Validation of a Dutch version of the Tinnitus Functional Index in a tertiary referral tinnitus clinic
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ABSTRACT

Introduction: Tinnitus is a condition with a subjective nature that requires self-report questionnaires for its assessment. Aspects such as quality of life, sleep or intrusiveness have been addressed by multiple tinnitus questionnaires, but the high responsiveness to treatment effects of the Tinnitus Functional Index (TFI) makes this questionnaire part of the standard practice in tinnitus screening. To date, the TFI has been translated to more than 20 languages and used in more than 22 countries. In this study, the TFI was translated to Dutch and validated through a clinical population in the Netherlands.

Methods: After a back-translation procedure, the Dutch TFI was filled-out by 377 patients in the tinnitus outpatient clinic at the Ear, Nose and Throat (ENT) department of the University Medical Center Groningen, in the Netherlands. Reliability and construct validity of the questionnaire were assessed by correlations with one other tinnitus questionnaire (Tinnitus Handicap Inventory, THI) and by moderate convergent (r = 0.55–0.67) and good-to moderate-divergent (r = 0.12–0.47) correlations with the psychological functioning questionnaires. The eight-factor structure of the TFI was confirmed for the Dutch version by the three models.

Results: The Dutch TFI showed a high internal consistency (α = 0.95), and construct validity was proven by moderate-to high-convergent correlations with the THI (r = 0.47–0.79) and by moderate convergent (r = 0.55–0.67) and good-to moderate-divergent (r = 0.12–0.47) correlations with the psychological functioning questionnaires. The eight-factor structure of the TFI was confirmed for the Dutch version by the three models.

Conclusion: The Dutch version of the TFI is a reliable instrument for screening tinnitus impact in a clinical population, and its psychometric properties are comparable to the original TFI and other validated tinnitus questionnaires.

1. Introduction

Tinnitus (“ringing in the ears”) is usually defined as the perception of a sound for which no external sound source exists. Most people experience episodes of tinnitus at times (ringing, buzzing or other sounds), either spontaneously or after being exposed to loud noise. In most cases, these sounds diminish or disappear after a certain period of time, from a few minutes to several days. If this perception persists for a period of 6 months or longer, the problem is considered chronic tinnitus (Mazurek et al., 2010).

Tinnitus is a common complaint, but its mechanisms are still poorly understood. Although different theories have been proposed, consensus has arisen with respect to a “central model” for the etiology of tinnitus, which is built on the assumption that tinnitus is the result of a change in spontaneous neural activity in the central auditory system (Eggermont and Roberts, 2004; Norena, 2011). Most cases of tinnitus are associated with some degree of hearing loss (Shargorodsky et al., 2010). Disentangling the two of them is still a challenge today since hearing loss and tinnitus are closely related (Ratnayake et al., 2009): proportions from 70 % to 80 % of substantial hearing loss among tinnitus patients have been reported (Jastreboff, 2011). The prevalence of tinnitus in the adult population has been estimated to fall in the range of 10 %–15 % (De Ridder et al., 2014). Although there is no clear consensus in the literature on the association between sex and tinnitus (Gallus et al., 2015; Biswas
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and Hall, 2020), several studies have shown an increase in tinnitus prevalence and reported severity as a function of age (McCormack et al., 2014; Gallus et al., 2015; Bhatt et al., 2016). Despite clinical experience shows some examples of tinnitus in children, there is still a lack of a robust research on this issue (Rosing et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2019).

Although the consequences of tinnitus are diverse, for most patients these symptoms affect their quality of life (QoL) to a certain degree (Zeman et al., 2014). When patients severely suffer from tinnitus, several aspects of their daily functioning are also affected (Andersson and Westin, 2008). Consequences often reported by patients are sleep disturbance (Schecklmann et al., 2015), fatigue (Burke and Naylor, 2020), difficulties with hearing and with concentration (Mohamad et al., 2016), and a higher sensitivity to everyday sounds (hyperacusis (Schecklmann et al., 2014))). Relationships between tinnitus and psychological distress have been reported in several studies, highlighting that substantial percentages of the tinnitus patients had symptoms of depression or anxiety (Holmes and Paghdam, 2009; Dural and Searchfield, 2016).

Since the consequences of tinnitus can be significant, research has aimed at finding effective treatments for tinnitus (Dobie, 1999; Savage and Waddell, 2014), such as pharmacological, electrophysiological or psychological approaches (Hall et al., 2016). Since a cure for tinnitus has not yet been found, the treatment of patients with tinnitus has shifted towards tinnitus management (Henry et al., 2005; Hoare et al., 2011). Tinnitus management aims at assisting patients in living with their condition as good as possible and to improve their quality of life. In order to assess the effect of tinnitus treatments on managing the complaints, there is a need for standardised outcome measures. Numerous self-report questionnaires have been developed to assess the impact of tinnitus on patients’ quality of life (Meikle et al., 2008; Kamalski et al., 2010; Hall et al., 2016), although these questionnaires were not specifically designed to study treatment outcomes (Kamalski et al., 2010). In order to study the effects of treatment options on the quality of life of the patients, it is necessary to use instruments that are responsive to treatment effects (Meikle et al., 2008). Therefore, Meikle et al. (2012) developed the Tinnitus Functional Index (TFI), to be able to assess both the impact of tinnitus and the treatment-related effects on the quality of life of the patients. In the developing process, an original prototype consisting of 175 items belonging to 9 different tinnitus questionnaires were evaluated by an expert panel and 13 different domains or subcategories were identified. After a refining process of clinical evaluations and restructurings, the final TFI resulted in 25 questions organized in 8 subscales of factors: intrusive, sense of control, cognitive, sleep, auditory, relaxation, quality of life and emotional.

The aim of the present study is to assess the psychometric properties of a Dutch version of the Tinnitus Functional Index and to test whether the same structure of 8 factors can be found, taking into consideration how these factors relate to each other. The original English version of the TFI has recently been validated within several cultures and for different languages (Oron et al., 2018; Kam et al., 2018; Peter et al., 2017; Hoff and Kahari, 2017; Wizrosek et al., 2016; Fackrell et al., 2016, 2018; Rabau et al., 2014; Suzuki et al., 2019; Müller et al., 2016). It is worth noting that the TFI version of Rabau et al. (2014) is written in Dutch language from Belgium (also known as Flemish Dutch), different from the one proposed in our study. Here, the performance of the Dutch version of the Tinnitus Functional Index was studied in a clinical setting, as part of the assessments in a tinnitus outpatient clinic at the ENT department of a university hospital in the Netherlands.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Participants and procedure

As part of a standard diagnostic protocol, the data for this study were collected in a tertiary referral tinnitus clinic at the University Medical Center Groningen. All patients who visited this clinic filled in several questionnaires in order to gather information on their tinnitus characteristics as well as to screen for potential psychosocial problems. These data are used in the multidisciplinary assessment of the patients to determine the advice for further treatment. The Dutch version of the TFI was administered to a group of 377 consecutive tinnitus patients, who visited the specialised multidisciplinary outpatient clinic between September 2013 and September 2015.

