan, S. (1999). An analysis of the communication tactics used by hearing-impaired adults. *British Journal of Audiology*, 33(1), 17-27.
- 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.
- Viljanen, A., Kaprio, J., Pyykkö, I., Sorri, M., Koskenvuo, M., & Rantanen, T. (2009). Hearing acuity as a predictor of walking difficulties in older women. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 57(12), 2282-2286. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2009.02553.x.
- Wang, H. X., Karp, A., Winblad, B., & Fratiglioni, L. (2002). Late-life engagement in social and leisure activities is associated with a decreased risk of dementia: A longitudinal study from the Kungsholmen Project. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 155(12), 1081-1087.
- WHO. (2002). *Active ageing: A policy framework*. World Health Organization.

Wilkie, R., Jordan, J. L., Muller, S., Nicholls, E., Healey, E. L., & van der Windt, D. A. (2011).

Measures of social function and participation in musculoskeletal populations: Impact on Participation and Autonomy (IPA), Keele Assessment of Participation (KAP), Participation Measure for Post-Acute Care (PM-PAC), Participation Objective, Participation Subjective (POPS), Rating of Perceived Participation (ROPP), and the Participation Scale. *Arthritis Care & Research*, 63 Suppl 11, S325-36. doi:10.1002/acr.20641.

Wilkie, R., Peat, G., Thomas, E., & Croft, P. (2006). The prevalence of person-perceived

participation restriction in community-dwelling older adults. *Quality of Life Research : An International Journal of Quality of Life Aspects of Treatment, Care and Rehabilitation*, 15(9), 1471-1479. doi:10.1007/s11136-006-0017-9

Wilkie, R., Peat, G., Thomas, E., & Croft, P. (2007). Factors associated with participation

restriction in community-dwelling adults aged 50 years and over. *Quality of Life Research : An International Journal of Quality of Life Aspects of Treatment, Care and Rehabilitation*, 16(7), 1147-1156. doi:10.1007/s11136-007-9221-5

Working group appointed by the Finnish Medical Society Duodecim, Societas Gerontologica

Fennica, the Finnish Neurological Society, Finnish Psychogeriatric Association and the Finnish Association for General Practice. (2010). Memory disorders (online). Current Care guideline., May 23 2013.

Yamada, M., Nishiwaki, Y., Michikawa, T., & Takebayashi, T. (2012). Self-reported hearing loss in

older adults is associated with future decline in instrumental activities of daily living but

not in social participation. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 60(7), 1304-1309.

doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2012.04039.x

## TABLES

**Table 1.** Characteristics of the Participants Reporting No Difficulty, Some Difficulty, and Major Difficulty in Hearing When Conversing in Noisy Environment (N=847).

	Self-reported hearing						
	No		Some		Major		p <sup>c</sup>
	difficulty		difficulty		difficulty		
	(N=366)		(N=393)		(N=88)		
N	%	N	%	N	%		
Gender							0.55
Male	138	38	154	39	29	33	
Female	228	62	239	61	59	67	
Living alone	189	52	209	53	54	61	0.21
Hearing aid owner	13	4	57	15	44	50	<0.001
Mobility difficulty	124	34	176	45	55	63	<0.001
Sufficient financial resources	165	45	178	54	35	40	0.61
Caregiver for a close relative	22	6	18	5	5	6	0.67
MMSE≤24	75	21	91	23	31	35	0.013

	Median	IQR	Median	IQR	Median	IQR	p <sup>d</sup>
Age	80	6.9	81	7.4	83	6.6	<0.001
Number of diseases <sup>a</sup>	4	3	4	3	6	4	<0.001
MMSE score	27	3	27	3	26	4.9	0.002
Perceived participation outdoors <sup>b</sup>	5	4	6	5	8	6	<0.001
Years of education	8.5	5	9	6	8	5	0.191

---

MMSE, Mini Mental State Examination

<sup>a</sup>ear/hearing diseases omitted

<sup>b</sup>Impact on Participation and Autonomy questionnaire, a higher score indicates more restricted perceived participation

<sup>c</sup>Chi-square test

<sup>d</sup>Kruskal-Wallis H-test

**Table 2.** Frequency Of Social Activity In Participants Reporting No Difficulty, Some Difficulty And Major Difficulty In Hearing When Conversing In Noisy Environment (N=847).

