

1       **Experienced hearing aid users’ perspectives of assessment and communication**  
2       **within audiology: A qualitative study using digital methods**

3       **Authors:** Bhavisha Parmar<sup>a</sup>, Kinjal Mehta<sup>b</sup>, Deborah Vickers<sup>c</sup>, Jennifer K. Bizley<sup>a</sup>

4  
5       <sup>a</sup>UCL Ear Institute, University College London, 332 Grays Inn Road, London, WC1X 8EE,

6  
7       <sup>b</sup>St Ann’s Hospital, Whittington Health NHS Trust, London, UK

8  
9       <sup>c</sup>Sound Lab, Cambridge Hearing Group, University of Cambridge, Biomedical Campus, Cambridge.  
10       CB2 0SZ

11  
12       **Abstract**

13  
14       **Objective:** To explore experienced hearing aid users’ perspectives of audiological assessments  
15       and the patient-audiologist communication dynamic during clinical interactions.

16       **Design:** A qualitative study was implemented incorporating both an online focus group and  
17       online semi-structured interviews. Sessions were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim.  
18       Iterative-inductive thematic analysis was carried out to identify themes related to assessment  
19       and communication within audiology practice.

20       **Study samples:** Seven experienced hearing aid users took part in an online focus group and 14  
21       adults participated in semi-structured interviews (age range: 22 - 86 years; 9 males, 11  
22       females).

23       **Results:** Themes related to assessment included the unaided and aided testing procedure and  
24       relating tests to real world hearing difficulties. Themes related to communication included the  
25       importance of communication strategies, explanation of test results and patient centred care in  
26       audiology.

27       **Conclusion:** To ensure that hearing aid services meet the needs of the service users, we should  
28       explore user perspectives and proactively adapt service delivery. This approach should be  
29       ongoing, in response to advances in hearing aid technology. Within audiology, experienced  
30       hearing aid users’ value 1) comprehensive, relatable hearing assessment, 2) clear, concise, deaf  
31       aware patient-audiologist communication, 3) accessible services and 4) a personalised  
32       approach to recommend suitable technology and address patient specific aspects of hearing  
33       loss.

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39       NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

40

## 41 **Introduction**

42 Hearing loss is a growing public health concern that negatively impacts daily life including  
43 communication, behavioural and social interaction and emotions, identity, and psychological  
44 wellbeing (Vas et al., 2017; Wilson et al., 2017). The benefits of hearing aids, for people with  
45 hearing loss, are well established (Acar et al., 2011; Chisolm et al., 2007; Ferguson et al., 2017;  
46 Hornsby, 2013; Humes et al., 2002). However, hearing aid acceptance and uptake remains low  
47 worldwide and self-reported benefits vary (Bisgaard & Ruf, 2017; Chien & Lin, 2012; Humes  
48 et al., 2002; Lopez-Poveda et al., 2017).

49 Effective patient-clinician communication is an essential part of patient-centred care (Zill et  
50 al., 2015); however, clinicians working with people with hearing loss may face additional  
51 challenges due to the impact of hearing loss on communication (Mick et al., 2014). Within  
52 audiology, the patient-audiologist interaction has been recognised as an important factor  
53 contributing to patient satisfaction, hearing aid adoption and hearing aid use (Grenness et al.,  
54 2014; Ismail et al., 2019; Poost-Foroosh et al., 2011; Sciacca et al., 2017), and has been  
55 investigated across a variety of populations and settings (Ekberg et al., 2014b; Mehta et al.,  
56 2019; Tai et al., 2019; Watermeyer et al., 2020; Watermeyer et al., 2017). Importantly, research  
57 demonstrates that audiologists tend to use clinician-centred approaches in practice, without  
58 addressing patients' concerns (Tai et al., 2019), in stark contrast to the patient-centred approach  
59 at the core of audiologists' clinical responsibility (American Speech-Language-Hearing  
60 Association, 2018). Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that psychosocial support is not  
61 routinely provided in audiology practice (Bennett et al., 2020; Ekberg et al., 2014a).  
62 Audiologists vary considerably in their interaction style with patients, in some cases they use  
63 overly-detailed scientific explanations without personalised care (Watermeyer et al., 2017).

64 A patient's hearing aid usage and communication needs may differ based on factors including  
65 the degree of hearing loss (Hartley et al., 2010), lifestyle (Barker et al., 2016), perceived benefit  
66 of hearing aids, perceived hearing disability, shared decision making and the role of  
67 communication partners (Hickson et al., 2014; Meyer et al., 2014; Ng & Loke, 2015). It is also  
68 important to recognize that the provision of audiology-based healthcare services varies  
69 considerably around the world, and, in some cases, hearing aid users may have access to  
70 different service providers. An international investigation of hearing help seeking and  
71 rehabilitation revealed mixed reviews regarding the hearing assessment process and the

72 applicability of test results to everyday listening difficulties (Laplante-Lévesque et al., 2012),  
73 highlighting the need for specific patient-centred approaches in this area to help professionals  
74 improve communication. Furthermore, some hearing aid users had preconceived notions about  
75 private versus public hearing healthcare. They reported that relational competence, including  
76 the clinicians' overall communication manner, was an important component of trust within the  
77 patient-audiologist dynamic (Preminger et al., 2015).

78 Recently, research has focussed on enhancing the ecological validity of audiological  
79 assessment (Keidser et al., 2020) and the development of tools to effectively explain  
80 assessment results to patients (Klyn et al., 2019), with the view of individualising care.  
81 Considering these findings, the influence of the patient-audiologist interaction, and the  
82 importance of ensuring hearing aid services meet the needs of the service users, we should  
83 explore user perspectives and proactively adapt service delivery. This study investigates  
84 experienced hearing aid users' perspectives of audiological assessments using iterative-  
85 inductive thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews and an online focus group. Interviews  
86 focused on the style of communication during patient-audiologist interactions, including the  
87 type of information given to patients by audiologists.

88

## 89 **Methods**

### 90 *Ethical Approval*

91 This study was approved by the UCL Ethics Committee (project no. 3866/001). Data was kept  
92 in compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation (EU 2016/679). Each participant  
93 provided written consent, personal identities were anonymised during transcription and audio  
94 recordings were subsequently destroyed.

95

96

97

98

### 99 *Recruitment*

100 Experienced hearing aid users (i.e., adults with over four years' experience of regular hearing  
101 aid use) with no known neurological conditions were identified through a database of  
102 individuals with hearing loss who had volunteered to take part in research studies at the UCL  
103 Ear Institute, London, England. Experienced hearing aid users were targeted for this study  
104 (rather than first time users) because of their increased exposure to a range of audiology  
105 services and clinicians as well as increased awareness of the hearing healthcare pathway. Email  
106 invitations were sent to potential participants who had been in contact with their audiology  
107 provider within the last 24 months.