Data were included in this study when patients were 18 years or older, and mastered the Dutch language sufficiently to fill in the questionnaires. Since the data were collected as part of the routine assessment in the tinnitus outpatient clinic and are anonymously reported in this paper, no informed consent was asked of the participants. The study met the criteria for an exemption from institutional review board approval (METc2013/400).

2.2. Measurements

2.2.1. The Tinnitus Functional Index

The original TFI (Meikle et al., 2012) was translated by means of a back-translation procedure, following Guilifman et al. (1993) guidelines. First, the translation to Dutch was carried on by two independent translators with Dutch as native language. Our Dutch translation of the questionnaire was translated back into English by another translator with English as native language. Thus, the accuracy of the translation process could be checked. None of the translators involved in the process were medically skilled. The comparison of the original TFI with the translated version was carried out by bilingual experts in the field, and it did not reveal differences in the meaning of the individual items.

The TFI consists of 25 items, which are divided into 8 subscales: intrusive (3 items), sense of control (3 items), cognitive (3 items), sleep (3 items), auditory (3 items), relaxation (3 items), quality of life (4 items), and emotional (3 items). All items are scored on a 10-point rating scale, with “0” and “10” indicating the lowest and highest impact on functioning, respectively. Items 1 and 3 are scored as percentages and have to be re-coded into a 10-point scale. Each subscale is scored individually: scores on the separate items are added up, divided by the number of items in the scale, and multiplied by 10. For the total TFI score, all items are added up, divided by 25 (the total number of items) and multiplied by 10. Figure 1 shows the Dutch version of the TFI. Total scores between 0-17 are interpreted as “not a problem”, total scores between 18-31 as “small problem”, total scores between 32-53 as “moderate problem”, total scores between 54-72 as “big problem”, and total scores between 73-100 as “very big problem”.

2.2.2. Tinnitus Handicap Inventory

In the present study, scores on the TFI were compared to scores on the Dutch version of the Tinnitus Handicap Inventory (THI; Newman et al., 1996), a validated (Newman et al., 1996; Brussee, 2003) and widely used questionnaire developed to assess the severity of patients’ tinnitus handicap. The THI consists of 25 items, scored on a 3-point self-rating scale (0 = “no”, 2 = “sometimes”, and 4 = “yes”). In addition to the total score, three different subscales are scored as well: functional (11 items), emotional (9 items), and catastrophic (5 items). Higher scores indicate a higher tinnitus impact.

2.2.3. Psychological functioning

Mental health or psychological functioning was measured by the Mental Health subscale of the Rand-36 Health Survey (Ware, 1992; Vander Zee et al., 1996). This subscale consists of 5 items, scored on a 6-point self-rating scale (0 = never to 6 = always) and assesses mood, including symptoms of depression and tension. The total score on this subscale varies from 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating a better psychological functioning or mental health.

Overall wellbeing was measured on Cantril’s ladder (Cantril, 1965), which is a scale ranging from 0 to 10. Patients answered the following question: “Here is a picture of a ladder. Suppose the top of the ladder
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**In de afgelopen week...**

1. Hoeveel procent van de tijd dat u wakker was, was u zich bewust van uw tinnitus?
   - Nooit ▶ 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100% ▶ Altijd

2. Hoe sterk of luid was uw tinnitus?
   - Hekmaan niet ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Extreem sterk of luid

3. Hoeveel procent van de tijd dat u wakker was, was u geïntimeerd door uw tinnitus?
   - Geen moment ▶ 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100% ▶ De hele tijd

4. Heel u het gevoel dat u controle had over uw tinnitus?
   - Altijd ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Nooit

5. Hoe gemakkelijk was het voor u om met uw tinnitus om te gaan?
   - Helaas gemakkelijk ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Ongemakkelijk

6. Hoe gemakkelijk was het voor u om uw tinnitus te negeren?
   - Helaas gemakkelijk ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Ongemakkelijk

**Hoewel versterkt uw tinnitus in de afgelopen week...**

7. ....uw concentratievermogen?
   - Niet verstoord ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Volledig verstoord

8. ....uw vermogen om helder te denken?
   - Niet verstoord ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Volledig verstoord

9. ....uw vermogen om de aandacht te richten op andere dingen dan uw tinnitus?
   - Niet verstoord ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Volledig verstoord

**In de afgelopen week...**

10. Hoe vaak maakte uw tinnitus het u moeilijk om in slaap te vallen of in slaap te blijven?
    - Nooit ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Altijd

11. Hoe vaak maakte uw tinnitus het u moeilijk om de hoeveelheid slaap te krijgen die u nodig had?
    - Nooit ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Altijd

12. Hoe vaak weerhield uw tinnitus u ervan zo te slapen of zo rustig te slapen als u graag had gewild?
    - Nooit ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Altijd

**Hoewel versterkt uw tinnitus gedurende de afgelopen week...**

13. ....uw vermogen om goed te horen?
    - Niet verstoord ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Volledig verstoord

14. ....uw vermogen om mensen te verstaan die aan het praten zijn?
    - Niet verstoord ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Volledig verstoord

15. ....uw vermogen om gesprekken te volgen in een groep of tijdens vergaderingen?
    - Niet verstoord ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Volledig verstoord

16. ....uw rustige ontspannende activiteiten?
    - Niet verstoord ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Volledig verstoord

17. ....uw vermogen om u te ontspannen?
    - Niet verstoord ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Volledig verstoord

18. ....uw vermogen om van rust te genieten?
    - Niet verstoord ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Volledig verstoord

19. ....uw plezier in sociale activiteiten?
    - Niet verstoord ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Volledig verstoord

20. ....uw levensvreugde?
    - Niet verstoord ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Volledig verstoord

21. ....uw contact met familie, vrienden en anderen?
    - Niet verstoord ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Volledig verstoord

22. Hoe vaak had u door uw tinnitus moeite met het uitvoeren van uw werk of andere taken, zoals huishoudelijke werkzaamheden, werk, school of de zorg voor kinderen of anderen?
    - Nooit ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Altijd

**In de afgelopen week...**

23. Hoe angstig of bezorgd heeft u zich gevoeld door uw tinnitus?
    - Hekmaan niet ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Extreem

24. Hoe geïntimeerd of boos heeft u zich gevoeld door uw tinnitus?
    - Hekmaan niet ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Extreem

25. Hoe somber was u door uw tinnitus?
    - Hekmaan niet ▶ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ▶ Extreem

Figure 1. Dutch version of the Tinnitus Functional Index.
represents the best possible life for you and the bottom represents the worst possible life for you. Where on the ladder do you feel you personally stand at the present time?”

