

Introduction

One common goal of hearing aid fittings is to restore loudness perception to normal levels for all sound inputs. This goal assumes that hearing-impaired people would like to perceive sounds with normal loudness. Some research (e.g., Smeds, 2004; Smeds, et al., 2006) suggests that this might not be the most appropriate loudness goal for hearing aid fittings. Nevertheless, the most commonlyimplemented prescription procedures for nonlinear hearing aids either are based on the principle of loudness normalization (e.g., DSL [i/o]) or else aim to maximize speech intelligibility while ensuring that overall loudness of amplified sounds are as loud as or are no louder than for a normal-hearing person (e.g., NAL-NL1/NL2). Hearing health care providers attempt to execute these prescriptive goals by adjusting amplification characteristics to match REAR prescription targets for different input levels. In addition, evidencebased hearing aid fitting procedures call for further modification of amplification characteristics in the clinic and in the field according to hearing aid wearers' individual preferences. These fine-tuning modifications can result in fittings with loudness characteristics that are considerably removed from the original loudness goals.

This research explored whether this widely-used and successful approach to hearing aid fitting results in normal loudness perception, as called for in fitting goals, for adults with mild to moderate sensorineural hearing loss.

Specifically the following questions were asked:

- Do hearing aid fittings that result from best fitting practices differ from prescribed fitting goals?
- Do best fitting practices result in acceptable selfreported loudness perception in the real world?
- Do best fitting practices result in normal loudness perception in the real world?

Participants



Acknowledgements

Supported by NIDCD. PAL normative data provided by Catherine Palmer, Ph.D. A pdf version of the poster can be found at www.harlmemphis.org

Is normal loudness the appropriate goal for hearing aid fitting? Jani Johnson and Robyn Cox

Hearing Aid Research Laboratory, The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN Presented at the American Auditory Society Convention, Scottsdale, AZ, March, 2013

Methods

Fifteen participants were fitted with four different pairs of mini-BTE hearing aids, resulting in 60 hearing aid fittings. A structured 5-step fitting and verification procedure was implemented for each pair. Participants wore each pair of hearing aids for one month as they went about their daily activities. After each one month field trial, participants completed the Profile of Aided Loudness (PAL; Palmer, et al., 1999). This self-report questionnaire provided a measure of the participants' perceptions of, and satisfaction with, the aided loudness of soft, average, and loud everyday sounds.

Five-Step Hearing Aid Fitting and Verification Procedure

	Step 1 - <i>First Fit</i>	 Programmed according to the many recommended method and setting Appropriate ear coupling chosen.
	Step 2 – Adjustment to match Real Ear Targets	 Maximum power output and gain aids adjusted to match NAL (in th targets for MPO and for speech in and 70 dB SPL.
	Step 3 – Subjective Verification	 Gain and MPO fine-tuned using rush subjective assessments of: bilatera balance, loudness of average spee comfort, and quality of own voice
	Step 4- Real world optimization of settings	 Remote controls and hearing aid capabilities used for a total of on optimize hearing aid performanc daily lives.
	Step 5- Follow up Fine Tuning	 Follow up telephone interview aft again after six days of use. Follow- after one week of daily use when
		Results
Hearing Aid Fittings		
	Q: Do hearing aid fittings that result from best fitting practices differ from prescribed fitting goals? A: For NL1 – Yes • These fittings provided gain for 70	
	inese nungs provided gain 101	

- and 55 dB SPL inputs that was less than the NAL-NL1 fitting targets for those levels. A: For NL2 – Not much
- Although fittings initially were matched to NL1 targets, modifications based on best fitting practices resulted in REARs that were much closer to NL2 targets.
- Still, fittings resulted in less gain for low-level high-frequency inputs than was prescribed by NL2.



Frequency (kHz)

nufacturer's ngs of all features. of the hearing nese cases, NL1) put levels of 55 ule-based al loudness ech, loudness learning e month to e in participants' er two days and -up fine-tuning needed.

Satisfaction

Q: Do best fitting practices result in acceptable self-reported loudness perception in the real world? A: Yes

- The PAL includes a Satisfaction Rating that ranges from "Not good at all" to "Just right". On average, participants rated their aided loudness perception between "Okay" and "Pretty good".
- The15 participants' aided satisfaction ratings (N = 60 hearing aid fittings) are presented at right compared to their unaided ratings.
- Amplification increased satisfaction with loudness of nonspeech sounds compared to listening without hearing aids.

Loudness

Q: Do best fitting practices result in normal loudness perception in the real world? A: No

- The PAL also includes a Loudness Rating that ranges from "Do not hear" to "Uncomfortably loud".
- On average, aided listeners with mild to moderate hearing impairment perceived soft and moderate everyday sounds louder and loud sounds softer than normal hearers.
- In like comparisons, Mueller & Powers (2001) and Shi et al. (2007) reported similar trends, especially for soft and loud everyday sounds.

Results Summary

On target? Or missing the mark?

- even for normal-hearing listeners.
- technology constraints.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS



Loudness Category

For listeners with mild-moderate hearing impairment, evidence-based fitting practices resulted in hearing aid fittings that provided less gain than was called for by the NAL-NL1 prescription. Instead, the fitting protocol resulted in gain closer to that called for by NAL-NL2, but still provided less low-level high-frequency gain than was prescribed. Regardless, the results of 59 hearing aid fittings revealed that aided hearing-impaired listeners perceived soft and moderate non-speech sounds louder than, and loud sounds softer than, normal hearers. These data are consistent with findings of Mueller & Powers (2001) and Shi et al. (2007). Although participants with hearing impairment did not perceive non-speech sounds to have "normal" loudness, they reported that loudness was acceptable to them in their daily lives, and that it was more satisfactory than unaided loudness.

The observation of small but statistically-significant differences between theoretical loudness goals and the perceived loudness resulting from best-fitting practices calls for some consideration. We should keep in mind that "normal" loudness is not necessarily preferred loudness. This is true

On the other hand, it is not clear whether these findings represent true preferences of hearing aid wearers or if they are the result of a fine-tuned compromise between patient preferences and

When real ear measures are used to evaluate hearing aid fittings, practitioners should be aware that loudness data consistently demonstrate differences between theoretical goals and patient preferences.

References Mueller, G. & Powers, T. (2001). Consideration of auditory acclimatization in the prescriptive fitting of hearing aids. Sem Hear, 22 (2), 103-124. Shi, et al. (2007). Aided loudness growth and satisfaction with everyday loudness perception in compression hearing aid users. JAAA, 18, 206-219. Smeds, K. (2004). Is normal or less than normal overall loudness preferred by first-time hearing aid users? Ear Hear, 25 (2), 159-172.

Mueller, G., & Palmer, C. (1998). The Profile of Aided Loudness: a new "PAL" for '98. Hear J, 51 (1), 10-19. Smeds, K., et al. (2006). Preferred overall loudness: II: Listening through hearing aids in field and laboratory tests. IJA, 45, 12-25.