108 Purposive sampling with maximum variation was employed to prioritize enrolment of eligible  
109 participants in the one-to-one interviews to maximise diversity of views and experiences (Suri,  
110 2011). Upon expressed interested, participants completed a demographic questionnaire adapted  
111 from Dawes et al (2014). A sampling matrix was then employed to ensure interviewees with  
112 diverse backgrounds were included (see Supplementary Material).

### 113 *Participants*

114 A total of 21 adults with an average of 17 years of hearing aid use participated in this study  
115 with different populations for the focus group (7 participants) and for the semi-structured  
116 interviews (14 participants). Demographics are provided in Table 1 (see Supplementary  
117 Material for individual demographics).

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

	<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
<b>Age group</b>	18-30	1
	31-40	1
	41-50	2
	51-60	6
	61-70	6
	71-80	2
	81+	3
<b>Sex</b>	<i>Female</i>	12
	<i>Male</i>	9
<b>Level of education</b>	<i>Secondary school</i>	4
	<i>Trade qualification</i>	2
	<i>Diploma</i>	2
	<i>University degree</i>	7
	<i>Post graduate qualification</i>	5
	<i>PhD</i>	1
<b>Work status</b>	<i>Working</i>	11
	<i>Retired</i>	10
<b>Audiology provider</b>	<i>Private</i>	9
	<i>Public</i>	12

128 *Table 1: Summary of participant demographics*

129

130 *Procedure*

131 *Topic Guide*

132 The present study implemented a semi-structured approach in an effort to understand  
 133 “participants’ experiences, how they describe their experiences, and the meaning they make of  
 134 those experiences” in an extended conversational format (Rubin, 2012). The topic guide was  
 135 developed based on open-ended questions (e.g., “Describe your experiences of hearing  
 136 assessment”) and follow-up probes (see Supplementary Material for the complete topic guide).  
 137 Once compiled, third-party audiologists and experienced hearing aid users reviewed the topic  
 138 guide content and interpretability (see Figure 1).

139 The focus group was carried out first, as an explorative process, to ensure the target discussion  
 140 topics were easily interpretable, aligned with the main research questions, and were appropriate  
 141 for use within the semi-structured interview format (Cyr, 2016). All focus group participants  
 142 reported good interpretability of questions and no changes were required prior to inclusion in

143 the semi-structured interviews. Thus, the focus group data was included in the present analysis  
144 and the topic guide used in the focus group was used for all interviews.

145

146

147

148


149

150

151

152

153



154 **Figure 1** Flow chart detailing the progression from topic guide development to data collection. <sup>1</sup>Audiologists  
155 suggested the inclusion of questions regarding the use of aided assessment methods, <sup>2</sup>Hearing aid users  
156 recommended questions about accessibility and communication experiences within the audiology reception  
157 area/waiting area.

156

### 157 *Online Protocol*

158 Focus group and interview sessions were conducted between January and March 2021. The  
159 focus group was carried out via Zoom because all participants had previous experience with  
160 this platform, did not require closed captions, and were comfortable with the visual gallery  
161 layout. Semi-structured interview participants chose their preferred online platform (Zoom or  
162 Microsoft Teams) based on their personal communication needs (e.g., closed captioning). All  
163 participants were offered a 1:1 trial call prior to the main session to check audio and internet  
164 quality.

165 The interview facilitator (B.P.) hosted each video call from a professional setting within their  
166 own home. Participants took part in the online video conference from their own homes and  
167 were encouraged to sit in a well-lit room with minimal background noise. Participants wore  
168 their hearing aids throughout the video call and chose to use either headsets, Bluetooth  
169 streamers, or loudspeakers based on their communication needs. The virtual waiting room was

170 open an hour before each call was scheduled to allow for audio and/or Bluetooth connection  
171 testing.

172

### 173 *Focus group*

174 Focus groups of six to ten participants are generally optimal for ensuring all individuals are  
175 able to contribute and provide a range of views without being led by the consensus of a larger  
176 group (Morgan, 1998). The nature of the online, video conference environment also impacts  
177 group facilitation and communication considerably, particularly for people with hearing  
178 difficulties (Dawes et al., 2014). Thus, the focus group was limited to seven participants and  
179 was 90 minutes in duration. Participants were encouraged to use a laptop or tablet (rather than  
180 a smartphone) and to keep their cameras switched on in gallery view to optimise audibility and  
181 access the non-verbal cues.

182 Specific instructions were provided to respondents prior to the focus group session time to  
183 optimise communication and replicate the interactive nature of in-person focus groups as best  
184 as possible (see Supplementary Material). During the session, all participants' microphones  
185 were muted. Participants were able to unmute if they wanted to join the discussion; focus group  
186 members were asked to raise their hand (either physically or by using a virtual signalling  
187 feature within the video conferencing software), to indicate they would like to contribute to the  
188 discussion.

### 189 *Semi-structured interviews*

190 Due to the one-to-one nature of the semi-structured interview, participants were able to use  
191 their preferred communication device (including smartphones); all parties kept their cameras  
192 and microphones switched on for the duration of the interview. On average, each interview  
193 session took approximately 46 minutes (range: 35 - 58 minutes). To avoid fatigue, the  
194 facilitator ensured interviews did not exceed the maximum allotted time of one hour (Adams,  
195 2015).

196

197

198

199

## 200 *Data Analysis*

201 Iterative-inductive thematic analysis with a descriptive phenomenological approach was used  
202 to identify, analyse and report patterns within the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The present  
203 thematic analysis uses a descriptive approach with a focus on lived experience.

204 Inductive (bottom up) thematic analysis was implemented by the first two authors, such that  
205 coded data were organised into general themes centring around experiences during audiology  
206 appointments and patient-audiologist communication. A saturation point was reached after  
207 inductive coding of the 11th interview (participant PQ) and was confirmed by carrying out  
208 three additional interviews for which no new themes emerged. The first and second authors  
209 double coded 25% of transcripts and any discrepancies were resolved at two separate  
210 timepoints within the study.

211

## 212 **Results**

### 213 *Experience of hearing assessment*

214 Here, participants focussed on their recent audiology hearing assessment experiences. Two key  
215 themes were identified: 1) testing procedure and 2) relating tests to real world hearing  
216 difficulties.

217

#### 218 *Testing procedure*

219 Participants described their experiences undergoing pure tone audiometry, including aspects of  
220 the patient-audiologist interaction and certain testing instructions that helped them feel more  
221 comfortable.

222

223 *“Something that really stood out in my mind, no matter how faint the noise is that it’s*  
224 *just as important as the louder ones. Now in the past I remember I’ve sat there*  
225 *thinking can I hear that? ... this time I was really determined that I was gonna press*  
226 *it if it was there was even a quiet sound” – LK (age range: 51-55 years, male, private*  
227 *sector)*

228

229 Some participants mentioned completing speech testing during audiology assessments and  
230 several reported the value for understanding the benefits of their hearing aids when switching  
231 between aided and unaided testing.



