

**Measurement of distortion product otoacoustic emissions
in South African gold miners
at risk for noise-induced hearing loss**

A thesis submitted to
the discipline of Speech Pathology and Audiology
School of Human and Community Development
Faculty of Humanities
University of the Witwatersrand

In fulfilment of the requirements
for a Doctor of Philosophy

by Anita Lynne Edwards

Johannesburg, October, 2009

I declare that this thesis project is my own, unaided work. It is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any other degree or examination at this or any other university.

Anita Lynne Edwards

21st day of October 2009.

Acknowledgements

“Delight yourself in the Lord and He will give you the desires of your heart”
Ps 37.4

Prof. Claire Penn (University of the Witwatersrand) for your insightful guidance and sharing your research expertise. Thank you for your time, patience and energy in helping me attain this life goal.

Dr. Jackie Clark (University of Texas at Dallas) for sharing your expertise and your gentle encouragement.

Prof. Steffens (University of Johannesburg) for your clear guidance and understanding of what I wanted to achieve and for directing me in the right direction in the statistical analysis.

Peter Fridjhon for your guidance in the statistical analysis.

The host mine staff in the audiology department for the use of the database and for the co-operation in this study.

CSIR for funding the project.

Bruce, my wonderful husband, who has encouraged me and shared my joy in achieving my goal.

My children, parents, family and friends for the encouragement and interest taken in the project.

My sister, Linda, for the many hours of patience and expertise with the initial data management that made the information useful for the project.

Dedicated to those who have lost their hearing in the workplace.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Figures.....	xi
List of Tables	xiii
List of Appendices	xvi
List of Abbreviations	xvii
Abstract	xix
Background.....	xix
Methodology.....	xix
Objectives.....	xix
Results	xx

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 History of Audiology in South Africa	1
1.3 History of Occupational Audiology	1
1.4 Mining in South Africa	2
1.5 Specific nature of Occupational Audiology in the South African mining industry	5
1.5.1 Language differences	7
1.5.2 Pseudohypacusis.....	8
1.5.3 Percentage Loss of Hearing	9
1.5.4 Objective measures	11
1.6 Rationale for the study	12
1.7 Potential impact of research outcomes	13

1.8 Organisation of the thesis.....	14
-------------------------------------	----

Chapter 2

Noise-induced Hearing Loss

2.1 Definition	16
2.2 Effects of Noise Exposure	16
2.2.1 Anatomical effects.....	16
2.2.2 Non-auditory effects.....	17
2.2.3 Auditory effects	19
2.2.3.1 Hearing threshold shift	19
2.2.3.2 Speech perception	20
2.2.3.3 Speech recognition threshold	22
2.3 Factors contributing to the risk of NIHL	26
2.3.1 Individual susceptibility to noise-induced hearing loss.....	26
2.3.2 Age	27
2.3.3 Gender.....	29
2.3.4 Health	30
2.3.4.1 HIV/AIDS.....	31
2.3.4.2 Tuberculosis.....	32
2.3.4.3 Smoking.....	33
2.3.4.4 Alcohol	33
2.3.4.5 Exercise	33
2.3.5 Toxins	34
2.3.6 Noise exposure levels.....	35
2.4 Prevalence of NIHL	39
2.5 NIHL risk in the South African mining context	41
2.5.1 Noise exposure levels in different mining commodities.....	41
2.5.1.1 Longitudinal noise exposure levels in South African mining	42
2.6 Research on the auditory function of South African miners.....	43
2.6.1 Middle ear function.....	43

2.6.2 Screening audiometry results.....	44
2.6.3 Diagnostic audiology results	45
2.6.4 Otoacoustic emission	46
2.6.5. Auditory Steady State Response (ASSR)	47
2.7 Research needs in NIHL in South Africa	48
2.8 Summary.....	48

Chapter 3

Compensation for Noise-induced Hearing Loss

3.1 Workers' Compensation.....	50
3.2 History of Workers' Compensation.....	51
3.3 Occupational Health in Mining.....	53
3.4 Disability.....	56
3.4.1 World Health Organisation	56
3.4.2 International Labor Organisation (ILO)	57
3.4.3 American Medical Association (AMA)	57
3.5 NIHL Compensation.....	58
3.5.1 Europe	60
3.5.2 United States (US) and Canada.....	61
3.5.3 Australia.....	62
3.5.4 South Africa	63
3.6 Costs of NIHL Compensation in South Africa.....	65
3.7 Asbestosis Compensation.....	66
3.8 Alternative measures for compensation	67