Symptoms of anxiety or depression were assessed by the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (Zigmond and Snith, 1983; Spinhoven et al., 1997). The HADS is a 14-item self-report screening instrument, developed to identify possible cases with anxiety or depression. The instrument consists of two 7-item scales, one of them with items assessing symptoms of anxiety, and the other one with items assessing symptoms of depression. The subscales vary from 0 to 21, with higher scores indicating a higher amount of anxiety or depression. The authors of the original questionnaire identified scores from 0 to 7 as “non-cases”, scores from 8 through 10 as “doubtful cases”, and scores higher than 11 as “cases” with anxiety or depression (Zigmond and Snith, 1983).

2.3. Data analysis

All descriptive analyses, reliability analyses, and construct validity analyses were performed with IBM SPSS Statistics 23. The factor structure of the Dutch version of the TFI was tested with M-Plus version 8.

2.3.1. Reliability and construct validity of the TFI

Reliability scores of the Dutch TFI were assessed by calculating the internal consistency coefficient Cronbach's alpha (α) for each subscale as well as for the total questionnaire (Cronbach, 1951). In general, Cronbach's alphas of ≥ .80 are considered good for diagnostic instruments, although Cronbach's alphas of > .90 are recommended in case of screening instruments (Nunnally, 1994).

Construct validity was evaluated by means of convergent and divergent correlations between TFI and measures of tinnitus handicap and psychological functioning. For it, Spearman's correlation coefficients between these measures were obtained. Correlation coefficients between .10 and .30 were considered small, correlations between .30 and .50 were considered moderate, and correlations higher than .50 were considered large (Cohen, 1988).

2.3.2. Factor structure of the TFI

In the original study (Meikle et al., 2012), the eight-factor structure of the TFI was derived from a principal component analysis (PCA, aimed to reduce the dimensionality of data) as an independent cluster model (ICM). An ICM (Marsh et al., 2009) is a factor structure in which each of the 25 items is loaded on only one of the eight factors. Three models were tested and compared to confirm the factor structure of the TFI.

First, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to check whether the ICM eight-factor structure of the original study could be confirmed (model ICM-CFA). In an ICM model, items load at their respective factor with no cross-loads on the other latent factors. A critical comment on the ICM model is that the zero factor loadings of items usually displays poor fit and leads to distorted factors with overestimated factor correlations (Marsh et al., 2009).

Second, in order to investigate whether cross-loading could be found in the ICM-CFA, an exploratory structural equation model (ESEM) (Asparouhov and Muthen, 2009) of eight factors was performed as an exploratory factor analysis (EFA).

And third, based on the ESEM model, we investigated whether an ESEM-CFA model could be obtained. An ESEM-CFA model means that non-significant loadings that are larger than zero of the ESEM solution then become zero loadings. This involves obtaining a model with cross-loadings, but the cross-loadings were retrieved from an ESEM model. Since the data were comprised of continuous variables, parameter estimation of the ESEM model was estimated by maximum likelihood (ML) with oblique factor rotation Geomin. A Geomin criterion of 0.01 with 30 random starts was used.

Finally, a goodness of fit test (GOF) (Schreiber et al., 2006) was used to compare the three models (ICM-CFA, ESEM and ESEM-CFA).

3. Results

3.1. Participants

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the patients that were included in this study. In total, 377 patients participated in the study. More men (60.7 %) than women (39.3 %) were included, with a mean age of 54.8 years (range 19–88 years). Tinnitus duration was on average 7.1 years. The number of patients with an acute or gradual onset of tinnitus was almost equally divided. Most of the patients in this study experienced a continuous tinnitus (89.6 %), whereas a smaller amount of the patients experienced tinnitus at intervals (10.4 %). The majority of the patients reported hearing loss (68.7 %). The demographic data described a wide range of characteristics in our clinical population.

3.2. Instruments

Table 2 gives an overview of all instruments used in the present study. The average TFI score fell into the ‘moderate problem’ category with a value of 48 ± 20.4, characteristic of a common tinnitus population as previous studies reported (Fackrell et al., 2018; Wzrosek et al., 2016; Peter et al., 2017; Jacquemin et al., 2019). In line with it, the THI presented also a ‘moderate handicap’ on average with a score of 44 ± 22.3. Psychological functioning tests such as Rand-36, Cantrill's ladder and HADS presented relatively normal average values as well.

3.3. Reliability

Table 3 summarizes the internal consistency scores of the subscales of the Dutch version of the TFI. Most of the subscales of the TFI, as well as the total scale, showed good internal consistency scores (Cronbach's alphas ranged from 0.82–0.96). Subscale “sense of control” showed a satisfactory internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of .72.

The internal consistency scores of the Dutch TFI were comparable to the scores of the original English version of the TFI, with only a lower internal consistency score for subscale “sense of control” of the Dutch version of the TFI (Meikle et al., 2012). The obtained values of internal consistency highlighted the reliability of each subscale.

3.4. Construct validity

Table 4 shows the expected convergent and divergent correlations between TFI subscales, THI subscales, and measures of psychological functioning. Convergent correlations were expected between the TFI subscales and the corresponding subscales of the THI. Also, subscales Quality of Life and Emotional were expected to be related to measures of psychological functioning. Divergent correlations were expected between TFI subscales Cognitive, Sleep and Auditory and measures of psychological functioning. These assumptions were made by the authors and based on their own clinical experience. In the case of the expected correlations between TFI and THI, both questionnaires contain similar questions.

Table 5 displays the actual convergent and divergent correlations that were found in the study population. With respect to convergent validity, all TFI subscales showed significant moderate-to-strong-correlations (range 0.47–0.79) with the corresponding subscales of the THI and measures of psychological functioning. Subscales Intrusive and Auditory correlated less strongly with THI subscales Emotional and Functional, respectively (r = 0.47). All expectations regarding the direction of the convergent correlations were confirmed by the results.

With respect to divergent validity, significant, but small-to-moderate-correlations were found for TFI subscales Cognitive, Sleep, and Auditory with measures of psychological functioning. Almost all of the correlation coefficients were smaller than 0.50 (range 0.12–0.47), which is indicative of a satisfactory divergent validity. Subscale Cognitive correlated strongly with overall wellbeing as measured by Cantrill's ladder (r =
0.50), which indicates that some association exists between these constructs. All expectations with respect to the direction of the divergent correlations were confirmed by the results.

Overall, the construct validity showed smaller divergent correlations compared to convergent correlations for the subscales of the TFI. These correlations indicated a strong construct validity of the questionnaire for almost all subscales, which might infer that these factors are adequate for assessing the aspects of tinnitus that they are intended to measure.