Type of participation	No difficulty (N=366)		Some difficulty (N=393)		Major difficulty (N=88)		p <sup>b</sup>
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
<b>Objective</b>							
<b>Group activities</b>							0.082
Weekly	158	43	181	46	27	31	
1 to 3 times a month	48	13	49	13	10	11	
A few times per year	11	3	19	4	6	7	
Not at all	149	41	143	36	45	51	
<b>Non-group activities</b>							0.253
<b>outside the home</b>							
Monthly	111	30	120	31	34	39	
A few times per year	126	35	141	36	34	39	
More seldom	128	35	132	34	20	23	
<b>Meeting (grand)children</b>							0.375
Daily	53	15	41	10	12	14	
Weekly	185	51	224	57	43	49	
Monthly	72	20	76	19	16	18	
A few times per year or more seldom	56	15	52	13	17	19	
<b>Meeting close friends</b>							0.019
Daily	46	13	53	14	10	11	



Weekly	190	52	178	45	34	39	
Monthly	83	23	78	20	24	27	
A few times per year	29	8	53	14	9	10	
More seldom	17	5	31	8	11	13	
<b>Meeting acquaintances</b>							0.591
Daily	59	16	66	17	8	9	
Weekly	179	49	191	49	43	49	
Monthly	74	20	79	20	19	22	
More seldom	54	15	57	15	18	21	
<b>Perceived</b>							
<b>Participation outdoors<sup>a</sup></b>							<0.001
Q1 (score 0-4)	142	39	114	29	16	18	
Q2 (5-6)	95	26	117	30	16	18	
Q3 (7-8)	65	18	61	16	17	19	
Q4 (>8)	64	18	101	26	39	44	

---

<sup>a</sup>IPA, Impact on Participation and Autonomy; higher score indicates more restricted perceived

participation

<sup>b</sup>Chi square test

**Table 3.** Results of the Ordered Logistic Regression Analyses. The Odds for More Restricted Participation by Categories of Self-Reported Difficulty in Hearing.

		Total sample (N=848)			MMSE≤24 (N=197)			MMSE>24 (N=651)					
		Model crude			Model crude			Model crude			Model adjusted		
Type of restricted participation	Hearing difficulty	OR	95%CI	p	OR	95%CI	p	OR	95%CI	p	OR	95%CI	p
<b>Objective</b>													
<b>Group activities</b>													
	No	1.0			1.0			1.0			1.0 <sup>b</sup>		
	Some	0.9	0.7-1.1	0.31	1.0	0.6-1.8	0.97	0.8	0.6-1.1	0.19	0.8	0.6-1.0	0.10
	Major	1.6	1.1-2.5	0.03	0.8	0.4-1.8	0.65	2.1	1.2-3.7	0.007	2.0	1.2-3.6	0.012
<b>Non-group activities outside the home</b>													
	No	1.0			1.0			1.0			1.0 <sup>c</sup>		
	Some	1.0	0.8-1.4	0.78	0.8	0.5-1.5	0.53	1.1	0.8-1.5	0.61	1.0	0.7-1.3	0.78
	Major	1.6	1.0-2.5	0.034	1.0	0.5-2.3	0.88	1.6	1.0-2.8	0.064	1.3	0.7-2.2	0.37
<b>Meeting (grand)children</b>													

	No	1.0			1.0			1.0			1.0 <sup>d</sup>		
	Some	1.0	0.8-1.3	0.95	1.2	0.7-2.2	0.51	1.0	0.7-1.3	0.89	1.0	0.7-1.4	0.98
	Major	1.2	0.7-1.8	0.53	1.6	0.7-3.6	0.23	1.1	0.7-1.9	0.71	1.2	0.7-2.1	0.51
<b>Meeting close friends</b>													
	No	1.0			1.0			1.0			1.0 <sup>b</sup>		
	Some	1.3	1.0-1.7	0.080	1.0	0.6-1.8	0.85	1.3	1.0-1.8	0.062	1.2	0.9-1.7	0.16
	Major	1.7	1.1-2.6	0.014	1.3	0.6-2.7	0.56	1.9	1.2-3.3	0.013	1.7	1.0-2.9	0.054
<b>Meeting acquaintances</b>													
	No	1.0			1.0			1.0			1.0 <sup>e</sup>		
	Some	1.0	0.8-1.3	0.84	1.7	0.9-2.9	0.081	0.8	0.6-1.1	0.21	0.8	0.6-1.1	0.17
	Major	1.5	1.0-2.3	0.078	1.3	0.6-2.9	0.46	1.6	0.9-2.6	0.097	1.4	0.8-2.4	0.18
<b>Perceived</b>													
<b>Participation outdoors<sup>a</sup></b>													
	No	1.0			1.0			1.0			1.0 <sup>f</sup>		
	Some	1.5	1.1-1.9	0.004	1.7	1.0-2.9	0.076	1.4	1.1-1.9	0.020	1.2	0.9-1.6	0.20
	Major	3.3	2.2-5.1	<0.001	3.1	1.5-6.8	0.004	3.4	2.0-5.7	<0.001	2.3	1.3-4.0	0.003

---

<sup>a</sup>IPA, Impact on Participation and Autonomy

<sup>b</sup>Model adjusted for mobility and living alone

<sup>c</sup>Model adjusted for age and mobility

<sup>d</sup>Model adjusted for age

<sup>e</sup>Model adjusted for mobility

<sup>f</sup>Model adjusted for number of diseases and mobility