232 *“It made me realise what I couldn’t hear, because he did a test first of all without my*  
233 *hearing aids in and then he read the words again in a different order with my hearing*  
234 *aids in and it made me understand what letter sounds that I couldn’t hear, what I was*  
235 *mixing up. That was very useful from a self-awareness point of view” -HG (age range:*  
236 *51-55 years, female, private & public sector)*

237 *And then I went private and he kind of explained to me, this is how it works in terms*  
238 *of picking up speech and really emphasised on speech in testing. And I was able to*  
239 *really kind of understand what I couldn’t hear and why I couldn’t hear certain sounds*  
240 *in relation to my hearing loss. So, it’s really interesting. – RS (age range 35-39 years,*  
241 *female, private sector)*

242  
243

#### 244 *Relating tests to real world hearing difficulties*

245 Participants described the experience of aided assessment once new hearing aids had been fitted  
246 or existing hearing aids had been adjusted, with a variety of aided testing techniques e.g.,  
247 speech perception testing or presentation of distractor stimuli. However, some participants  
248 reported that the audiologist tended to ask them for their opinions of the hearing aid sound  
249 quality rather than performing any aided assessments or using outcome measures.

250 *“They ask: ‘how does that sound?’ & ‘are you comfortable with that?’ and yeah that’s*  
251 *usually how it’s done” - WX (age range: 56-60, male, public sector)*

252  
253 The benefits and challenges of replicating externally valid situations in a controlled clinical  
254 environment were discussed in detail. For example, the significant limitation of conducting  
255 hearing aid fittings in a quiet room was emphasized, as was the benefit of using speakers to  
256 play background noise to simulate noisy environments. When realistic sounds and background  
257 noise were used within the audiology assessment, participants reported feeling more confident  
258 wearing the hearing aids outside of the clinic and expressed a lower need to return to the clinic  
259 for adjustments.

260 *“And I think it gives you confidence to know that you can pick up certain speech with*  
261 *the hearing aids you’ve got, kind of the reassurance to know I can still pick up speech”*  
262 *-RS (age range: 35-39 years, female, private sector)*

263

264 Other respondents did indicate, however, that a simulated environment was still very unrealistic  
265 compared to everyday challenging listening situations.

266

267 *“They would test different noises and then I’ll put one [hearing aid] in and the other*  
268 *one in to see how it felt and their voice as they were speaking to me, but it’s not a*  
269 *good test of the real world to be honest because of course you know my perfect*

270 *world isn't one of being quiet without background noise. That's not how we hear" -*  
271 *ML (age range: 40-45 years, female, public sector)*

272

273 Some participants believed that it would be beneficial to record their listening difficulties in  
274 environments they experience regularly (e.g., home, work) or have a trial period wearing  
275 hearing aids outside the clinic with the option of providing immediate feedback.

276

277 *"I can hear you in a completely silent room, but as soon I walk out the door it isn't*  
278 *right. So, the advantage and it's not perfect, but you can actually have the audiologist*  
279 *or receptionist or someone random person that happens to be in the building, come*  
280 *in and they can have a conversation while you've got music or street sounds on, so it*  
281 *gives you a much better idea because they can tweak it while you're there" -ON (age*  
282 *range: 56-60 years, female, private sector)*

283 *"I've had the thing that mimics restaurants. If only they could come with me or if only*  
284 *they could just come with me and tell me about the street, or come to work with me."*  
285 *- LK (age range: 51-55 years, male, private sector)*

286 *"You've got all the other kind of speakers that generate all sorts of background noise*  
287 *so that you can try them in background noise and then you can wander out in the*  
288 *street in them for a few minutes and come back" - NO (age range: 56-60, private &*  
289 *public sector)*

290

### 291 *Patient-Audiologist Communication*

292 Participants discussed their experiences within specific scenarios they had experienced or in  
293 relation to communication techniques they hoped audiologists would incorporate in future  
294 meetings. Three key themes were identified: 1) importance of communication strategies, 2)  
295 explanation of test results, and 3) patient-centred care. Participants felt that the lack of  
296 individualised care and inadequate communication strategies amongst practitioners negatively  
297 impacted their experiences.

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306 *Importance of communication strategies*

307 Firstly, participants emphasized the importance of professional development training regarding  
308 communication skills and deaf awareness for all audiology staff, including receptionists.  
309 Participants also recounted specific situations where audiologists had not used adequate  
310 communication skills (e.g., conducting clinical questionnaires when the patient was not  
311 wearing their hearing aids) and indicated that some healthcare professionals did not seem aware  
312 of the communication barriers people with hearing aids face.

313 *“I’ve had it where I’ve had my impressions taken, they’ve filled my ears obviously*  
314 *with the putty and start talking to me and I’ve not looked at them. And then it’s kind*  
315 *of... I laugh about it. Quite often I’m one of those I kind of brush things off quite a*  
316 *lot” -QP (age range: 20-24 years, female, public sector)*

317 *“I mean many times I’ve been sat there unaided, with the audiologist talking to me,*  
318 *turning around to put the tube in and I think don’t you know... you of all people must*  
319 *know I can’t hear a thing you’re saying. It’s just annoying.”*  
320 *-WX (age range: 56-60 years, male, public sector)*

321 *“Some audiologists really have... very minimal experience of working with patients*  
322 *like myself, with the type of hearing loss that I have. One had a tendency to over-*  
323 *pronounce and I said you don’t need to speak to me like I’m a five-year-old”*  
324 *-RS (age range: 35-39 years, female, private sector)*

325 *“And the audiologist is clearly checking setting your hearing aids against whatever’s*  
326 *on the computer. And if you felt like they were concentrating on something, and then*  
327 *you had a question... Would you feel comfortable to ask it?” -AB (age range: 81-85*  
328 *years, male, public sector)*

329

330 To better understand the first-hand experience of hearing loss and the perspective of their  
331 patients, experienced hearing aid users suggested audiologists should spend time with  
332 temporary simulated hearing loss (e.g., ear plugs). The importance of having working loop  
333 systems and visual displays in the reception areas to alert patients was also stressed

334 *“the first thing I would do is I would arrange for them to have a week with earplugs*  
335 *in. Just so they would appreciate what people who can’t hear are up against. It*  
336 *happens every time when I don’t have the aids in my ears because they’re adjusting*  
337 *them and they try and speak to me, I do that [points to ear], and they realise I can’t*  
338 *hear them”- WX (age range: 56-60 years, male, public sector)*

339 *“Somebody with really good deaf awareness that faces you when they speak, they*  
340 *explain what they’re going to do before they do it, they’re not somebody that just*  
341 *comes and says right sit in that booth, I’ll put these on, press the button when you*  
342 *hear something” – HG (age range: 51-55 years, female, private & public sector)*

343

344 Finally, some participants reported positive experiences involving being seen by audiologists  
345 with hearing loss. In these cases, they felt the audiologist had an enhanced awareness of the  
346 impact of hearing loss and a unique ability to relate to the hearing difficulties experienced by  
347 patients.

