



# Clinical Approaches to Hearing Aid Feature Adjustments

Alireza Faghanoghani, Jani Johnson

School of Communication Sciences & Disorders, University of Memphis, TN



## Introduction

Hearing aid fitting includes evidence-based steps, such as frequency-specific gain adjustment guided by validated prescriptive formulas (e.g., NAL-NL2). In contrast, there is little standardized guidance for adjusting signal-processing features such as noise reduction and directional microphones. Research shows that the most aggressive settings are not always preferred. Adding to this complexity, labels (e.g. “brighter” vs “fuller”) often do not clearly reflect the acoustic changes they produce. Despite increasingly advanced technology, little is known about how audiologists adjust these features in clinical practice. This study surveys current approaches to feature adjustment among practicing audiologists.

- Research Questions:**
- When presented with common patient complaints and simulated manufacturer feature controls, how often do audiologists modify default feature settings and in what direction?
  - Do clinician characteristics differ between clinicians who frequently modify settings and those who primarily retain defaults?

## Methodology

**Design**  
Cross-sectional survey administered via Qualtrics.

**Participants**  
7 clinical audiologists and 3 audiology students recruited via clinic email and social media

**Survey Content**  
Participants adjusted simulated feature controls (5 manufacturers) across three common hearing-loss scenarios. Adjustments were recorded relative to default settings. Demographics were collected.

**Data Coding & Analysis**  
Adjustments were coded as Decrease, No Change, or Increase. For each clinician, the proportion of features modified was calculated across all scenarios and manufacturers. Clinicians were descriptively classified as:  

- High Modifiers (>60% changed)
- Default-Oriented (>60% unchanged)

Group characteristics and rationales were compared descriptively

## Discussion

Descriptive analyses demonstrated substantial variability in how audiologists adjusted hearing aid features across scenarios. Across all scenarios and features, only two instances showed unanimous adjustment in the same direction. In most cases, clinicians differed in whether they increased, retained, or decreased feature strength within the same scenario.

Adjustment patterns were more consistent when features directly aligned with the presenting complaint. For example, in impulse noise discomfort scenarios, most clinicians increased impulse noise reduction from default settings. However, overall, feature adjustment direction was not consistently linked to specific patient complaints.

Clinicians were less likely to decrease feature strength relative to manufacturer defaults and were less likely to modify features with less explicit labels (e.g., “Brightness,” “Sound Enhancement”).

Seven participants modified more than 60% of available features (“High Modifiers”). Although no clear demographic pattern emerged, less experienced clinicians and students appeared more likely to modify defaults. Two Default-Oriented clinicians held PhD or Master’s degrees rather than an AuD.

## Conclusions

Feature adjustments varied widely across clinicians, even within identical patient scenarios. Modifications were not consistently aligned with presenting complaints, suggesting variability in clinical decision-making and interpretation of manufacturer controls.

Clinician training and experience may influence reliance on default settings, though findings are exploratory (n = 10).

Results highlight the need for clearer guidance regarding feature adjustment and may inform manufacturer design and labeling of programmable controls.

## Results