### 3.5. Confirmation of the 8-factor structure of the TFI

The 8-factor structure was tested by three different models (ICM-CFA, ESEM, and ESEM-CFA). Tables 6A, 6B, and 6C show the standardized factor loadings ($\beta$) for all 25 TFI items and the 8 factors. The loadings of the ICM-CFA are shown in Table 6A, where only the items of each factor are considered and the empty cells represent zero loadings. All values indicate good associations with their designated factor since they are above the recommended cutoff $\geq 0.40$ (Wülferth, 2013). Table 6B contains the loadings of the ESEM model. Values in bold correspond to the significant loadings ($p \leq 0.05$), which occurs for items that are either associated with their factor or not. For this model, several items showed significant cross-loadings with other factors (i.e., item 20 and factor Emotional). However, none of these cross-loadings scored above the cut-off value of 0.40. The loadings of the model ESEM-CFA are shown in Table 6C, which includes only the significant loadings obtained in the ESEM-CFA model, zero loadings appear blank. As in the previous model, none of the cross-loadings scored above 0.40.

Tables 7A, 7B, and 7C contain the correlations between factors of the 3 models. Values presented in bold are below or above the recommended criteria ($<0.30$ to $>0.85$) (Hair et al., 2010). For all models, the Auditory factor showed the weakest correlations with the rest of the factors.

Table 8 shows the results of the goodness of fit test (GOF). Values of root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) for the three models are below 0.08, indicating good fitting (MacCallum et al., 1996). Despite RMSEA values should normally be below 0.05, the limit of 0.08 is

### Table 1. Demographic data and tinnitus characteristics of the subjects.

| Demographic characteristics | N = 377 (%) |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Gender                      |             |
| Male                        | 229 (60.7)  |
| Female                      | 148 (39.3)  |
| Age (years)                 |             |
| Mean                        | 54.8        |
| SD                          | 13.6        |
| Range                       | 19-88       |
| Marital status              |             |
| With partner                | 301 (80.3)  |
| Without partner             | 74 (19.7)   |
| Missing                     | 2           |
| Educational level           |             |
| Low                         | 87 (24.0)   |
| Middle                      | 166 (45.7)  |
| High                        | 110 (30.3)  |
| Missing                     | 14          |
| Tinnitus duration (years)   |             |
| Mean                        | 7.1         |
| SD                          | 8.1         |
| Range                       | 0-47        |
| Onset of tinnitus           |             |
| Acute                       | 174 (47.7)  |
| Gradual                     | 191 (52.3)  |
| Missing                     | 12          |
| Presence of tinnitus        |             |
| Continuous                  | 329 (89.6)  |
| With intervals              | 38 (10.4)   |
| Missing                     | 10          |
| Perceived hearing loss      |             |
| No                          | 118 (31.3)  |
| Yes                         | 259 (68.7)  |

### Table 2. Questionnaires and subscales used. The maximum score for TFI, THI and RAND-36 is 100. The maximum scores for Cantril’s ladder and HADS is 10 and 21, respectively.

| Questionnaires and subscales used. | N | Items | Possible Score Range | Observed Score Range | Mean | SD |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------|-----------------------|----------------------|------|----|
| Tinnitus Functional Index         |   |       |                       |                      |      |    |
| Intrusive                         | 356 | 3    | 0–100                 | 0–100                | 61.61 | 21.98 |
| Sense of Control                  | 359 | 3    | 0–100                 | 3.33–100             | 65.04 | 20.44 |
| Cognitive                         | 362 | 3    | 0–100                 | 0–100                | 43.43 | 25.38 |
| Sleep                             | 369 | 3    | 0–100                 | 0–100                | 47.27 | 34.29 |
| Auditory                          | 361 | 3    | 0–100                 | 0–100                | 43.52 | 30.50 |
| Relaxation                        | 366 | 3    | 0–100                 | 0–100                | 47.48 | 27.96 |
| Quality of Life                   | 360 | 4    | 0–100                 | 0–100                | 37.26 | 27.66 |
| Emotional                         | 363 | 3    | 0–100                 | 0–100                | 39.61 | 27.66 |
| Total                             | 371 | 25   | 0–100                 | 3.20–100             | 47.93 | 20.41 |
| Tinnitus Handicap Inventory       |   |       |                       |                      |      |    |
| Functional                        | 368 | 11   | 0–44                  | 0–44                 | 21.68 | 10.41 |
| Emotional                         | 368 | 9    | 0–36                  | 0–36                 | 14.08 | 9.01  |
| Catastrophic                      | 370 | 5    | 0–20                  | 0–20                 | 7.96  | 4.88  |
| Total                             | 374 | 25   | 0–100                 | 0–98                 | 43.84 | 22.33 |
| RAND-36                           |   |       |                       |                      |      |    |
| Mental health                     | 372 | 5    | 0–100                 | 0–100                | 63.89 | 19.27 |
| Cantril’s ladder                   | 363 | 1    | 0–10                  | 0–10                 | 6.31  | 1.85  |
| Hospital Anxiety & Depression Scale |   |       |                       |                      |      |    |
| Anxiety                           | 368 | 7    | 0–21                  | 0–21                 | 6.96  | 4.18  |
| Depression                        | 369 | 7    | 0–21                  | 0–21                 | 5.82  | 4.54  |
Table 3. Internal consistency scores of the Dutch version of the TFI.

| Tinnitus Functional Index       | N  | Items | Cronbach’s Alpha |
|--------------------------------|----|-------|------------------|
| Intrusive                      | 356| 3     | .82              |
| Sense of Control               | 359| 3     | .72              |
| Cognitive                      | 362| 3     | .92              |
| Sleep                          | 369| 3     | .96              |
| Auditory                       | 361| 3     | .95              |
| Relaxation                     | 366| 3     | .94              |
| Quality of Life                | 360| 4     | .89              |
| Emotional                      | 363| 3     | .90              |
| Total                          | 309| 25    | .95              |

Table 4. Expected convergent and divergent correlations between TFI subscales, THI subscales, and measures of psychological functioning.

| TFI                | THI Functional | THI Emotional | THI Catastrophic | RAND-36 Mental Health | Cantril’s Ladder | HADS Anxiety | HADS Depression |
|--------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Intrusive          | +              |               |                  |                        |                 |              |                |
| Sense of Control   |                | +             |                  |                        |                 |              |                |
| Cognitive          | +              | 0             | 0                | 0                      | 0               |              |                |
| Sleep              | +              | 0             | 0                | 0                      | 0               |              |                |
| Auditory           | +              | 0             | 0                | 0                      | 0               |              |                |
| Relaxation         | +              |               |                  |                        |                 |              |                |
| Quality of Life    | +              | -             | -                |                        | -               |              |                |
| Emotional          | +              | -             | -                |                        | -               |              |                |

+ = expected positive correlation. - = expected negative correlation. 0 = no association expected.