Chapter 4

Otoacoustic Emissions

4.1	Definition of Terms	69
4.2	Distortion product otoacoustic emissions	70
4.2.1	Stimulus parameters of DPOAEs.....	70
4.2.2	Application of DPOAEs	71
4.2.2.1	Limitations of the use of DPOAEs	72
4.2.2.2	Specificity of DPOAE measurements.....	72
4.2.2.3	Degree of hearing loss	73
4.2.3	Interpretation of DPOAEs	73
4.3	Characteristics of DPOAEs	75
4.3.2	Gender	75
4.3.3	Age	76
4.3.4	Ethnicity	77
4.3.5	Occupation.....	78
4.4	NIHL and DPOAEs.....	78
4.4.1	DPOAEs and Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS).....	80
4.5	Prediction of Hearing Threshold Levels from DPOAEs	81
4.5.1	Previously reported prediction of hearing thresholds from DPOAEs..	82
	studies	82
4.5.2	Correlation with Air-conduction Hearing Threshold Levels	84
4.5.3	Averages of DPOAE Levels.....	86
4.5.4	Speech Recognition Thresholds (SRTs) and DPOAEs.....	87
4.6	Conclusion	88

Chapter 5

Research Design and Research Questions

5.1 Research Design.....	89
5.2 Reliability and Validity	90
5.3 Research Questions	94
5.3.1 Phase one.....	95
5.3.2 Phase two	99

Chapter 6

Methodology

6.1 Objectives	103
6.1.1 Phase one.....	103
6.1.2 Phase two	104
6.2 Records.....	105
6.2.1 Selection Criteria.....	105
6.2.1.1 Sensori-neural hearing loss	105
6.2.1.2 Gender.....	106
6.2.1.3 Complete information.....	106
6.2.1.4 Audiogram reliability.....	106
6.3 Population Description	107
6.3.1 Population size.....	108
6.3.2 Sampling.....	108
6.3.2.1 Pilot Study.....	108
6.3.2.2 Sample description.....	108
6.3.2.2.1.1 Age distribution in sample	110
6.3.2.2.1.2 Ethnic distribution in sample	111
6.3.2.2.1.3 Hearing level distribution in sample	111
6.4 Procedures.....	113

6.4.1 Ethical Considerations	113
6.4.2 Data Collection.....	114
6.4.2.1 Procedures for audiogram data collection.....	114
6.4.2.1.1 Interview.....	114
6.4.2.1.2 Otosopic examination.....	115
6.4.2.1.3 Tympanometry	115
6.4.2.1.4 Pure-tone audiometry	115
6.4.2.1.5 Speech recognition thresholds.....	116
6.4.2.2 Apparatus used to collect audiogram data.....	116
6.4.2.2.1 Apparatus for otoscopic examination	116
6.4.2.2.2 Apparatus for immittance measurements.....	116
6.4.2.2.3 Apparatus for audiogram and SRT collection.....	117
6.4.2.3 Procedures for DPOAE data collection.....	117
6.4.2.3.1 Apparatus used to collect DPOAE data	119
6.5 Data Analysis	119
6.5.1 Audiogram data management.....	119
6.5.2 DPOAE data management	121
6.5.2.1 DPOAE interpretation criteria.....	122
6.5.3 Statistical Analysis	124
6.5.2.1 Stepwise regression analysis.....	125

Chapter 7

Results and Discussion

7.1 Phase One	127
7.1.1 DPOAE profile of gold miners	127
7.1.1.1 Signal-to noise ratio	127
7.1.1.2 Noise floor level	131

7.1.1.3 Emission strength	133
7.1.2 Correlations between DPOAE levels and hearing threshold levels	136
7.1.3 Pure-tone average correlations with DPOAE averages	143
7.1.4 Speech recognition threshold (SRT) correlations with DPOAE averages	146
7.1.5 DPOAE characteristics in relation to age categories	148
7.1.6 DPOAE characteristics in relation to ethnic group	152
7.1.7 DPOAE characteristics in relation to occupation	157
7.2 Phase Two	160
7.2.1 Development of a prediction model	160
7.2.2 Validation of the prediction model	162
7.3 Percentage Loss of Hearing (PLH)	170