348 *“I think possibly if more deaf people were involved in audiology, not just one deaf*  
349 *audiologist, but if more people, more deaf people were involved all the way through*  
350 *then there might be some changes.” – FE (age range: 61-65 years, female, public*  
351 *sector)*

352 *“My audiologist was Deaf and it was quite an experience. I knew that the person had*  
353 *really good understanding, really good deaf awareness because not all audiologists*  
354 *that I’ve seen have a good deaf awareness. - HG (age range: 51-55 years, female,*  
355 *private & public sector)*

359 Some participants also reported communication barriers in the waiting area and with  
360 administrative staff.

361 *“In the reception I feel like...do I really have to tell you that I’m deaf? I would’ve*  
362 *thought in this environment this is somewhere where I’m safe, you know where I’m*  
363 *with like-minded people and I don’t have to explain myself” -LK (age range: 51-55*  
364 *years, male, private sector)*

365 *“There’s a big waiting room, the audiologist calls my number and then they walked*  
366 *away and didn’t have a chance to see the lip reading or anything.” -LM (age range:*  
367 *71-74 years, male, public sector)*

368

### 369 *Explanation of test results*

370 Participants explained their general understanding of audiometry results and they reported  
371 engaging in varying levels of explanation with their audiologist when interpreting test results.  
372 Some respondents felt their audiologist’s description was sufficient for their needs and trusted  
373 the audiologist’s judgement without requiring additional detail. Others, however, were not  
374 shown the audiogram and felt they would have benefitted from more information., Some  
375 participants felt audiologists assumed audiograms had been explained to the patient in depth at  
376 an earlier date because they were long-term hearing aid users and thus were simply comfortable  
377 reporting when there were no significant changes to hearing thresholds, even if the patient was  
378 unfamiliar with audiogram reports.

379

380 *“I mean it appears on the screen and I sort of look vaguely at the screen but not with*  
381 *great interest, I trust, I trust her.” – TU (age range: 81-85 years, female, private*  
382 *sector)*

383

384 *“My audiologist just said something like, well there’s not much change.”* – CD (age  
385 range: 56-60 years, male, public sector)

386 *“Because when they do the testing, they didn’t tell me the results of the testing, of how*  
387 *beneficial my hearing aids actually were. I just felt like I had this massive gap in my*  
388 *knowledge and my understanding of my hearing and it’s my hearing, it’s mine, no-*  
389 *one else’s”.* – RS (age range: 35-39 years, female, private sector)

390

391 Hearing aid users who received a more thorough explanation reported more benefits in terms  
392 of linking pure tone thresholds with relatable sounds in their everyday environments.  
393 Moreover, participants felt the process of linking audiogram results to everyday sounds gave  
394 them a better understanding of why they could not hear certain sounds in their daily life and  
395 helped them feel more confident in relaying results to communication partners. Many  
396 respondents felt they would have benefited from being given a copy of their audiogram results  
397 to monitor the progression of their hearing loss and consolidate their knowledge outside the  
398 clinic.

399 *“They say there has not been much change and it’s like well actually I want more*  
400 *information than that because my hearing’s really important to me. It is about*  
401 *understanding how to interpret an audiogram for one. Oh yes, oh this is why I can’t*  
402 *hear these sounds that I know... It can give me more confidence.”* - RS (age range:  
403 35-39 years, female, private sector)

404

405 *“My graph, it’s my hearing, I always get a copy. I’ve got a copy of nearly every test*  
406 *I’ve done. If I’m not offered it, I get offended. I want a copy.”* – NO (age range: 56-  
407 60 years, female, private & public sector)

408 *“when it was explained from my graph that the low frequencies were the ones that I*  
409 *was missing which is why I find men more difficult to hear often because they’ve got*  
410 *lower voices or deeper tones and that sort of, it was almost like a little bit of a jigsaw*  
411 *puzzle going oh, that’s why I can’t hear speech”* – HG (age range: 51-55 years,  
412 female, private & public sector)

413

414

415

#### 416 *Patient-centred care*

417 Participants shared experiences of individualised care within audiology services and  
418 recommendations for improvements in this area. A key suggestion was to include more  
419 specific, personalised questioning within the assessment, especially regarding the impact of  
420 hearing loss on employment, education, leisure, and home life, so audiologists could provide  
421 or recommend suitable intervention options.

422 *“And so, the impression I get from audiologists is they think my lifestyle is just like an*  
423 *old person’s lifestyle and it isn’t. Every patient is different and that’s really crucial*  
424 *to the advice they can give as an audiologist.”* -RS (age range: 35-39 years, female,  
425 private & public sector)

426 *“Just with having one conversation she really got it, straight away, she saw how upset*  
427 *I was and understood about the impact it has, because that’s it isn’t it, it’s not just oh*  
428 *you know you have a bit of trouble with the phone, it’s like well that impacts on*  
429 *everything. So, I think the wider issues that hearing loss brings, not just to my identity,*  
430 *to how I fit in with you know my relationships, going out- everything” - ML (age*  
431 *range: 40-45 years, female, public sector)*

432 Hearing aid services have high technical demands, therefore participants felt audiologists need  
433 to balance optimising hearing aid technology (e.g., performing real ear measurements) with  
434 patient communication. This could help services become more patient-focussed (rather than  
435 the technology- or clinician-focus). Other experienced hearing aid users wanted to know more  
436 about the technological capabilities of their hearing aids and additional devices that could be  
437 beneficial for managing hearing difficulties at home or at work.

438 *“My audiologist made me feel that he was committed to my needs, my specific ones.*  
439 *With a lot of audiologists it’s about right ‘let’s give you technology’, but my*  
440 *audiologist knows my needs above the hearing aids are really important. And I know*  
441 *that if things weren’t right I could ring and he’d get me in tomorrow. You know that’s*  
442 *the big difference” -LK (age range: 51-55 years, male, private sector)*

443 *“It was more about the hearing aids than the person with the hearing loss. And it*  
444 *shouldn’t be”.* -HG (age range: 51-55 years, female, private & public sector)

445

446 Experienced hearing aid users also commented on the impact of clinician continuity in hearing  
447 aid services. Some participants felt it was vital to see the same clinician at each appointment  
448 because they had taken time to build the rapport and trust. However, others felt that it was not  
449 so important if there was a significant amount of time between appointments.