Table 5. Convergent and divergent Spearman correlations obtained between TFI subscales, THI subscales, and measures of psychological functioning.

| TFI                | THI Functional | THI Emotional | THI Catastrophic | RAND-36 Mental Health | Cantril’s Ladder | HADS Anxiety | HADS Depression |
|--------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Intrusive          |                |               |                  |                        |                 |              |                |
| Sense of Control   |                |               |                  |                        |                 |              |                |
| Cognitive          | .76**          | .46**         | .50**            | .47***                 | .56**          |              |                |
| Sleep              | .60**          | .37**         | .33**            | .39**                  | .44**          |              |                |
| Auditory           | .47**          | .12**         | .12**            | .19**                  | .26**          |              |                |
| Relaxation         | .64**          |               |                  | .53**                  |                |              |                |
| Quality of Life    | .79**          | .68**         | .55**            | .56**                  | .67**          |              |                |
| Emotional          | .78**          |               |                  | .66**                  | .57**          | .60**        | .64**          |

* = p < .05. ** = p < .01.

Bold values indicate the expected convergent correlations; Italic values indicate expected divergent correlations.
Table 6A. Standardized loadings ($\beta$) of ICM-CFA model: Eight factors based on 25 items of the TFI. All values are above the recommended cut-off ≥ 0.40.

| Intrusiveness | Sense of Control | Cognitive | Sleep | Auditory | Relaxation | Quality of life | Emotional |
|---------------|------------------|-----------|-------|----------|------------|-----------------|-----------|
| TF1           | 0.778            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF2           | 0.826            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF3           | 0.770            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF4           | 0.415            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF5           | 0.849            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF6           | 0.778            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF7           | 0.903            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF8           | 0.918            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF9           | 0.839            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF10          | 0.901            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF11          | 0.985            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF12          | 0.925            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF13          | 0.918            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF14          | 0.997            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF15          | 0.897            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF16          | 0.868            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF17          | 0.850            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF18          | 0.912            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF19          | 0.768            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF20          | 0.875            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF21          | 0.949            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |

Values in bold correspond to the significant loadings (p ≤ 0.05).

Table 6B. Standardized loadings ($\beta$) of ESEM model: Eight ESEM factors based on 25 items of the TFI.

| Intrusiveness | Sense of Control | Cognitive | Sleep | Auditory | Relaxation | Quality of life | Emotional |
|---------------|------------------|-----------|-------|----------|------------|-----------------|-----------|
| TF1           | 0.924            | -0.049    | -0.068| -0.011   | 0.001      | 0.006           | 0.073     |
| TF2           | 0.627            | 0.134     | 0.051 | 0.010    | 0.121      | 0.065           | -0.038    |
| TF3           | 0.448            | 0.159     | 0.120 | 0.041    | -0.034     | -0.037          | -0.015    |
| TF4           | -0.004           | 0.473     | 0.013 | -0.090   | 0.089      | 0.080           | 0.044     |
| TF5           | 0.014            | 0.593     | -0.003| 0.098    | 0.010      | -0.028          | -0.030    |
| TF6           | 0.078            | 0.630     | 0.042 | 0.011    | -0.020     | 0.045           | 0.093     |
| TF7           | 0.072            | 0.079     | 0.736 | 0.076    | 0.035      | -0.004          | 0.064     |
| TF8           | -0.002           | -0.128    | 0.992 | 0.009    | 0.037      | 0.019           | -0.014    |
| TF9           | -0.015           | 0.079     | 0.607 | 0.013    | -0.041     | 0.085           | 0.162     |
| TF10          | 0.012            | 0.044     | 0.069 | 0.860    | -0.034     | -0.015          | -0.039    |
| TF11          | 0.004            | -0.022    | -0.006| 0.962    | 0.035      | 0.014           | 0.024     |
| TF12          | 0.005            | 0.003     | -0.006| 0.891    | 0.016      | 0.063           | 0.041     |
| TF13          | 0.028            | -0.020    | 0.008 | -0.004   | 0.893      | 0.027           | -0.013    |
| TF14          | -0.029           | 0.014     | -0.037| 0.017    | 1.014      | 0.017           | -0.005    |
| TF15          | 0.033            | 0.011     | 0.083 | 0.006    | 0.815      | -0.029          | 0.109     |
| TF16          | -0.003           | 0.018     | 0.070 | 0.019    | 0.071      | 0.808           | 0.010     |
| TF17          | 0.005            | -0.039    | 0.055 | 0.024    | 0.004      | 0.911           | 0.010     |
| TF18          | 0.037            | 0.052     | -0.026| 0.012    | -0.020     | 0.813           | 0.018     |
| TF19          | 0.054            | 0.019     | 0.004 | 0.004    | 0.035      | 0.029           | 0.872     |
| TF20          | 0.024            | 0.000     | -0.019| 0.041    | -0.086     | 0.142           | 0.520     |
| TF21          | -0.028           | -0.026    | 0.066 | 0.024    | 0.056      | -0.120          | 0.795     |
| TF22          | 0.001            | 0.079     | 0.295 | -0.051   | 0.021      | 0.079           | 0.452     |
| TF23          | -0.039           | 0.052     | -0.124| 0.041    | 0.039      | 0.072           | 0.088     |
| TF24          | 0.034            | 0.045     | 0.059 | -0.068   | 0.053      | 0.023           | -0.009    |
| TF25          | 0.031            | -0.096    | 0.077 | -0.006   | -0.007     | 0.010           | 0.067     |

Values in bold correspond to the significant loadings (p ≤ 0.05).
The study by Fackrell et al. (2016) included both clinical and non-clinical populations, obtaining a lower proportion of participants with global TFI scores above 50 (30%). The difference in severe cases might be explained by the tinnitus symptoms of a patient population who seek medical help, compared to a general population who might report milder tinnitus on average. In our dataset, a proportion of 17.2% of patients scored above 65, which is a rather small group and might not represent the distress reported by the patients who visited our clinic.

### Table 6C. Standardized loadings (β) of ESEM-CFA model: Eight ESEM factors based on 25 items of the TFI. Only the significant loadings (p ≤ 0.05) of the ESEM-CFA model are shown, zero loadings appear blank.

| Factor | Intrusiveness | Sense of Control | Cognitive | Sleep | Auditory | Relaxation | Quality of life | Emotional |
|--------|---------------|------------------|-----------|-------|----------|------------|-----------------|-----------|
| TF1    | 1.266         | -0.330           | -0.219    |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF2    | 0.806         |                  |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF3    | 0.599         |                  |           |       |          |            |                 | 0.240     |
| TF4    | 0.555         |                  |           |       |          |            |                 | -0.153    |
| TF5    | 0.646         |                  |           |       |          |            |                 | 0.260     |
| TF6    | 0.819         |                  |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF7    |               | 0.897            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF8    | -0.297        | 1.142            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF9    |               | 0.685            |           |       |          |            | 0.204           |           |
| TF10   |               | 0.900            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF11   |               | 0.985            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF12   |               | 0.925            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF13   |               |                  |           |       | 0.915    |            |                 |           |
| TF14   |               | -0.075           | 1.040     |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF15   |               |                  |           |       |          |            | 0.896           |           |
| TF16   |               |                  |           |       | 0.895    |            |                 |           |
| TF17   |               |                  |           |       | 0.957    |            |                 |           |
| TF18   |               |                  |           |       | 0.890    |            |                 |           |
| TF19   |               |                  |           |       | 1.001    | -0.135     |                 |           |
| TF20   |               | -0.136           | 0.120     | 0.592  |          | 0.307      |                 |           |
| TF21   |               | -0.193           | 0.979     |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF22   |               | 0.519            |           |       |          |            |                 |           |
| TF23   |               |                  |           |       |          |            | 0.779           |           |
| TF24   |               |                  |           |       |          |            |                 | 0.872     |
| TF25   |               |                  |           |       |          |            |                 | 0.955     |