Chapter 8

Conclusion

8.1 Phase One	175
8.1.1 Air conduction	175
8.1.2 Pure-tone averages	176
8.1.3 Speech recognition threshold	177
8.1.4 Age	178
8.1.5 Ethnic group	178
8.1.6 Occupation type	178
8.1.7 DP-NF profile of gold miners	179
8.2 Phase Two	179
8.3 Limitations of the Study	180
8.4 Future Research Needs	181
8.5 Conclusion	181

References	183
------------------	-----

List of Figure

Figure 1	Audiogram indicating the position of environmental sounds as depicted in a frequency and intensity matrix	22
Figure 2	Summary of time Weighted Average exposure for all mining commodities	42
Figure 3	Percentage of sample with >10dB SPL difference between emission strength and noise floor for different stimulus protocols	128
Figure 4	Average percentage of sample in DP-NF categories	129
Figure 5	Pearson correlation coefficients $p < 0.01$ level (2 tailed) for three different stimulus procedures air conduction hearing threshold levels and DPOAE levels	139
Figure 6	Comparison of Pearson correlations between four groups of DPOAE averaged responses and pure-tone averages for different stimulus procedures at $p < 0.01$ (2 tailed level)	143
Figure 7	Comparison of Pearson correlations between four categories of DPOAE averages and Speech Recognition Thresholds (SRT) for different stimulus protocols	146
Figure 8	Comparison of average DPOAE responses for average categories using FB1-R	149
Figure 9	Comparison of average DPOAE responses for average categories using FB1-S	149
Figure 10	Comparison of average DPOAE responses for average categories using FB2-S	150
Figure 11	Comparison of DPOAE responses for Africans and Caucasians using FB1-R stimulus procedure	152
Figure 12	Comparison of DPOAE responses for Africans and Caucasians using FB1-S stimulus procedure	153
Figure 13	Comparison of DPOAE responses for Africans and Caucasians using FB2-S stimulus procedure	153

Figure 14	Comparison of average DPOAE responses using the FB1-R stimulus procedure in three occupation types of noise-exposed gold miners	157
Figure 15	Comparison of average DPOAE responses using the FB1-S stimulus procedure in three occupation types of noise-exposed gold miners	158
Figure 16	Comparison of averaged actual and averaged predicted audiograms for the FB1-R procedure	163
Figure 17	Comparison of averaged actual and averaged predicted audiograms for the FB1-S procedure	163
Figure 18	Comparison of averaged actual and averaged predicted audiograms for the FB2-S procedure	164
Figure 19	a to h Actual vs Predicted scatter plot for FB1-R for 250Hz to 8000Hz	166
Figure 20	a to h Actual vs Predicted scatter plot for FB1-S for 250Hz to 8000Hz	167
Figure 21	a to h Actual vs Predicted scatter plot for FB2-S for 250Hz to 8000Hz	168

List of Tables

Table 1	Initial impressions of characteristics of audiological caseload in the mining industry	7
Table 2	Percentage Loss of Hearing related to the hearing handicap reported in South African gold miners	21
Table 3	Predicted hearing threshold levels (dB) of males for advancing ages in unscreened population	28
Table 4	Expected hearing threshold levels (in decibels HL) for males and females when exposed to different levels of noise for progressively longer periods of time	30
Table 5	Comparison of the risk of hearing impairment at age 60 after a 40-year exposure to occupational noise	31
Table 6	South African classification of risk rating for noise exposure levels	38
Table 7	Extract from report on occupational diseases certified by the Compensation Commissioner in the non-mining sector in South Africa 2001-2005	40
Table 8	Occupational diseases certified for the mining sector in South Africa 2001-2005	41
Table 9	Comparison of reported average noise exposure in gold mines in South Africa	43
Table 10	Comparison of estimated and actual hearing threshold levels for gold miners for the 95 dBA exposure level	45
Table 11	Mean hearing threshold levels for occupation types in the South African mining industry	46
Table 12	Difference in compensation criteria in various countries	93
Table 13	Compensation for NIHL in South Africa	66
Table 14	Current study evaluated against Worster et al., (2005) criteria	93
Table 15	Summary if research questions and related information	101
Table 16	Population size summary	108
Table 17	Sample description	110