450 *“you have a relationship and I think that relationship and trust is really important. I*  
451 *realise it’s not always possible to see the same person, but I think if it can be done it’s*  
452 *important” – LK (age range: 51-55 years, male, private sector)*

453 *“Seeing the same audiologist is hugely important, and it’s taken me a while to find*  
454 *the right person. I’ve been through so many audiologists” – NO (age range: 56-60*  
455 *years, female, private & public sector)*

456 *“I don’t think it makes any difference, you only see somebody once every three years*  
457 *you know, it’s not personal in any way” – FE (age range: 56-60 years, female, public*  
458 *sector)*

459

460 Finally, hearing aid users reported time constraints within the audiology consultation as a key  
461 barrier to patient-centred care.

462 *“I’ve only been in one time, where someone has actually taken the time to go into*  
463 *detail. Where they ask how the hearing aid sounds, and really listen to the answer to*  
464 *suggest alternative settings. Apart from that, it’s always been once we’ve gone through*  
465 *the test, they ask are these settings and if any problems, give us a call. They don’t get*  
466 *time to get to know you”- CD (age range: 56-60 years, male, public sector)*

467 *“I think with the public sector the biggest learning curve was to ask a lot more*  
468 *questions. I would say to anybody going to an audiologist-. ask them questions, tell*  
469 *them what you need your hearing aids for, what’s most important to you. From a*  
470 *private provider they actually do that because you know you’ve got your nice hour-*  
471 *long appointment to have a chat and develop a professional relationship. I think it’s*  
472 *really important.” – HG (age range: 51-55 years, female, private & public sector)*  
473

474

## 475 **Discussion**

476 To ensure that hearing aid services meet the needs of service users, a greater understanding of  
477 user experiences and proactive adaption to service delivery is necessary. To address this, the  
478 present study used an online focus group and a series of semi structured interviews to highlight  
479 key elements of the audiology assessment process and communication experienced hearing aid  
480 users’ value.

481 Adults with hearing loss have previously reported that audiologists were not in tune with their  
482 communication needs, instead using “information dumping with a script like approach”  
483 (Watermeyer et al., 2015). This results in patients having poor recall and understanding of most  
484 of the technical information relating to the nature, degree, and severity of hearing loss. Some  
485 evidence-based recommendations are available for audiologists to improve their reporting and  
486 communication skills at the initial audiology appointment (Grenness et al., 2015; Watermeyer  
487 et al., 2015), but there are currently no national or international standards. The current research  
488 adds to this body of knowledge by confirming that hearing aid users are exposed to various  
489 communication styles during audiology consultations. Many experienced hearing aid users  
490 preferred receiving clear, relatable explanations of pure tone audiometry results from their  
491 audiologists that could be easily related to real-word sounds. Despite a lack of consensus  
492 regarding if and how the audiogram should be explained to patients in detail, evidence-based  
493 tools could help audiologists discuss test results with patients, focussing on the functional  
494 impact of hearing loss (Bundesen, 2021).

495 Beyond audiometry, interviewees reported having minimal experience with formal aided and  
496 unaided functional hearing assessments, including the use of speech and/or background noise.  
497 Instead, it appears audiologists tend to rely on patients’ self-reports to determine hearing aid  
498 sound quality within the consultation room, thereby limiting ecological validity relating to  
499 everyday environments. Some hearing aid users felt it would be beneficial to keep track of  
500 hearing aid sound quality across a range of real scenarios (e.g., sound quality diary). However,

501 the extended period between audiology appointments, particularly within the public sector,  
502 would mean that such feedback may not be considered in a timely manner. The use of remote  
503 care and ecological momentary assessment (a method to track a phenomena of interest in  
504 someone's natural environment) could provide a solution to increasing responsiveness to feedback  
505 in audiology and accommodating time-sensitive adjustments (Convery et al., 2020; Jenstad et  
506 al., 2021).

507

508 Hearing loss can negatively impact communication and participation in activities (Meyer et al.,  
509 2016) and thus it is not surprising that many experienced hearing aid users in the present study  
510 preferred audiologists asking personalized questions to individualise audiology assessment and  
511 rehabilitation. The World Health Organisation's International Classification of Functioning,  
512 Disability and Health model (ICF) has been applied within the hearing healthcare context to  
513 recognise that hearing loss is not defined solely by the status of the objective bodily function,  
514 but also influenced by factors involving the individual within specific contexts (Lind et al.,  
515 2016). Implementation of self-report questionnaires and hearing aid validation measures can  
516 help promote a patient-focussed rehabilitation process (Hickson & Scarinci, 2007); however, a  
517 lack of consensus regarding the optimal outcome measures to use in audiology practice has  
518 been noted (Granberg et al., 2014). The 'Brief ICF Core Set for Hearing Loss' provides a  
519 minimum standard for the assessment of functioning in adults with hearing loss. Its use in  
520 clinical practice could allow for a more holistic approach to audiological assessment (Karlsson  
521 et al., 2021; van Leeuwen et al., 2020).

522 By definition, many patients presenting at an audiology department will have some form of  
523 hearing loss. Therefore, it is imperative audiology environments are as accessible as possible  
524 for the hearing impaired. However, a recent survey revealed that assistive communication  
525 devices were only available in 64% of audiology reception areas (Jama et al., 2020). The  
526 current research presents specific communication barriers experienced by hearing aid users  
527 including poor communication accommodations for hearing impaired patients and time  
528 constraints within public audiology services limiting adequate care and communication.  
529 Interviewees felt all audiology staff should participate in adequate and ongoing professional  
530 training regarding communication strategies and deaf awareness, as well as simulated hearing  
531 loss in order to better understand and empathize with the communication barriers patients



532 encounter. Moving forward, it would be beneficial to involve patients in audiology service  
533 development and evaluation to improve accessibility for patients with hearing loss.

534 The financing and distribution of hearing aids varies globally; some countries offer universal  
535 or selective public insurance for hearing aid services (e.g., Australia, UK), whereas others rely  
536 solely on private insurance or out-of-pocket payments (e.g., USA, Japan; (Yong et al., 2019).  
537 Experienced hearing aid users who had received public sector care reported that the lack of  
538 individualised care and limited availability of tests and assessment tools were most likely due  
539 to time and resource constraints. Additional services available in the private sector are also  
540 likely to be associated with the commercial nature of private sector provision. Further evidence  
541 is needed to better understand which assessment and rehabilitation tools add value to a long-  
542 term hearing aid users' experience of audiology services, technology uptake, and understanding  
543 of diagnostic testing results.