### Table 7A. ICM-CFA model: Correlations between factors.

| Factor   | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| (1) Intrusiveness | 1   | 0.766 | 0.624 | 0.495 | 0.388 | 0.590 | 0.588 | 0.595 |
| (2) Sense of Control | 1   | 0.646 | 0.505 | 0.293 | 0.632 | 0.614 | 0.676 |
| (3) Cognitive      | 1   | 0.562 | 0.505 | 0.700 | 0.756 | 0.625 |
| (4) Sleep          | 1   | 0.239 | 0.586 | 0.501 | 0.474 |
| (5) Auditory       | 1   | 0.366 | 0.494 | 0.269 |
| (6) Relaxation     | 1   | 0.749 | 0.696 |
| (7) Quality of life| 1   | 0.780 |
| (8) Emotional      |     | 1   |

Values in bold are below or above the recommended criteria (<0.30 to >0.85). 1 = Intrusiveness; 2 = Sense of control; 3 = Cognition; 4 = Sleep; 5 = Auditory; 6 = Relaxation; 7 = Quality of life; 8 = Emotional.

The study by Fackrell et al. (2016) included both clinical and non-clinical populations, obtaining a lower proportion of participants with global TFI scores above 50 (30%). The difference in severe cases might be explained by the tinnitus symptoms of a patient population who seek medical help, compared to a general population who might report milder tinnitus on average. In our dataset, a proportion of 17.2% of patients scored above 65, which is a rather small group and might not represent the distress reported by the patients who visited our clinic.

### Table 7B. ESEM model: Correlations between factors.

| Factor   | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| (1) Intrusiveness | 1   | 0.547 | 0.456 | 0.393 | 0.312 | 0.446 | 0.381 | 0.433 |
| (2) Sense of Control | 1   | 0.488 | 0.342 | 0.215 | 0.444 | 0.320 | 0.412 |
| (3) Cognitive      | 1   | 0.483 | 0.467 | 0.605 | 0.607 | 0.523 |
| (4) Sleep          | 1   | 0.177 | 0.527 | 0.384 | 0.434 |
| (5) Auditory       | 1   | 0.308 | 0.470 | 0.176 |
| (6) Relaxation     | 1   | 0.630 | 0.633 |
| (7) Quality of life| 1   | 0.607 |
| (8) Emotional      |     | 1   |

Values in bold are below or above the recommended criteria (<0.30 to >0.85). 1 = Intrusiveness; 2 = Sense of control; 3 = Cognition; 4 = Sleep; 5 = Auditory; 6 = Relaxation; 7 = Quality of life; 8 = Emotional.
to the similarities between the global scores of the THI and the TFI, a potential solution to this problem is to increase the number of categories as in the THI, instead of raising the limit of the group with severe tinnitus.

Construct validity of the Dutch TFI showed strong correlations with the THI for almost all factors. One of the exceptions was the convergent validity between the TFI-factor Intrusive and the THI-factor Emotional. Previous studies highlighted the importance of evaluating tinnitus intrusiveness for studying treatment outcomes (Hoare et al., 2011; Hall et al., 2019). In the case of the Dutch TFI, the three items belonging to this factor are focused on annoyance, awareness and loudness of the tinnitus percept. Two of these items (awareness and loudness) do not necessarily correlate with the items included in the Emotional factor of the THI, which mostly covers anxiety, depression and psychological impact. The low correlation obtained for this particular comparison between the two questionnaires might be due to this effect, since only one of the items evaluating intrusiveness is clearly connected to the THI-Emotional. A similar effect occurs when comparing the TFI-Auditory to the THI-Functional, for which a weak correlation was obtained as well. The Functional factor covers aspects such as concentration, sleep, intrusive-ness and fatigue. Only 2 out of 11 items of this THI factor are surely related to the TFI-Auditory, and these are “Does the loudness of your tinnitus make it difficult for you to hear people?” and “Does your tinnitus interfere with your ability to enjoy your social activities (such as going out to dinner, to the movies?)”. The wide-ranging design of the THI-Functional is presumably the reason for the low convergent validity obtained. Moreover, a strong correlation is expected when comparing two subscales with the same name from different questionnaires, however, they might measure different underlying aspects (Jacquemin et al., 2019). Nevertheless, it should be noted that previous translations of the THI have shown that the subscales are unreliable, and a THI-total scale might be a valid measure of general tinnitus related distress (Zachariae et al., 2000). Further validations of the TFI might benefit most by analyzing construct validities of the global scores.

One aspect of our study that should be considered is the confirmation of the 8-factor structure by means of 3 different models of factor analysis. Most of the available TFI translations used a CFA model based on independent clusters (ICM). This method assumes no crossloadings between factors which leads to poor fit and overestimated factor correlations (Marsh et al., 2009). In addition to this model, the 8-factor structure of the Dutch TFI was confirmed by 2 more models (ESEM and ESEM-CFA) that take into account possible crossloadings between factors and, consequently, further ensuring the fit. This overestimation can be seen when comparing Tables 7B and 8A: all correlations are higher in the first table. We think that the models ESEM and ESEM-CFA are more adequate for a factor analysis in a study like this one, given the complexity and the subjective nature of a tinnitus questionnaire.

Another aspect worth to note with regard to previous TFI translations, is that the Dutch TFI was validated through a broad and diverse clinical population of 377 patients whose characteristics corroborate the values of reliability and construct validity that have been obtained in this study. Both sample size and techniques of factor analysis used in this study make the validation process more robust. It should be noted that the Dutch language used in Rabau et al. (2014) refers to Flemish, which is mostly spoken in Belgium. One of the main motivations of this study was to obtain a new Dutch version that could be fully understood by a clinical population in The Netherlands.