Table 18	Sample description for analysis of DPOAE levels in relation to age categories	110
Table 19	Sample description for analysis of DPOAE levels in relation to ethnic groups	111
Table 20	Hearing loss classification	111
Table 21	Distribution of participants' average hearing threshold levels in FB1-S group	112
Table 22	Distribution of participants' average hearing threshold levels in FB1-R group	112
Table 23	Distribution of participants' average hearing threshold levels in FB2-S group	113
Table 24	Stimulus frequencies for DPOAE procedures	118
Table 25	Summary of Pure-tone average groupings	119
Table 26	Summary of DPOAE frequencies averaged for FB2-S	121
Table 27	Summary of DPOAE frequencies averaged for FB1-S and FB1-R	122
Table 28	Summary of mean DPOAE levels and average noise floor levels in the research sample	124
Table 29	Summary of signal-to-noise ratios	130
Table 30	GSI normative data for noise floor levels (n=41)	132
Table 31	Descriptive statistics for noise floor levels in the study sample	132
Table 32	GSI normative data for emission levels (n=41)	133
Table 33	Descriptive statistics for DPOAE levels in the study sample	134
Table 34	Pearson correlations between DPOAE levels and hearing threshold levels for procedure FB1-R	137
Table 35	Pearson correlations between DPOAE levels and hearing threshold levels for procedure FB1-S	137
Table 36	Pearson correlations between DPOAE levels and hearing threshold levels for procedure FB2-S	138
Table 37	Averaged signal-to-noise ratios for ethnic group analysis	154
Table 38	Sample size for prediction and validation process	162

Table 39	Differences in average predicted and actual hearing threshold levels	164
Table 40	Comparison between average actual Percentage Loss of Hearing and average predicted Percentage Loss of Hearing	171
Table 41	Summary of findings	174
Table 42	Summary of prediction model for FB1-R procedure with highest number of variables	212
Table 43	Summary of prediction model for FB1-R procedure with highest number of variables	213
Table 44	Summary of prediction model for FB1-R procedure with highest number of variables	214

List of Appendices

A1	Letter of permission from host mine	210
A2	Ethics certificate	211
A3	Prediction model	212
A3	Sample size calculations	215

List of Abbreviations

ABR	Auditory Brainstem Response
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
ASHA	American Speech and Hearing Association
COIDA	Compensation for Occupational Injuries and Diseases Act
dB	decibels
dBA	A-weighted decibels
dB HL	decibels Hearing level
dB SPL	decibels Sound pressure level
DME	Department of Minerals and Energy
DPOAE	Distortion product otoacoustic emission
EU	European Union
GSI	Grason Stadler Incorporated
HCP	Hearing Conservation Programme
HPD	Hearing protection devices
HSE	Health and Safety Executive
ICF	International Classification Framework
ISO	International Standards Organisation
MHSA	Mine Health and Safety Act
MHSC	Mine Health and Safety Council
NIHL	Noise Induced hearing loss
NIOSH	National Institute of Safety and Health
ODMWA	Occupational Diseases for Mineworkers Act
OEL	Occupational Exposure Level
OHC	Outer hair cells
OHSA	Occupational Health and Safety Act
OHS	Occupational Health and Safety
PEL	Permissible Exposure Level
PLH	Percentage Loss of Hearing
PTA	Pure-tone average

REL	Recommended Exposure Level
RMA	Rand Mutual Assurance
SANS	South African national Standards
SRT	Speech recognition threshold
TES	Temporary Emission Shift
TTS	Temporary Threshold Shift
TWA8h	Time Weighted Average for 8 hours
WHO	World Health Organisation

Abstract

Background

The noise-exposed population in the mining industry in South Africa poses unique problems to the occupational audiologist working in this environment, due to the broad linguistic and cultural diversity in the audiology and mining environment. Unfortunately, the problems are also exacerbated by a high incidence of pseudohypacusis within this population who are incentivised by compensation for NIHL. A solution to these specific problems would be the reliable and valid use of an objective test of function such as the DPOAE. The rationale for the study therefore was to extend the body of knowledge about the use of DPOAEs in the noise-exposed mining population.

Methodology

The current study was divided into two phases: phase one's objectives entailed the investigation of the characteristics of DPOAEs in a noise-exposed mining population; phase two aimed to develop a multivariate regression model that would facilitate the prediction of the hearing threshold levels from the DPOAE levels in this population.

Objectives

The objectives in phase one of the study were to investigate the bivariate correlations between DPOAE levels and air-conduction hearing threshold levels in noise-exposed gold miners, for the three stimulus procedures. The study also aimed to investigate the bivariate correlations between various pure-tone averages (PTA) and the DPOAE averages of f_2 frequencies closest to those pure-tone frequencies. Similarly, the Speech Recognition Thresholds (SRT) were correlated with DPOAE averages of f_2 frequencies closest to the PTA.