544 Previous research indicates audiologists tend to focus heavily on technological aspects, rather  
545 than considering how hearing aids address activity limitations and participation restrictions  
546 (Meyer et al., 2017). The current research also acknowledges the presence of sophisticated  
547 technical equipment within audiology services: experienced hearing aid users felt it would be  
548 beneficial to have a better balance between technology and patient factors during consultations.  
549 This can be considered in two ways. Firstly, there is a need to offset the technical diagnostic  
550 measures or hearing aid verification methods (e.g., real ear measurements) with personalized  
551 patient interaction. These beliefs are in line with a recent report indicating hearing aid users  
552 were interested in learning more about the technical process during the clinic session (Ryall et  
553 al., 2021), from which the authors provided suggestions to help audiologists make such  
554 information accessible. Secondly, participants within the present study felt individualised  
555 questioning would help audiologists better understand patients' specific needs and  
556 expectations, with the goal of matching them to technology suitable to their lifestyle. Notably,  
557 the current study suggests that clinician continuity could help improve patient-clinician rapport  
558 and trust within hearing aid services more generally, although an association between clinician  
559 continuity and hearing aid outcomes has yet to be established (Bennett et al., 2016).  
560 Collectively, the current research aligns with an operationalised, patient-centred audiology  
561 rehabilitation model (Grenness et al., 2014), highlighting the need to focus on the patient-  
562 clinician relationship, adequately informing and involving patients in results interpretation, and  
563 individualising care.

564

565

566 *Strengths, limitations, and areas for future work*

567 Because hearing loss and the onset of hearing aid use is most common in older adults (aged  
568 65+; Barker et al., 2020), most research evaluating audiology service provision has focused on  
569 the outcomes and experiences of older adults. In contrast, one strength of the current study is  
570 the inclusion of younger hearing aid users and inclusion of participants with recent audiology  
571 service experiences in both the private and public sectors. This diversity permits a richer  
572 understanding of audiology experiences for a more heterogeneous and representative group of  
573 patients and acknowledges the needs of younger individuals with hearing loss. The diversity  
574 within participants' service providers also helps facilitate comparison of results between  
575 countries. The implementation and detailed description of online techniques and  
576 accommodations for carrying out semi-structured interviews and focus groups with hearing aid  
577 users is also a particular strength of this research. These methods are applicable across a range  
578 of applications and such strategies will be beneficial for future studies involving special  
579 populations and/or in-person restrictions. One primary limitation of this study is that ethnicity  
580 and socio-economic status characteristics were not recorded; such factors influence access to  
581 health services and should be considered within future research. Also, within the participant  
582 group there was a skew towards more highly educated (degree level and higher) respondents.

583

584

## 585 **Conclusion**

586 To ensure that hearing aid services meet the needs of the service users, we should explore user  
587 perspectives and proactively adapt service delivery, whilst maintaining cost effective, quality  
588 services. Within audiology, experienced hearing aid users' value 1) comprehensive, reliable  
589 hearing assessments, 2) clear, concise, deaf aware patient-audiologist communication, 3)  
590 accessible services and 4) a personalised approach to recommend suitable technology and  
591 address patient specific aspects of hearing loss.

592

593

594

595

596 **Acknowledgements**

597 We would like to thank to the hearing aid users that took part in the focus group and interviews  
598 and those that commented on the final manuscript. Finally, we would like to extend our thanks  
599 to Mel Ferguson and Cherilee Rutherford for assisting us during the initial planning of this  
600 study and reading this manuscript.

601 **Funding**

602 This work is supported by the NIHR UCLH BRC Deafness and Hearing Problems theme (B.P PhD  
603 studentship). D.A.V was funded by an MRC Senior Fellowship in Hearing (MR/S002537/1) and NIHR  
604 programme grant for applied research (201608). This research was funded, in whole or in part, by  
605 Wellcome Trust/Royal Society Sir Henry Dale Fellowship, (to JKB; Grant 098418/Z/12/Z).

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624 References

625

626 Acar, B., Yurekli, M.F., Babademez, M.A., Karabulut, H., & Karasen, R.M. (2011). Effects of hearing  
627 aids on cognitive functions and depressive signs in elderly people. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr*,  
628 52(3), 250-252. doi:10.1016/j.archger.2010.04.013

629 Adams, W.C. (2015). Conducting Semi-Structured Interviews. In *Handbook of Practical Program*  
630 *Evaluation* (pp. 492-505).

631 American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2018). Scope of Practice in Audiology Retrieved  
632 from <https://www.asha.org/policy/SP2018-00353/>

633 Barker, F., Mackenzie, E., Elliott, L., Jones, S., & de Lusignan, S. (2016). Interventions to improve  
634 hearing aid use in adult auditory rehabilitation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 2016(8),  
635 Cd010342. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD010342.pub3

636 Bennett, R.J., Meyer, C., & Eikelboom, R.H. (2016). Does clinician continuity influence hearing aid  
637 outcomes? *Int J Audiol*, 55(10), 556-563. doi:10.1080/14992027.2016.1185169

638 Bennett, R.J., Meyer, C.J., Ryan, B.J., & Eikelboom, R.H. (2020). How Do Audiologists Respond to  
639 Emotional and Psychological Concerns Raised in the Audiology Setting? Three Case  
640 Vignettes. *Ear and Hearing*, 41(6). Retrieved from [https://journals.lww.com/ear-](https://journals.lww.com/ear-hearing/Fulltext/2020/11000/How_Do_Audiologists_Respond_to_Emotional_and.23.aspx)  
641 [hearing/Fulltext/2020/11000/How\\_Do\\_Audiologists\\_Respond\\_to\\_Emotional\\_and.23.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/ear-hearing/Fulltext/2020/11000/How_Do_Audiologists_Respond_to_Emotional_and.23.aspx)

642 Bisgaard, N., & Ruf, S. (2017). Findings From EuroTrak Surveys From 2009 to 2015: Hearing Loss  
643 Prevalence, Hearing Aid Adoption, and Benefits of Hearing Aid Use. *Am J Audiol*, 26(3s), 451-  
644 461. doi:10.1044/2017\_aja-16-0135

645 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*  
646 *Psychology*, 3, 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

647 Bundesen, L. (2021). The audiogram is complex: This new tool helps audiologists explain it. Retrieved  
648 from [https://hearinghealthmatters.org/innovationsinhearing/2021/ida-future-pcc-my-](https://hearinghealthmatters.org/innovationsinhearing/2021/ida-future-pcc-my-hearing-explained/)  
649 [hearing-explained/](https://hearinghealthmatters.org/innovationsinhearing/2021/ida-future-pcc-my-hearing-explained/)

650 Chien, W., & Lin, F.R. (2012). Prevalence of Hearing Aid Use Among Older Adults in the United States.  
651 *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 172(3), 292-293. doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2011.1408