Some items of the models ESEM and ESEM-CFA loaded on to their designated factor but also on to others, resulting in the so-called crossloadings. Although the significance of a factor loading depends on the sample size (Stevens 2012), it’s common practice in exploratory factor analysis to ignore loadings below 0.3 (Field et al., 2012). Using the recommendation of Guadagnoli and Velicer (1988), only scores greater than 0.4 are considered stable. In our study, none of the crossloading scores in any of the models exceeded this threshold, resulting in only stable items with loadings on to their designated factor. Despite the crossloadings of both models can be ignored, ESEM-CFA showed better correlations between factors and better GOF values when compared to ESEM. Therefore, we suggest that the ESEM-CFA is the most optimal model out of the three.

| Table 7C. ESEM-CFA model: Correlations between factors. Correlations between factors. |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor                    | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  |
| (1) Intrusiveness          | 1  | 0.795 | 0.691 | 0.497 | 0.421 | 0.6  | 0.571 | 0.565 |
| (2) Sense of Control       | 1  | 0.688 | 0.473 | 0.334 | 0.596 | 0.529 | 0.564 |
| (3) Cognitive              | 1  | 0.558 | 0.542 | 0.697 | 0.699 | 0.621 |
| (4) Sleep                  | 1  | 0.268 | 0.586 | 0.48  | 0.480 |
| (5) Auditory               | 1  | 0.399 | 0.544 | 0.292 |
| (6) Relaxation             | 1  | 0.727 | 0.691 |
| (7) Quality of life        | 1  | 0.734 |
| (8) Emotional              | 1  |

Values in bold are below or above the recommended criteria (<0.30 to >0.85). 1 = Intrusiveness; 2 = Sense of control; 3 = Cognition; 4 = Sleep; 5 = Auditory; 6 = Relaxation; 7 = Quality of life; 8 = Emotional.

| Table 8. Goodness of fit (GOF) statistics for the models ICM-CFA, ESEM, and ESEM-CFA. |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                                | ICM-CFA | ESEM | ESEM-CFA |
| AIC                             | 38197  | 37951 | 37913  |
| BIC                             | 38602  | 38824 | 38373  |
| RMSEA (90%CI)                   | 0.071 (0.065-0.077) | 0.046 (0.036-0.055) | 0.044 (0.036-0.051) |
| SRMR                            | 0.047  | 0.011 | 0.027  |
| CFI                             | 0.946  | 0.988 | 0.980  |
| TLI                             | 0.943  | 0.972 | 0.975  |

AIC = Akaike information criterion; BIC = Bayesian information criterion; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardised Root Mean Square Residual; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index.
Although the Dutch TFI showed a good reliability as a screening tool, responsiveness to treatment for different follow-up groups was not evaluated in this study. The main goals of the original TFI were evaluating both the impact of tinnitus and the treatment-related effects on the patients. Further analyses should focus on evaluating treatment efficacy by measuring the changes before and after treatment for the total score and for each subscale.

Overall, the results of this study show that most of the subscales of the Dutch version of the TFI have a good internal consistency. The reliability scores are considered good for use as a diagnostic instrument as well as a screening instrument (Nunnally, 1994). Furthermore, these results are comparable with the reliability scores of the original TFI (Meikle et al., 2012). Only the subscale “sense of control” showed a low internal consistency, which indicates that its use for screening should be done carefully, although the scale is acceptable for using it as a research instrument.

Declarations

Author contribution statement

Jose L. Santacruz: Analyzed and interpreted the data; Contributed reagents, materials, analysis tools or data; Wrote the paper.
Rosemarie Arnold: Conceived and designed the experiments; Performed the experiments; Analyzed and interpreted the data; Contributed reagents, materials, analysis tools or data; Wrote the paper.
Jolanda Tuinstra: Performed the experiments; Analyzed and interpreted the data.
Roy E. Stewart: Analyzed and interpreted the data; Wrote the paper.
Pim van Dijk: Conceived and designed the experiments; Analyzed and interpreted the data; Contributed reagents, materials, analysis tools or data; Wrote the paper.

Funding statement

This work was supported by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement number 722046.

Data availability statement

The authors do not have permission to share data.

Declaration of interests statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Additional information

No additional information is available for this paper.

Acknowledgements

This paper is part of the ESIT project (Schlee et al., 2018) that has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement number 722046.