The study further aimed to investigate the characteristics of DPOAEs in noise-exposed gold miners by comparing the average DPOAE levels for different age category groups, different ethnic groups and for different occupation types. Finally, phase one aimed to describe the characteristics of emission level and noise floor differences (DP-NF) in a DPOAE database of a noise-exposed gold mining population.

Phase two of the study had the objective of developing a multivariate prediction model using stepwise regression analysis to identify which of the DPOAE frequencies produced the best prediction of the audiogram frequencies when multivariate inputs were used for each stimulus procedure. The objective was also to evaluate the use of the predicted audiograms' calculated percentage loss of hearing (PLH) with that of the actual PLH.

This retrospective record review used an audiological database from a mine in the North West province of South Africa that contained 4800 records. The required sample size to be representative of the population was statistically determined. The records were randomly selected resulting a sample size for the FB2-S group of 161, for the FB1-S group of 177 and the FB1-S group of 155 respectively. The hearing loss characteristics in the samples ranged from normal to profound losses with the majority being mild to moderate hearing losses.

Results

The findings of phase one showed negative correlations ranging from -0.327 to -0.573 for Frequency Band 1- Replicated (FB1-R) between DPOAE levels and air conduction hearing threshold levels. Similarly, Frequency Band 1-Single (FB1-S) and Frequency Band 2-Single (FB2-S) also showed negative correlations (ranging from -0.203 to -0.609 and -0.274 to -0.738 respectively). These correlation strengths have been confirmed previously by other published studies.

Correlations between groups of frequencies on an audiogram and averaged match groups of DPOAE frequencies by intensity levels, both for PTA and SRT, ranged between -0.323 and -0.661. No statistically significant differences were found between the DPOAE measurements and ethnic groups of African and Caucasian (Sample size of 175 for FB1-S, 137 for FB1-R and 161 for FB2-S). No differences were found between the DPOAE levels and the occupation types of mining team members, stopers and drillers. There was, however, a relational finding of a progressive decrement of DPOAE intensity levels by decade of age increase (Sample size of 37 for FB1-S, 45 for FB1-R and 155 for FB2-S).

Mean DP levels in this population ranged from 1.5 to -14 dB SPL, and mean NF levels in the sample ranged from 0.1 to -16.8 dB SPL with the mean DP-NF difference ranges from 0.4 to 9.3 dB SPL. More than 60% of the data collected resulted in a DP-NF of less than 10 dB SPL.

The simple correlation relationship between hearing threshold levels and DPOAEs did not sufficiently explain the variance within the sample and due to the fact that a number of the independent variables in the sample were highly correlated, there was a call to use a method that allows for multicollinearity (i.e. stepwise regression analysis) in order to develop a prediction model. Consequently, phase two of the study was able to compare actual air-conduction hearing threshold levels with those calculated with the prediction model, and then calculate predicted percentage loss of hearing (PLH) with actual PLH found in the noise-exposed gold miners.

In phase two, with the use of the predictive models, the predicted hearing threshold levels were found to differ from the actual thresholds by no more than 7dB HL across all frequencies (average of 5 dB HL for FB1-R, 2 dB HL for FB1-S and 3 dB HL for FB2-S). The differences for each audiogram frequency between the actual and the predicted thresholds are represented on scatter plots in phase two of the thesis. The PLH of the predicted audiograms was calculated using the weighted

tables prescribed by the Compensation for Occupational Diseases and Injuries Act (COIDA). A comparison of the predicted PLH with the actual PLH indicated that the predicted PLH ranged between minus 1.3% PLH and plus 6.7% PLH of the actual PLH.

Results of the study are discussed with regards to the clinical implications, and the implications for training occupational audiologists in South Africa. The results of this study will improve and inform practice in the mining environment and in the field of compensation for NIHL. By developing a reliable prediction tool which is implemented on an objective test proven to document the extent of damage incurred from noise-exposure, a clinician will gain greater confidence in an accurate diagnosis, thereby further safeguarding a vulnerable population. The results from this study are highly relevant to the mining industry and will add value to the industrial development of South Africa by informing the policy on hearing conservation and compensation, thereby increasing the awareness of the need for improved occupational health and safety conditions and sustainable development in the mining industry.

Key words: DPOAE; NIHL compensation; prediction model for hearing threshold levels; characteristics of DPOAE; NIHL in mining.