652 Chisolm, T.H., Johnson, C.E., Danhauer, J.L., Portz, L.J., Abrams, H.B., Lesner, S., . . . Newman, C.W.  
653 (2007). A systematic review of health-related quality of life and hearing aids: final report of  
654 the American Academy of Audiology Task Force On the Health-Related Quality of Life  
655 Benefits of Amplification in Adults. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 18(2), 151-183.  
656 doi:10.3766/jaaa.18.2.7

657 Convery, E., Keidser, G., McLelland, M., & Groth, J. (2020). A Smartphone App to Facilitate Remote  
658 Patient-Provider Communication in Hearing Health Care: Usability and Effect on Hearing Aid  
659 Outcomes. *Telemedicine journal and e-health : the official journal of the American*  
660 *Telemedicine Association*, 26(6), 798-804. doi:10.1089/tmj.2019.0109

661 Cyr, J. (2016). The Pitfalls and Promise of Focus Groups as a Data Collection Method. *Sociological*  
662 *Methods & Research*, 45(2), 231-259. doi:10.1177/0049124115570065

663 Dawes, P., Maslin, M., & Munro, K.J. (2014). 'Getting used to' hearing aids from the perspective of  
664 adult hearing-aid users. *International Journal of Audiology*, 53(12), 861-870.  
665 doi:10.3109/14992027.2014.938782

- 666 Ekberg, K., Grenness, C., & Hickson, L. (2014a). Addressing Patients' Psychosocial Concerns Regarding  
667 Hearing Aids Within Audiology Appointments for Older Adults. *American Journal of*  
668 *Audiology*, 23(3), 337-350. doi:doi:10.1044/2014\_AJA-14-0011
- 669 Ekberg, K., Grenness, C., & Hickson, L. (2014b). Addressing patients' psychosocial concerns regarding  
670 hearing aids within audiology appointments for older adults. *Am J Audiol*, 23(3), 337-350.  
671 doi:10.1044/2014\_aja-14-0011
- 672 Ferguson, M.A., Kitterick, P.T., Chong, L.Y., Edmondson-Jones, M., Barker, F., & Hoare, D.J. (2017).  
673 Hearing aids for mild to moderate hearing loss in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 9(9),  
674 Cd012023. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD012023.pub2
- 675 Granberg, S., Dahlström, J., Möller, C., Kähäri, K., & Danermark, B. (2014). The ICF Core Sets for  
676 hearing loss--researcher perspective. Part I: Systematic review of outcome measures  
677 identified in audiological research. *Int J Audiol*, 53(2), 65-76.  
678 doi:10.3109/14992027.2013.851799
- 679 Grenness, C., Hickson, L., Laplante-Lévesque, A., & Davidson, B. (2014). Patient-centred audiological  
680 rehabilitation: perspectives of older adults who own hearing aids. *Int J Audiol*, 53 Suppl 1,  
681 S68-75. doi:10.3109/14992027.2013.866280
- 682 Grenness, C., Hickson, L., Laplante-Lévesque, A., Meyer, C., & Davidson, B. (2015). The nature of  
683 communication throughout diagnosis and management planning in initial audiological  
684 rehabilitation consultations. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 26(1), 36-50. doi:10.3766/jaaa.26.1.5
- 685 Hartley, D., Rochtchina, E., Newall, P., Golding, M., & Mitchell, P. (2010). Use of hearing AIDS and  
686 assistive listening devices in an older Australian population. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 21(10), 642-  
687 653. doi:10.3766/jaaa.21.10.4
- 688 Hickson, L., Meyer, C., Lovelock, K., Lampert, M., & Khan, A. (2014). Factors associated with success  
689 with hearing aids in older adults. *International Journal of Audiology*, 53(sup1), S18-S27.  
690 doi:10.3109/14992027.2013.860488
- 691 Hickson, L., & Scarinci, N. (2007). Older adults with acquired hearing impairment: applying the ICF in  
692 rehabilitation. *Semin Speech Lang*, 28(4), 283-290. doi:10.1055/s-2007-986525
- 693 Hornsby, B.W. (2013). The effects of hearing aid use on listening effort and mental fatigue associated  
694 with sustained speech processing demands. *Ear Hear*, 34(5), 523-534.  
695 doi:10.1097/AUD.0b013e31828003d8
- 696 Humes, L.E., Wilson, D.L., Barlow, N.N., & Garner, C. (2002). Changes in hearing-aid benefit following  
697 1 or 2 years of hearing-aid use by older adults. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*, 45(4), 772-782.  
698 doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2002/062)
- 699 Ismail, A.H., Munro, K.J., Armitage, C.J., & Dawes, P.D. (2019). What do hearing healthcare  
700 professionals do to promote hearing aid use and benefit among adults? A systematic review.  
701 *Int J Audiol*, 58(2), 63-76. doi:10.1080/14992027.2018.1531154
- 702 Jama, G.M., Shahidi, S., Danino, J., & Murphy, J. (2020). Assistive communication devices for patients  
703 with hearing loss: a cross-sectional survey of availability and staff awareness in outpatient  
704 clinics in England. *Disabil Rehabil Assist Technol*, 15(6), 625-628.  
705 doi:10.1080/17483107.2019.1604823
- 706 Jenstad, L.M., Singh, G., Boretzki, M., DeLongis, A., Fichtl, E., Ho, R., . . . Stephenson, E. (2021).  
707 Ecological Momentary Assessment: A Field Evaluation of Subjective Ratings of Speech in  
708 Noise. *Ear Hear*. doi:10.1097/aud.0000000000001071
- 709 Karlsson, E., Mäki-Torkko, E., Widén, S., Gustafsson, J., Manchaiah, V., Mahomed-Asmail, F., . . .  
710 Granberg, S. (2021). Validation of the Brief International Classification of Functioning,  
711 Disability and Health (ICF) core set for hearing loss: an international multicentre study.  
712 *International Journal of Audiology*, 60(6), 412-420. doi:10.1080/14992027.2020.1846088
- 713 Keidser, G., Naylor, G., Brungart, D.S., Caduff, A., Campos, J., Carlile, S., . . . Smeds, K. (2020). The  
714 Quest for Ecological Validity in Hearing Science: What It Is, Why It Matters, and How to  
715 Advance It. *Ear and Hearing*, 41 Suppl 1(Suppl 1), 5S-19S.  
716 doi:10.1097/AUD.0000000000000944