References

Andersson, G., Westin, V., 2008. Understanding tinnitus distress: introducing the concepts of moderators and mediators. Int. J. Audiol. 47 (sup2), S106–S111.
Asparouhov, T., Muthén, B., 2009. Exploratory structural equation modeling. Struct. Equ. Model. a Multidiscip. J. 16, 397–438.
Bhatt, J.M., Lin, H.W., Bhattacharyya, N., 2016. Prevalence, severity, exposures, and treatment patterns of tinnitus in the United States. JAMA Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery 142 (10), 959–965.
Biswas, R., Hall, D.A., 2020. Epidemiology of Tinnitus. Brussee, L., 2003. Tinnitus ein permanente stoorzender. De invloed van tinnitus op het dagelijks functioneren en de kwaliteit van leven. Groningen. Wetenschappelijk Genootschap Geneeskunde en Volkgezondheid, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
Burke, L.A., Naylor, G., 2020. Daily-life fatigue in mild to moderate hearing impairment: an ecological momentary assessment study. Ear Hear. 41 (6), 1518.
Cantril, H., 1965. Discovering People’s Aspirations: the Method Used. The Pattern of Human Concerns, pp. 21–29.
Cohen, J., 1988. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences, pp. 273–406.
Cronbach, L.J., 1951. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika 16, 297–334.
De Ridder, D., Vanneste, S., Weisz, N., Londero, A., Schlee, W., Elgoyhen, A.B., Langguth, B., 2014. An integrative model of auditory phantom perception: tinnitus as a unified percept of interacting separable subnetworks. Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev. 44, 15–22.
Dobie, R.A., 1999. A review of randomized clinical trials in tinnitus. Laryngoscope 109 (8), 1202–1211.
Dursi, M., Stearchfield, G., 2016. Anxiety and depression, personality traits relevant to tinnitus: a scoping review. Int. J. Audiol. 55 (11), 605–615.
Eggermont, J.J., Roberts, E.L., 2004. The neuroscience of tinnitus. Trends Neurosci. 27 (11), 676–682.
Fackrell, K., Hall, D.A., Barry, J.G., Hoare, D.J., 2016. Psychometric properties of the tinnitus functional index (TFI): assessment in a UK research volunteer population. Hear. Res. 335, 220–235.
Fackrell, K., Hall, D.A., Barry, J.G., Hoare, D.J., 2018. Performance of the Tinnitus Functional Index as a diagnostic instrument in a UK clinical population. Hear. Res. 358, 74–85.
Field, A., Miles, J., Field, Z., 2012. Discovering Statistics Using R. Sage publications.
Gallass, S., Lego, A., Garavello, W., Bosetti, C., Santoro, E., Colombo, P., Perin, P., La Vecchia, C., Langguth, B., 2015. Prevalence and determinants of tinnitus in the Italian adult population. Neuroepidemiology 45 (1), 12–19.
Gos, E., Rajchel, J.J., Dziendziel, B., Kutyba, J., Bienkowska, K., Sliwieniak, W., Gocel, M., Raj-Koziak, D., Skarzynski, P.H., Skarzynski, H., 2021. How to interpret tinnitus functional index scores: a proposal for a grading system based on a large sample of tinnitus patients. Ear Hear. 42 (3), 654–661.
Guadagnoli, E., Velicer, W.F., 1988. Relation of sample size to the stability of component solutions. J. Educ. Psychol. 80 (3), 324–331.
Hair Jr., J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., 2010. SEM: an Introduction. Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective.
Hall, D.A., Haider, H., Szczepek, A.J., Lau, P., Rabau, S., Jones-Diette, J., Londero, A., Edvall, N.K., Cederoth, C.R., Mielczarek, M., Fuller, T., 2016. Systematic review of outcome domains and instruments used in clinical trials of tinnitus treatments in adults. Trials 17 (1), 270.
Hall, D.A., Smith, H., Hibbert, A., Colley, V., Haider, H.F., Horobin, A., Londero, A., Mazurek, B., Thacker, B., Fackrell, K., 2018. The COMITID study: developing core outcome domains sets for clinical trials of sound-, psychology-, and pharmacology-based interventions for chronic subjective tinnitus in adults. Trends in hearing 22.
Henry, J.A., Dennis, K.C., Schechter, M.A., 2005. Review of tinnitus. J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res.
Henry, J.A., Griest, S., Zaugg, T.L., Thielman, E.J., Kaelin, C., Galvez, G., Carlson, K.F., 2014. Tinnitus and Hearing Survey: a screening tool to differentiate bothersome tinnitus from hearing difficulties. Am. J. Audiol. 24, 66e77.
Hoare, D.J., Kowalkowski, V.L., Kang, S., Hall, D.A., 2011. Systematic review and meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials examining tinnitus management. Laryngoscope 121 (7), 1555–1564.
Hoff, M., Kähari, K., 2017. A Swedish cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the Tinnitus Functional Index. Int. J. Audiol. 56 (4), 277–285.
Holmes, S., Padgham, N.D., 2009. More than ringing in the ears: a review of tinnitus and its psychosocial impact. J. Clin. Nurs. 18 (21), 2927–2937.
Hu, L.T., Bentler, P.M., 1999. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Struct. Equ. Model.: a multidisciplinary journal 6 (1), 1–55.
Jacquesmin, L., Mertens, G., Van de Heyning, P., Vanderveken, O.M., Topsakal, V., De Hertogh, W., Michiels, S., Van Rompaey, G., Gilles, A., 2019. Sensitivity to change and convergent validity of the functional tinnitus index (TFI) and the tinnitus questionnaire (TQ): clinical and research perspectives. Hear. Res. 382, 107966.
Jastreboff, P.J., 2011. Tinnitus Retraining Therapy. Textbook of Tinnitus, pp. 575–596.
Kam, A.C.S., Leung, E.K.S., Chan, P.Y.B., Tong, M.C.F., 2018. Cross-cultural adaptation and psychometric properties of the Chinese tinnitus functional index. Int. J. Audiol. 57 (2), 91–97.
Kaminski, D.M., Hoekstra, C.E., Zanten, B.G.V., Groolman, W., Rovers, M.M., 2010. Measuring disease-specific health-related quality of life to evaluate treatment outcomes in tinnitus patients: a systematic review. Otolaryngology-Head Neck Surg. (Tokyo) 143 (2), 181–185.
MacCallum, R.C., Browne, M.W., Sugawara, H.M., 1996. Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. Psychol. Methods 1 (2), 130.
Marsh, H.W., Muthen, B., Asparouhov, T., Lüdtke, O., Robitzsch, A., Morin, A.J.S., Trautwein, U., 2009. Exploratory structural equation modeling, integrating CFA and EFA: application to students’ evaluations of university teaching. Struct. Equ. Model. a Multidiscip. J. 16, 439–476.

associations between chronic tinnitus and sleep: a cross validation of tinnitus and insomnia questionnaires. Biomed Res. Int. 2015.
Schlee, W., Hall, D., Canlon, B., Cima, R.P.P., de Kleine, E., Hauck, F., Huber, A., Gallus, S., Kleing J., Kyprais, T., Langguth, B., Lopez-Escamaz, A., Hugo, L., Meyer, M., Mieleczarek, M., Norena, A., Pfiffner, F., Pryax, R., Reichert, M., Requena, T., Schecklmann, M., van Dijk, P., van de Heyning, P., Weisz, N., Cederroth, C.R., 2018. Innovations in doctoral training and research on tinnitus: the European school on interdisciplinary tinnitus research (ESIT) perspective. Front. Aging Neurosci. 9, 1–7.
Schreiber, J.B., Nora, A., Stage, F.K., Barlow, E.A., King, J., 2006. Reporting structural equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis results: a review. J. Educ. Res. 99, 323–338.
Sharogradsky, J., Curhan, G.C., Farwell, W.R., 2010. Prevalence and characteristics of tinnitus among US adults. Am. J. Med. 123 (8), 711–718.
Smith, H., Fackrell, K., Kennedy, V., Barry, J., Partridge, L., Hoare, D.J., 2019. A scoping review to catalogue tinnitus problems in children. Int. J. Pediatr. Otolaryngol. 122, 141–151.
Spinholven, P.I.H., Ormel, J., Slokken, P.P.A., Kempen, G.I.J.M., Speckens, A.E.M., Van Hentem, A.M., 1997. A validation study of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) in different groups of Dutch subjects. Psychol. Med. 27 (2), 363–370.
Stevens, J.P., 2012. Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences. Routledge.
Suzuki, N., Ohbi, N., Ogawa, K., 2019. Validation of the Japanese version of the tinnitus functional index (TFI). Front. Audiol. 58, 167–173.
Vander Zee, K.I., Sanderman, R., Heyink, J.W., de Haes, H., 1996. Psychometric qualities of the RAND 36-item Health Survey 1.0: a multidimensional measure of general health status. Int. J. Behav. Med. 3 (2), 104.
Ware Jr., J.E., 1992. Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. Med. Care 30 (6), 473–483.
Wrzesniewski, M., Szymborska, E., Klemens, W., Kotylo, P., Schlee, W., Modrzyńska, M., Lang-Malecka, A., Preis, A., Bulla, J., 2016. Polish translation and validation of the tinnitus handicap inventory and the tinnitus functional index. Front. Psychol. 7, 1871.
Wülfert, H., 2013. Validity and reliability of empirical discretion model. In: Managerial Discretion and Performance in China. Physica, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 257–368.
Zacharias, R., Mirz, F., Johansen, L.V., Andersen, S.E., Bjerring, P., Pedersen, C.B., 2000. Reliability and validity of a Danish adaptation of the tinnitus handicap inventory. Scand. Audiol. 29 (1), 37–43.
Zeman, F., Koller, M., Langguth, B., Landgrebe, M., 2014. Which tinnitus-related aspects are relevant for quality of life and depression: results from a large international multicentre sample. Health Qual. Life Outcome 12 (1), 1–10.
Zigmond, A.S., Snaith, R.P., 1983. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. Acta Psychiatr. Scand. 67 (6), 361–370.