- 717 Klyn, N.A.M., Rutherford, C., Shrestha, N., Lambert, B.L., & Dhar, S. (2019). Counseling with the  
718 Audiogram. *The Hearing Journal*, 72(11), 12,13,17. doi:10.1097/01.Hj.0000612568.43372.73
- 719 Laplante-Lévesque, A., Knudsen, L.V., Preminger, J.E., Jones, L., Nielsen, C., Öberg, M., . . . Kramer,  
720 S.E. (2012). Hearing help-seeking and rehabilitation: Perspectives of adults with hearing  
721 impairment. *International Journal of Audiology*, 51(2), 93-102.  
722 doi:10.3109/14992027.2011.606284
- 723 Lind, C., Meyer, C., & Young, J. (2016). Hearing and Cognitive Impairment and the Role of the  
724 International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health as a Rehabilitation  
725 Framework. *Seminars in hearing*, 37(3), 200-215. doi:10.1055/s-0036-1584410
- 726 Lopez-Poveda, E.A., Johannesen, P.T., Pérez-González, P., Blanco, J.L., Kalluri, S., & Edwards, B.  
727 (2017). Predictors of Hearing-Aid Outcomes. *Trends in hearing*, 21, 2331216517730526.  
728 doi:10.1177/2331216517730526
- 729 Mehta, K., Mahon, M., Watkin, P., Marriage, J., & Vickers, D. (2019). A qualitative review of parents'  
730 perspectives on the value of CAEP recording in influencing their acceptance of hearing  
731 devices for their child. *International Journal of Audiology*, 58(7), 401-407.  
732 doi:10.1080/14992027.2019.1592250
- 733 Meyer, C., Barr, C., Khan, A., & Hickson, L. (2017). Audiologist-patient communication profiles in  
734 hearing rehabilitation appointments. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 100(8), 1490-1498.  
735 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2017.03.022>
- 736 Meyer, C., Hickson, L., Lovelock, K., Lampert, M., & Khan, A. (2014). An investigation of factors that  
737 influence help-seeking for hearing impairment in older adults. *International Journal of*  
738 *Audiology*, 53(sup1), S3-S17. doi:10.3109/14992027.2013.839888
- 739 Mick, P., Foley, D.M., & Lin, F.R. (2014). Hearing Loss is Associated with Poorer Ratings of Patient-  
740 Physician Communication and Healthcare Quality. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*,  
741 62(11), 2207-2209. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.13113>
- 742 Morgan, D. (1998). *The Focus Group Guidebook*. doi:10.4135/9781483328164
- 743 Ng, J.H.-Y., & Loke, A.Y. (2015). Determinants of hearing-aid adoption and use among the elderly: A  
744 systematic review. *International Journal of Audiology*, 54(5), 291-300.  
745 doi:10.3109/14992027.2014.966922
- 746 Poost-Foroosh, L., Jennings, M.B., Shaw, L., Meston, C.N., & Cheesman, M.F. (2011). Factors in client-  
747 clinician interaction that influence hearing aid adoption. *Trends in amplification*, 15(3), 127-  
748 139. doi:10.1177/1084713811430217
- 749 Preminger, J.E., Oxenbøll, M., Barnett, M.B., Jensen, L.D., & Laplante-Lévesque, A. (2015).  
750 Perceptions of adults with hearing impairment regarding the promotion of trust in hearing  
751 healthcare service delivery. *Int J Audiol*, 54(1), 20-28. doi:10.3109/14992027.2014.939776
- 752 Rubin, H.R., I. (2012). *Qualitative Interviewing (3rd ed.): The Art of Hearing Data(3rd ed.)*. Retrieved  
753 from <https://methods.sagepub.com/book/qualitative-interviewing>
- 754 Ryall, A., Jenstad, L.M., Pumford, J., Howe, T., & Grosjean, G. (2021). Counseling During Real Ear  
755 Measurements: The Clients' Perspective. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 32(2), 107-115. doi:10.1055/s-  
756 0040-1718930
- 757 Sciacca, A., Meyer, C., Ekberg, K., Barr, C., & Hickson, L. (2017). Exploring Audiologists' Language and  
758 Hearing Aid Uptake in Initial Rehabilitation Appointments. *Am J Audiol*, 26(2), 110-118.  
759 doi:10.1044/2017\_aja-16-0061
- 760 Suri, H. (2011). Purposeful Sampling in Qualitative Research Synthesis. *Qualitative Research Journal*,  
761 11, 63-75. doi:10.3316/QRJ1102063
- 762 Tai, S., Barr, C., & Woodward-Kron, R. (2019). Towards patient-centred communication: an  
763 observational study of supervised audiology student-patient hearing assessments. *Int J*  
764 *Audiol*, 58(2), 97-106. doi:10.1080/14992027.2018.1538574
- 765 van Leeuwen, L.M., Pronk, M., Merkus, P., Goverts, S.T., Terwee, C.B., & Kramer, S.E. (2020).  
766 Operationalization of the Brief ICF Core Set for Hearing Loss: An ICF-Based e-Intake Tool in

- 767 Clinical Otology and Audiology Practice. *Ear and Hearing*, 41(6), 1533-1544.  
768 doi:10.1097/AUD.0000000000000867
- 769 Vas, V., Akeroyd, M.A., & Hall, D.A. (2017). A Data-Driven Synthesis of Research Evidence for  
770 Domains of Hearing Loss, as Reported by Adults With Hearing Loss and Their Communication  
771 Partners. *Trends in hearing*, 21, 2331216517734088. doi:10.1177/2331216517734088
- 772 Watermeyer, J., Kanji, A., & Brom, L. (2020). "What's Going on With My Ears?": Some Reflections on  
773 Managing Uncertainty in the Audiology Consultation. *Am J Audiol*, 29(3), 504-512.  
774 doi:10.1044/2020\_aja-19-00116
- 775 Watermeyer, J., Kanji, A., & Mlambo, N. (2015). Recall and understanding of feedback by adult  
776 patients following diagnostic audiological evaluation. *Int J Audiol*, 54(10), 758-763.  
777 doi:10.3109/14992027.2015.1051667
- 778 Watermeyer, J., Kanji, A., & Sarvan, S. (2017). The First Step to Early Intervention Following  
779 Diagnosis: Communication in Pediatric Hearing Aid Orientation Sessions. *Am J Audiol*, 26(4),  
780 576-582. doi:10.1044/2017\_aja-17-0027
- 781 Wilson, B.S., Tucci, D.L., Merson, M.H., & O'Donoghue, G.M. (2017). Global hearing health care: new  
782 findings and perspectives. *The Lancet*, 390(10111), 2503-2515. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
783 6736(17)31073-5
- 784 Yong, M., Willink, A., McMahan, C., McPherson, B., Nieman, C.L., Reed, N.S., & Lin, F.R. (2019).  
785 Access to adults' hearing aids: policies and technologies used in eight countries. *Bull World*  
786 *Health Organ*, 97(10), 699-710. doi:10.2471/blt.18.228676
- 787 Zill, J.M., Scholl, I., Härter, M., & Dirmaier, J. (2015). Which Dimensions of Patient-Centeredness  
788 Matter? - Results of a Web-Based Expert Delphi Survey. *PLoS One*, 10(11), e0141978.  
789 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0141978
- 790